Usenet Newsgroup Archive: rec.radio.amateur.policy

2003-01 - 2003-02

These Usenet messages were preserved as a plain-text archive. This PDF was generated by Digital Library of Amateur Radio & Communications from the source text file in 2026.

Date span: 2003-01-01 through 2003-02-28

Source text: rec.radio.amateur.policy.txt

Source item: https://archive.org/details/usenet-rec

Messages included in this PDF: 3,104

Message records with no readable body available in the source text: 2

Messages are presented chronologically by archived date.

Binary or encoded payloads are not printed as blocks of encoded text; a placeholder appears where such material was detected. The original source text is unchanged.

1. Re: Adding something extra to a CQ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 00:05:24 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E1230B0.AFD589E8@earthlink.net>
Source record: 59083

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E107344.F26C8343@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20021229102142.27399.00000280@mb-bk.aol.com>...
> > > > >Subject: Re: Adding something extra to a CQ?
> > > > >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> > > > >Date: 12/29/02 8:44 AM Central Standard Time
> > > > >Message-id: <f45722ac.0212290644.5e64cfa7@posting.google.com>
> > >
> > > > >> >What a sweeping statement. Are you saying that nearly all, or even
> > > > >> >most, DX stations accept the ARRL DXCC as a worldwide standard? The
> > > > >> >ARRL can't even get half of the US hams to join, let alone
> > > > >> >participate. I'd wager that most DX hams have never submitted a thing
> > > > >> >to the DXCC desk.
> > > > >>
> > > > >> As a matter of fact, they do. Whether it is in direct participation
> > of
> > > > >> DXCC or use of it's standards list of accpetable countries, it is.
> > > > >
> > > > >So you claim that a mojority of international amateurs have submitted
> > > > >for DXCC?
> > > >
> > > > WHERE, in that ENTIRE QUOTE, did I say ANYTHING about "SUBMITTED" for DXCC,
> > > > Brainiac?
> > >
> > > Then how do you measure it? You've got to measure something for you
> > > to say that a majority are for it.
> >
> > Try plugging in "the overwhelming majority of DXers worldwide". That's
> > how you measure it.
>
> Now, Dave, you should know as well as anyone that you have to have a
> piece of paper with someone's signature on it to back up such claims.
>
> I think that an application for DXCC is that piece of paper.
>
> So, of all the amateurs worldwide, how many have submitted for DXCC?

Why don't you run this by the DXCC desk?

> Of all the DXers worldwide, how many have submitted for DXCC?

Most.

> Or do you have some other way to measure it?

The overwhelming majority of DXers worldwide accept the DXCC program as
the standard and participate in it. There is no other standard which
comes close.
If you had a clue about DXing, you'd have come to that conclusion long
ago.

> > > > >Don't characterize my Somalia amateur operating based upon DXCC
> > > > >acceptance. You're making the same mistake Dave and Ed did.
> > > > >
> > > > You cannot produce any documentation of authorization to operate there,
> > > > and it's not accepted for DXCC credit. I think YOU characterized it all by
> > > > yourself, Brian.
> > > >
> > > Yet I was authorized to operate there, by my commander, just as the
> > > requirements on the ARRL web site state. If DXCC doesn't accept it,
> > > so be it.
> > >
> > Maybe the DXCC desk will just take your word for it.
> >
> Why would they do that?

I don't believe they would do that.

I haven't asked them to.

...and for good reason. You'd only look like a fool (again).

Dave K8MN

2. Re: Adding something extra to a CQ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 00:07:44 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E12314A.21BFFC50@earthlink.net>
Source record: 59084

```
Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E10720A.EC9B2A72@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E0F26F9.D7EDA0DF@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E0E806D.BC4FE12@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E0D4CA6.110326FE@earthlink.net>...
> > >
> > > > > > > > > If a rare DX station wants to rag chew, he'll rag chew. It is the rare
> > > > > > > > > DX station's ball game--always.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > I'm glad you've finally come around to my way of thinking. I knew you
> > > > > > > > > would, eventually.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > If that is what you got from what I wrote, you still have a
> > > > > > > > > comprehension problem.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > You said, "If a rare DX station wants to rag chew, he'll rag chew. It
> > > > > > > > is the rare DX station's ball game--always."
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > We know what I wrote. What is at issue is how it is in agreement with
> > > > > > > anything you've posted in the past.
> > > >
> > > > > > You said that as a DXer, that I wasn't allowed to ragchew. You were
> > > > > > wrong. Now you're making more sense with the above statement.
> > >
> > > Go back to "Start".
> >
> Sorry, can't do that.

Go ahead, Brian. It isn't very far.

> > You did not comprehend what I wrote since I've
> > never made the statement you attribute to me. Keep working.
> >
> You're welcome to clarify your statement at any time.
```

You're welcome to go back and re-read it at any time. It isn't my statement which needs clarification, it is your comprehension.

Dave K8MN

3. Re: Adding something extra to a CQ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 00:26:10 UTC
From: AC6V <ac6v@amsat.org>
Message-ID: <CAqQ9.12411$L61.1127103@news1.west.cox.net>
Source record: 59085

I thought this one would get some action.

I'm just quoting the ARRL (and I agree with them) -- URL:
http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/pdf/repeater1.pdf

"Don't call CQ to initiate a conversation on a repeater." --- ARRL,
Repeaters - How To Use Them.
I agree that simplex operation frequently uses CQ to good effect.

Your comment on "monitoring" or "listening" is just fighting traditional
protocol.
On San Diego repeaters and Bay area repeaters, one can listen for weeks, nay
months and never hear a CQ

Can you use CQ on a repeater -- sure, but be prepared to have 16 VHFers come
back and explain why no one uses CQ on a repeater. Your locale may vary. I'm
not saying what I would like it to be --- just the way it IS by traditional
protocol.

At one time VHF was the land of technical repeater builders, many not from
HF and they developed their own protocols. No CQ's, Q-Signals HF Jargon --
back then. But Q-Signals have crept back in except most VHFers don't know
what QRV or QRU means. And they should -- nice short hand during emergency
communications when time is critical.

On some repeaters -- "monitoring" is reserved for control ops. Others
announce their presence and invite a QSO by listening.

Even travelling across country, I don't ever remember a CQ on a repeater.

When in Rome ---- Oh well -- nuff

--
I Doubt, Therefore I Might Be
73 From AC6V, Rod In Oceanside, CA
http://ac6v.com
"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3E122DBD.AD783681@earthlink.net...
> AC6V wrote:
> > CQ is NOT used on local VHF - its FM channelized and no need for it.
>
> I disagree. There is nothing at all wrong with "CQ from K8MN" on 2m or
> 70cm FM, especially on a simplex calling frequency. Beats the heck out
> of "monitoring" or "listening". Everyone is doing that whether they
> announce it or not.
>
> Dave K8MN

4. Re: Mini-HOWTO: Killing Dave Heil / W5TIT ego battles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 00:34:47 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <9D976F2DD27A930F.96F9F402A86B22A9.60441FE4E899E6EA@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 59088

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20021231154637.14241.00000455@mb-cr.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Mini-HOWTO: Killing Dave Heil / W5TIT ego battles
> >From: "W5TIT" seventythree@eightyeight.net
> >Date: 12/31/02 6:20 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id:
> ><6EDDCA6F97268CFB.99A0A9F420A66C47.7617E25B6C5C2D50@lp.airnews.net>
>
> >Is this something you're going to get around to doing? You obviously
enjoy
> >the posts.
>
> I love how these testicleless creeps pop out from the woodwork with
> anonymous addresses, suggesting that "real" people be killfiled.
>
> This guy is in the same category with those who mislead people into
> thinking they served in the Armed Forces or were "Special Forces" when all
they
> did was peel potatoes for three years.
>
> Loser with a LARGE "L".
>
> 73
>
> Steve,K4YZ

And, you're the only here that I'll say 88 to

88, Kim W5TIT

5. Re: County Issuing Radio Licenses

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 00:36:00 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <1F18F3A1F660F9D8.447E9E719877F853.A6A7A05B52C6D985@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 59087

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0212311257.39e3e875@posting.google.com...
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E10714C.4DF31B39@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:<DB0E1FE6CC5D655E.EB2DF39279A5BA94.966B854ADEF2A48D@lp.airnews.net>...
> > >
> > > >
> > > > My backside that you affectionately refer is hardly as ample as
you've been
> > > > led *LED* to believe, Dave.
> > >
> > > Careful, Kim. He might accuse you of wanting to build LED's from
scratch.
> >
> > Maybe I rated you higher than you are. Kim didn't make any statements
> > about homebrewing components. She doesn't need help from you in putting
> > her hoof in her yap.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> And you certainly don't need any help from me coming to the wrong
conclusion.
>
> So Sorry.

Dave doesn't need any help from anyone to come to wrong conclusions...LOL

Kim W5TIT

6. Re: Something for everyone...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 00:40:55 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <B4A3CF9A04954EC3.6150C17877BCE347.228F22533C55A0AD@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 59086

```
"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3E1118CA.266F57E7@earthlink.net...
> W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>
> > > Old Arrogant Dave K8MN
> > > sitting up on top of the hill eating from the fine china using the
best
> > > sterling ware while swilling expensive bordeaux from the Belarussian
> > > lead crystal we bought in Tallinn.
> > >
> > > "I wonder what the poor did for Christmas?"
> > >
> >
> > I rest my case.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> Don't look know, Kim. You never had a case.
>
> Dave K8MN
>
```

Dave, I happened to show the past few exchanges here to some folks at work. Some I don't even know who got involved. An interesting point was brought up. What's so different about your "shock" value in the statement you make above, from the "shock" value of statements that I make? We simply make them from different perspectives.

The other thing that was asked is, do I smile at your "shock" statements. Generally, yes, I do. I can almost guarantee a constant frown on your face, though.

So, you shock away; and I'll shock away.

Kim W5TIT

7. Re: "one step closer to extinction" (Was: Re: Followup from K4ZDH)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 00:52:38 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <auukrf55b2@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 59106

Hopefully that also includes corporate welfare too!

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

"Symbolism is for the simple minded....."

> I don't want my tax dollars going to welfare, no matter what
> it's wrapping is.
>
> That's what.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

8. Re: Adding something extra to a CQ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 00:55:51 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <auukrf65b2@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 59110

I did that for about the first year of operation myself. Now the only ones I log are the ones that are infrequent or first time contacts.... Got rid of that anal-retentiveness that seems to run prevalent in the ham world.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

"Symbolism is for the simple minded....."

>
> Yeah, that's what I think, too. I used to log every contact. All I
needed
> was to open that book and run down the list and be quite happy.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

9. Re: Adding something extra to a CQ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 00:59:17 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <auukrg75b2@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 59111

>
> Ryan:
>
> A "no-coder" is a very specific thing. It is a person who doesn't simply
> dislike and not use the Morse code and has a personal opinion against
> code testing. A "no-coder" for the purposes of this newsgroup is someone
> who considers the Morse code and the CW mode, and those who support
> same, to be patently evil.

Now I understand your definition of the words "No-coder" as I assumed that you meant any technician license class without the code endorsement. If your comment was based on the definition that I thought you were referring to, then I guess I felt you were wrong in your statement. But I see your definition is different.

Is this what you think? If not, then the post in
> question didn't apply to you.

Definitely not thinking like that....

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

"Symbolism is for the simple minded....."

10. Re: Mini-HOWTO: Killing Dave Heil / W5TIT ego battles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 01:12:36 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <auukrh85b2@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 59108

Easier to do that with Outlook Express.... Go to MESSAGE in the toolbar,
then choose BLOCK SENDER.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

"Symbolism is for the simple minded....."

"Lloyd Braxilwartenoski" <Lloyd@no.spammmmm> wrote in message
news:dave.n.kim.lovetohate@taranews.net...
> Dear Reader,
>
> You may be getting tired of the endless Heil - W5TIT nattering, but
> you may not know how to kill all such threads with a news reader which
> supports regular expressions in its filtering rules. The answer is
> simple: Filter on the references header, and filter on the sequence
> of references. A useful regular expression pair is
>
> References: .*airnews\.net> <.*earthlink\.net>
>
> and
>
> References: .*earthlink\.net> <.*airnews\.net>
>
> with your filters set to kill all posts for which either condition is
> true. The pair of rules also has the added advantage that any
> followups to a Heil - W5TIT ego battle thread are also killed.
>
> Extension of these rules to include other ego battling pairs of users
> should be obvious.
>
> Happy nattering-free New Year!

11. Re: What country?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 01:54:26 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <auukri95b2@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 59107
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

That is sort of true eh? The N5HHH would sound like a "T" and then "ERROR"
if sent really quickly! :)

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

"Symbolism is for the simple minded....."

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.h7ycze7.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Mon, 30 Dec 2002 02:46:39 -0500, KC8PMX wrote:
>
> >How about N5HHH? (in morse that is!)
>
> You can do better th that...how about WB5HHH ??
>
> ---
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>

12. Re: What country?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 01:55:53 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3E124AA9.1C6B0F5B@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 59089
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Brian wrote:

>
>
> Ther's a hydro job open on Saipan. The missus doesn't want to live on
> an island anymore.
>
> What should I do?

With the economy in the toilet right now, I'd sit tight for maybe 6 months more. When things pick up, then leave Saipan.

13. Re: What country?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 01:59:59 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <auukrk05b2@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 59109
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

If you don't know what state you are in, you definitely have a problem!

Just kidding, I know what you meant. What would be the alternative?
KC##ABC?? With the ## being the order of which state joined the union?

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

"Symbolism is for the simple minded....."

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.h7yd308.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Mon, 30 Dec 2002 02:53:06 -0500, KC8PMX wrote:
>
> >Very simple in morse.... KC8***/call district. On voice modes, callsign
and
> >the two words "mobile" and the number of the call district you are in.
Ex:
> >KC8PMX/4 or KC8PMX mobile 4. Short, sweet and gets the point across.
>
> Except for California, it doesn't tell "others" what state you're in.
>
> ---
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>

14. Re: What country?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 02:12:47 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.h805eac.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 59090

On Tue, 31 Dec 2002 17:52:59 GMT, K0HB wrote:

>We had a similar SOFA in Japan which assigned the "KA#" prefixes, and I
>dimly recall that "KG3xx" was also briefly used by US forces, perhaps in
>Greenland?

Note that we've spent a few days talking here about radios operated
by U S servicemen in Japan in the early 1950s. Is someone missing
from this rag-chew?

(Grin and Duck....)

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

15. Re: County Issuing Radio Licenses

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 02:23:30 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0212311823.232e535e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59091

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E122EBC.627EF63A@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E10714C.4DF31B39@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:<DB0E1FE6CC5D655E.EB2DF39279A5BA94.966B854ADEF2A48D@lp.airnews.net>...
> > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > My backside that you affectionately refer is hardly as ample as you've been
> > > > > led *LED* to believe, Dave.
> > > >
> > > > Careful, Kim. He might accuse you of wanting to build LED's from scratch.
> > >
> > > Maybe I rated you higher than you are. Kim didn't make any statements
> > > about homebrewing components. She doesn't need help from you in putting
> > > her hoof in her yap.
> >
> > And you certainly don't need any help from me coming to the wrong conclusion.
> >
> > So Sorry.
>
> You usually seem a step or two behind the rest.

No missteps here, Dave.

There was no wrong
> conclusion on my part.

No, never!

There was a misstatement on your part after you
> misread a post.

Which post did I misread?

16. Re: What country?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 02:27:34 UTC
From: Jay Listrom <Jay804@inovatronics.org>
Message-ID: <autjmaust0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 59092
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"K�HB" <k�hb@arrl.DOTORG> wrote in message
news:%PkQ9.6120$9N5.643474@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> "Jay Listrom" <Jay804@inovatronics.org> wrote
>
> : How many or you, or should I say does anyone know the
> : full story behind U.S. amateur radio operations in Iceland? This
> : question applies to the "Agreed Area" only. "Agreed Area" is the
> : term the U.S. and Icelandic governments use when referring to
> : the NATO base at Keflavik. It is an interesting story and
> : illustrates how ham radio bickering and envy exists even at the
> : international level. HINT: The dispute involved call sign
> : usage.
>
> I know that we used the prefix "KG1" there for a number of years just as
we
> use "KG4" in Cuba, and this was probably written into the SOFA, but beyond
> that I don't know a "full story".
>
> We had a similar SOFA in Japan which assigned the "KA#" prefixes, and I
> dimly recall that "KG3xx" was also briefly used by US forces, perhaps in
> Greenland?
>
> Our SOFA with Germany was different in that it assigned calls which came
out
> of the host country prefix block.
>
> ��� 73, de Hans, K0HB

Looks like Hans is the only one to venture an answer, and you're
right Hans, the "KG1" was used in Iceland by personnel on the NATO
base up until influential members of the Reykjavik Radio Club lobbied
their government that the prefix was an insult to Icelandic sovereignty.
An amendment to the SOFA agreement required NATO personnel
to obtain "TF" call signs for amateur radio operations. The plan
backfired when NATO base personnel began operating the base club
station 24/7 and handing out "TF" confirmations to the tune of several
hundred a week. The anger went so far that NATO personnel were
banned from attending meetings of the Reykjavik Radio Club in
downtown Reykjavik. We were met at the door and told to get out, that
we were not welcome. Why? Because the Icelandics, I.E. Reykjavik
Radio Club wanted to keep Iceland a rare DX contact on the air, and
that could not occur with us sending out hundreds of QSL cards a week,
confirming a "TF" contact. The Reykjavik Radio Club wanted all ham

radio operations from the NATO base to cease totally. However, the U.S. State Department, realizing ham radio was a morale factor for NATO personnel, struck a compromise with the Icelandic government. Henceforth, NATO personnel would use their home country call signs, followed by a /TF, or "portable TF." Reykjavik Radio Club members (Icelandics) were still not happy and retaliated by voting a permanent ban on all foreigners from meetings of the Reykjavik Radio Club and prohibiting any Icelandic from engaging in domestic communication with resident foreign stations. Don't ask me how such a ban worked. I have no idea, but I know of at least one Icelandic who defied it, and Igmar Yohonasson (sp), president of the Reykjavik Radio Club, had the guy's ticket revoked in 72 hours. So much for international ham radio friendship in the Land of Ice, Fire, and Snow.

Jay Listrom
Retired Merchant Marine

17. Re: Adding something extra to a CQ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 02:29:15 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0212311829.15301457@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59093

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E122DBD.AD783681@earthlink.net>...
> AC6V wrote:
> > CQ is NOT used on local VHF - its FM channelized and no need for it.
>
> I disagree. There is nothing at all wrong with "CQ from K8MN" on 2m or
> 70cm FM, especially on a simplex calling frequency. Beats the heck out
> of "monitoring" or "listening". Everyone is doing that whether they
> announce it or not.

Except when Larry is conducting an impromptu "SET." In which case no
one is "listening" or "monitoring."

Meanwhile, there's no reason why CQ won't work on FM. Its unusual
enough there that you might actually get a response.

18. Re: Adding something extra to a CQ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 02:31:29 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0212311831.2a5c2428@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59094

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E11CAEE.B68AA5E6@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20021230111011.01948.00000080@mb-mn.aol.com>...
> > > >Subject: Re: Adding something extra to a CQ?
> > > >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> > > >Date: 12/30/02 9:40 AM Central Standard Time
> > > >Message-id: <f45722ac.0212300740.5ffba5bd@posting.google.com>
>
> > > >I knew it was a trap.
> > >
> > > What trap? You succumbed to your own rant. If there was a trap, you set
> > > it!
> > >
> > > >Dave was a minuteman, and Jim and I rag chewed. Both were gentlemen.
> > >
> > > See...!
> > >
> > > 73
> > >
> > > Steve, K4YZ
> >
> > That was all prior to my participation on rrap.
>
> Looks like a chicken/egg scenario.
>
> Dave K8MN

Which were you?

19. Re: Adding something extra to a CQ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 02:39:27 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0212311839.119faefa@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59095

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E11CC29.7EC262A1@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E0F27BC.F4840B05@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E0E04C9.D3D32C01@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
>
> > > > > > Just like you knew what I was saying about Somalia was wrong, wrong,
> > > > > > wrong, until I dug it out of the ARRL web site.
> > > > >
> > > > > It is apparent that only you, of all individuals operating from Somalia
> > > > > during that time period, neglected to get permission in writing from
> > > > > someone authorized to grant it. That it never dawned on you that this
> > > > > would be the thing to do, marks you as a rube.
>
> > > > That you said I was "wrong, wrong, wrong" then I pulled it out of a
> > > > readily available ARRL resource marks you, with all your vast overseas
> > > > operating experience, not even a novice, but merely a non-player in
> > > > operations from countries without a government.
> > >
> > > What you gathered from the League's web site in no way supports your
> > > supposed operation from Somalia.
> >
> > I operated exactly to the ARRL recommendation.
>
> You continue to theorize that the couple of lines offered on the ARRL
> web site is the sum total of information on the subject.

It was 1,000 times more information than the World's Greatest DXer had
when you told me I was wrong.

> > In fact, you have nothing which
> > > supports your operation from Somalia.
> >
> > Then you have nothing to bitch about.
>
> ...other than your bootlegging from T5 as described by you.

I've never characterized it as bootlegging. Ever.

> > > > You had no experience in such operations, yet you pass judgement on
> > > > others who have. You and Ed.
> > >
> > > ...and you have yet to provide any evidence that your operation was
> > > legal, accepted for DXCC credit or that it ever took place at all.
> >
> > Then you have nothing to bitch about.
>
> ...other than your claim of operating from Somalia without written
> permission from someone authorized to do so.

Meanwhile, I did have permission from someone authorized to do so,
even when you said that a military commander could NOT do so.

> To summarize:
>
> It is apparent that only you, of all individuals operating from Somalia
> during that time period, neglected to get permission in writing from
> someone authorized to grant it. That it never dawned on you that this
> would be the thing to do, marks you as a rube.
>
> Dave K8MN

Yes, yes, Dave. You've said that before. But saying it and saying it
often doesn't make it true, no matter how hard you wish it so.

Brian

20. Re: What country?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 02:45:44 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0212311845.3dffeac3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59096
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E11CAB5.AEDE954C@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E0F282B.4DACAF4D@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E0E7DB8.2728433A@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E0D48F8.E243C02B@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > "K HB" <k hb@arrl.DOTORG> wrote in message news:<kV%O9.1862
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > The FCC could care less about DXCC
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Dave confuses DXCC with FCC. Ditto his minions. You five need a one on one.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Do you have a single reference of such a comment from me?
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Yes.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Then put up or shut up.
> > > > >
> > > > > You claimed my Somalia operation was illegal based upon ARRL DXCC rules.
> > > >
> > > > No, I claimed and still do, that your operation was not acceptable for
> > > > DXCC credit. Without supporting documentation, you can never make it
> > > > so.
> > >
> > > How do you characterize your use of the term "bootlegging?"
> >
> > I do not and did not claim that you were a bootlegger based upon
> > violation of DXCC rules. You were a bootlegger because you have no
> > documentation to support your claim that you had permission to
> > operate. You have no military or UN issued paperwork? Too bad.

You did, based upon DXCC rules, claim my operation was illegal. But
you have been wrong on so many counts that you really don't recall
what you've said anymore.

Tell us again how a military commander cannot authorize amateur operations.

21. Re: Mini-HOWTO: Killing Dave Heil / W5TIT ego battles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 02:53:40 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0212311853.22b16d9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59097

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20021231154637.14241.00000455@mb-cr.aol.com>...

> This guy is in the same category with those who mislead people into
> thinking they served in the Armed Forces or were "Special Forces" when all they
> did was peel potatoes for three years.
>
> Loser with a LARGE "L".
>
> 73
>
> Steve,K4YZ

Or those who have "military background" but never served.

22. Re: Adding something extra to a CQ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 05:17:10 UTC
From: AC6V <ac6v@amsat.org>
Message-ID: <qRuQ9.12722$L61.1231026@news1.west.cox.net>
Source record: 59098

Brian wrote:
Meanwhile, there's no reason why CQ won't work on FM. Its unusual
> enough there that you might actually get a response.
Yep you will get a response -- from 16 VHFers explaining why CQ is not used
on repeaters. Have heard it many a time.
--
I Doubt, Therefore I Might Be
73 From AC6V, Rod In Oceanside, CA
http://ac6v.com
"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0212311829.15301457@posting.google.com...
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E122DBD.AD783681@earthlink.net>...
> > AC6V wrote:
> > > CQ is NOT used on local VHF - its FM channelized and no need for it.
> >
> > I disagree. There is nothing at all wrong with "CQ from K8MN" on 2m or
> > 70cm FM, especially on a simplex calling frequency. Beats the heck out
> > of "monitoring" or "listening". Everyone is doing that whether they
> > announce it or not.
>
> Except when Larry is conducting an impromptu "SET." In which case no
> one is "listening" or "monitoring."
>
> Meanwhile, there's no reason why CQ won't work on FM. Its unusual
> enough there that you might actually get a response.

23. Re: Adding something extra to a CQ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 05:46:11 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <DgvQ9.7062$9N5.741758@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 59099

"AC6V" <ac6v@amsat.org> wrote

:
: "Don't call CQ to initiate a conversation on a repeater." --- ARRL,
: Repeaters - How To Use Them.

That, in and of itself is a good argument to occasionally toss out a "CQ" on a repeater. We need some contrarians around just to keep ARRL from thinking they are the arbiter of proper radio procedure.

Yes, I'm a fervent supporter of ARRL, but it gets up my nose when folks attempt to turn ARRL 'opinion' into 'The Rules'.

QRZ?

de Hans, K0HB/4ID

24. Re: Equipment Purchases for the year 2003?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 06:07:04 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030101010704.07882.00000490@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 59100

In article <20021230222752.04603.00000670@mb-fe.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam
(Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>>>My primary antenna is a "dual band" 20/10 meter parallel dipole built from
>>>approximately 35 cents worth of scrap wire purchased at a radio club
>>>auction almost ten years ago. I've used it to make thousands of CW and
>>>digital QSO's. I can't honestly say that counts as "doing better" than
>>>you've done with your trap dipole, but there you have it.
>>
>>No tuner nor open line, huh?
>
>Jim:
>
>Tuner, yes -- an MFJ 949E. The antenna will already work OK on 20 or 10 as
>it is, but I use the tuner just to take it down to a dead-flat match or to
>get
>it to
>serve as a semi-radiating dummy-load on 40-meters.

OK so far, but the efficiency on 40 will be terrible.
>
>[SNIPPAGE]
>
>>>I think the Times Microwave web site has a loss calculator, if I remember
>>>correctly.
>>
>>That's not what I asked.
>>
>>>I don't remember the URL, but I'm sure a search on Times
>>>Microwave LMR coaxial cable would dig it up for you. Yes, the LMR 240
>>>will weigh significantly more than RG-8X.
>>
>>240 weighs more. 400 weighs a lot more.
>
>Don't look now, but I think I already said that!

Nope. You did not mention 400's weight. Nor how to deal with it.

>>>However, the lower loss may make
>>>a difference, particularly on receive when trying to pull in a QRP station.
>>
>>Just the opposite.
>>
>>The difference is less than 1 dB on the bands in question. Not enough to
>make

>>"a big improvement" in radiated strength.
>>
>>On receive, the limiting factor here when receiving weak signals is
>>atmospheric
>>noise. Said noise is easily heard on any of my receivers. Reducing the
>>feedline
>>loss in the way you propose will simply make the noise a little louder, but
>>won't affect S/N in any real-world manner. To hear weaker signals on the
>>bands
>>described requires a better antenna, not a lower loss feedline.
>
>Hmmm. Hadn't thought about from the noise angle.

It's basic stuff. HF Amateur Radio 101.

>BTW -- I've thought of trying some 450-ohm ladder line to feed my dipole,
>but the total length would be around 15 feet. Is this good or bad?

Figure it out.

Download W7EL's EZNEC demo version and model the sucker. Or get Reg Edwards' DIPOLE3 and figure out the impedances and losses.

> Am I
>going to have a "radiating" feedline?

depends on the balance.

>Currently the antenna is fed by
>a scrap piece of RG-58 about 12 feet long. I also have heavy-duty 300-
>ohm twinlead -- would that be just as good?

Do the modeling and tell us. Google will lead you to the websites and the freeware will tell you the answers.

>I'm also thinking about creating
>a new dipole which would be a half-wave on 40 meters, but it would have
>to be folded quite drastically. What are the issues here?

Cancellation.

No bend should be more acute than 90 degrees. Total bending should not exceed 180 degrees.

Run the EZNEC model and you'll see.

A trap dipole can be built that covers 40, 20 15 and 10 meters with a single pair of traps and a total wire length of 54-55 feet.

Perhaps some "tough love" and an Antenna Book is in order here.

73 de Jim, N2EY

25. Re: Mini-HOWTO: Killing Dave Heil / W5TIT ego battles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 07:16:45 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030101021645.01868.00000097@mb-mn.aol.com>
Source record: 59101

>Subject: Re: Mini-HOWTO: Killing Dave Heil / W5TIT ego battles
>From: "W5TIT" seventythree@eightyeight.net
>Date: 12/31/02 6:34 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id:
><9D976F2DD27A930F.96F9F402A86B22A9.60441FE4E899E6EA@lp.airnews.net>

>And, you're the only here that I'll say 88 to
>

MMMMMWWWWHUAH!

88 too!
Steve, K4YZ

26. Re: Mini-HOWTO: Killing Dave Heil / W5TIT ego battles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 07:53:57 UTC
From: Voldemort <Muggle@anon.com>
Message-ID: <auu6pc$94r$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 59102

```
"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:9D976F2DD27A930F.96F9F402A86B22A9.60441FE4E899E6EA@lp.airnews.net...
> "Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20021231154637.14241.00000455@mb-cr.aol.com...
> > >Subject: Re: Mini-HOWTO: Killing Dave Heil / W5TIT ego battles
> > >From: "W5TIT" seventythree@eightyeight.net
> > >Date: 12/31/02 6:20 AM Central Standard Time
> > >Message-id:
> > ><6EDDCA6F97268CFB.99A0A9F420A66C47.7617E25B6C5C2D50@lp.airnews.net>
> >
> > >Is this something you're going to get around to doing? You obviously
> enjoy
> > >the posts.
> >
> > I love how these testicleless creeps pop out from the woodwork with
> > anonymous addresses, suggesting that "real" people be killfiled.
> >
> > This guy is in the same category with those who mislead people into
> > thinking they served in the Armed Forces or were "Special Forces" when
all
> they
> > did was peel potatoes for three years.
> >
> > Loser with a LARGE "L".
> >
> > 73
> >
> > Steve,K4YZ
>
> And, you're the only here that I'll say 88 to
>
> 88, Kim W5TIT

Hmm....as if that is any mark of distinction?
```

27. Wonder?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 08:20:26 UTC
From: Voldemort <Muggle@anon.com>
Message-ID: <auu8b1$da1$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 59103

If it is OK for TIT to have such a call, since she claims to be doing such for 'shock' value, then it should also, by her standards, to be OK to have a calll such as 'DIK' or 'FUK' or "KNT'.
Why not?
Of course if one were to desire to obtain such calls one would also, by projection, think that such calls or persons requesting such calls be obliged to carry as much cellulite on and about their posteriers as Kim does.
It is no secret that TIT is less than voluptuous and has years ago lost her "girly figure".
Sorry, Kim, but them's the ugly and indisputable facts. Your days of 7/8 Petite are long gone if indeed they ever were.
Not to be personal, Kim, but just how many years ago WAS it when you used to be able to squeeze into a 7/8? You were probably what? Nine or ten years old?
No need to be ashamed...most women your age wear tents and very dark panty-hose...it helps hide your ever-widening hips and the dark panty-hose hides the varicose veins. Such is life...eh?
Color me cruel...

28. Re: Adding something extra to a CQ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 08:41:09 UTC
From: Dult <Shatz@anon.com>
Message-ID: <auu9hsgmb0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 59104

"K�HB" <k�hb@arrl.DOTORG> wrote in message
news:DgvQ9.7062$9N5.741758@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> "AC6V" <ac6v@amsat.org> wrote
>
> :
> : "Don't call CQ to initiate a conversation on a repeater." --- ARRL,
> : Repeaters - How To Use Them.
>
> That, in and of itself is a good argument to occasionally toss out a "CQ"
on
> a repeater. We need some contrarians around just to keep ARRL from
thinking
> they are the arbiter of proper radio procedure.
>
> Yes, I'm a fervent supporter of ARRL, but it gets up my nose when folks
> attempt to turn ARRL 'opinion' into 'The Rules'.
>
> QRZ?
>
> de Hans, K0HB/4ID
>
Well, for the most part the ARRL is inconsequential. Since only 30% of
Amateurs belong...well, that alone says something.
The ARRL wants your $$$....and more $$$...
It really IS OK to say NO to the ARRL!
It really IS OK to ask just what the ARRL has done for you.
Do NOT fall for the ARRL members' arguments that if you are not a member you
are part of the problem.
That is old hat.
You can keep your Ham license year after year after year and the ARRL has
not one whit to say about it.
Bottom line...YOU do not need the ARRL to keep your license. The ARRL needs
you, needs your money to stay in operation. YOU do not owe the ARRL one
single penny. Not one.
You can easily tell the ARRL to take a hike or, better yet, not send them a
penny unless you so desire.

29. Re: Wonder?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 11:33:02 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030101063302.02011.00000073@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 59105

>Subject: Wonder?
>From: "Voldemort" Muggle@anon.com
>Date: 1/1/03 2:20 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <auu8b1$da1$0@pita.alt.net>

>Color me cruel...

We'll just color you yet another of a growing number of disenfranchised cowards with insufficient manhood to put your name to your comments.

You're a loser. Another 44 inch waist still trying to wear those 36 Dickies to work, held together by yet another truck manufacturer belt buckle. You most likely have your thinning bangs combed back over your bald spot that's usually covered with some concrete company logo ball cap. You probably tried out for the male character in Dixie Chicks video "Goodbye Earl", but were passed over because you thought "Redneck and Rude" were posterboys for Miss Manners.

And that loud whistle heard as the neighborhood nymphet walks by is not a "wolf-whistle", but a vain attempt by you to haul that beer belly back up to your chest before she notices...Fat chance. (pun intended)

You're only hope of experiencing any "satisfaction" with a woman is to humilate and initimidate her in yet another failed attempt to position yourself in a place of mastery over her.

"Color (you) cruel"...?!?! Nahhh...I'll just color you YELLOW for not having the guts to make such ugly comments and put your name to them. Putz.

Steve, K4YZ

30. Re: Equipment Purchases for the year 2003?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 13:13:30 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0301010513.41b02337@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59112

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20021230222752.04603.00000670@mb-fe.aol.com>...
> In article <20021229205527.15952.00000426@mb-mj.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:
>

> [SNIPPAGE]
>

> >On receive, the limiting factor here when receiving weak signals is
> >atmospheric
> >noise. Said noise is easily heard on any of my receivers. Reducing the
> >feedline
> >loss in the way you propose will simply make the noise a little louder, but
> >won't affect S/N in any real-world manner. To hear weaker signals on the
> >bands
> >described requires a better antenna, not a lower loss feedline.
>
> Hmmm. Hadn't thought about from the noise angle. OK, Jim -- you win!
> Shall

'Snot really Jim's point. In your situation with short coax runs the
flavor of the coax used is a total no-counter, as a practical matter I
seriously doubt that you could discern any any difference in the S/N
ratios between RG-174 and two inch Heliax feedlines.

> BTW -- I've thought of trying some 450-ohm ladder line to feed my dipole,
> but the total length would be around 15 feet. Is this good or bad?

Neither. Feedline length, any feedline, doesn't make any difference if
ya efficiently transfer the watts coming out of yer TX to the dipole.
The whole trick is the tuner in practical situations.

> Am I
> going to have a "radiating" feedline?

Where did you get the notion that radiating feedlines are necessarily
a bad thing? N2EY was there one Field Day midnite when I worked a VK
and a JA back-to-back on 20 cw with what, for all practical purposes,
was a radiating feedline.

> Currently the antenna is fed by
> a scrap piece of RG-58 about 12 feet long. I also have heavy-duty 300-
> ohm twinlead -- would that be just as good?

A balanced line like TV twinlead or 450 ohm ladder line should be fed
with a balanced tuner. Which the 949E very decidely is NOT despite the

advertising hype. The thing will introduce huge losses despite the warm fuzzy SWRs the meter displays if ya use it in it's "balanced tuner" mode. Real balanced tuners today are homebrew country. The 949E is another example of the dumbing-down of ham radio when ya try to use one as a "balanced tuner". You need a coax-fed dipole which is "sorta resonant" and the 949E will pretty efficiently trim the SWRs down to a level which makes yer TX happy.

> I'm also thinking about creating
> a new dipole which would be a half-wave on 40 meters, but it would have
> to be folded quite drastically. What are the issues here?

The only issue is folding any part of either one of the two legs of the dipole back on itself or ya run into the "cancellation effect". Total length of a 40m dipole is 66 feet give or take. One leg is roughly 33 feet long. The first segment per leg can go west, the second segment can go south (or north) from there and the third segment can go down (or up) vertically. There is nothing at all sacred about the segment lengths as long as they add up to 33 or so feet. Just don't run two segments in the north-south, east-west or on the up-down axes, etc., i.e., don't run any segements paralell with each other. Ditto the leg on the other side of the coax feedpoint. Also the other side does not have to be symmetrical wrt to the other side. At all. Should open up a lotta installation possibilities particulrly in scrunched spaces. For even bigger kicks run yer usual 20/10 (15?) parallel wires alongside the 40m legs and ya get it all, no EZNEC, no traps, no bullshit.

The best investment you could possibly make wrt to building HF dipoles is an MFJ 259B antenna analyzer. If ya trim the wire lengths right and the 259B at the coax connector to the radio shows a 10:1 or less SWR the 949 will clean up the remaining SWRs OK.

Don't have a damned thing to do with ham radio policy.

>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

w3rv

31. Re: Something for everyone...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 14:06:03 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E12F60D.282FC4A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 59113

W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3E1118CA.266F57E7@earthlink.net...
> > W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > >
> > > > Old Arrogant Dave K8MN
> > > > sitting up on top of the hill eating from the fine china using the
> best
> > > > sterling ware while swilling expensive bordeaux from the Belarussian
> > > > lead crystal we bought in Tallinn.
> > > >
> > > > "I wonder what the poor did for Christmas?"
> > > >
> > >
> > > I rest my case.

> > Don't look know, Kim. You never had a case.

> Dave, I happened to show the past few exchanges here to some folks at work.
> Some I don't even know who got involved. An interesting point was brought
> up. What's so different about your "shock" value in the statement you make
> above, from the "shock" value of statements that I make? We simply make
> them from different perspectives.

If your co-workers didn't see that my response was a humorous response
to your silly charges, they are as ditzy as you. My statement was not
intended to shock, but to poke fun at you.

> The other thing that was asked is, do I smile at your "shock" statements.
> Generally, yes, I do. I can almost guarantee a constant frown on your face,
> though.

You'd be wrong yet again.

> So, you shock away; and I'll shock away.

Just shove a shock in it.

Dave K8MN

32. Re: County Issuing Radio Licenses

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 14:12:34 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E12F74A.2A60834A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 59114

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E122EBC.627EF63A@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E10714C.4DF31B39@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:

> > > > Maybe I rated you higher than you are. Kim didn't make any statements
> > > > about homebrewing components. She doesn't need help from you in putting
> > > > her hoof in her yap.
> > >
> > > And you certainly don't need any help from me coming to the wrong conclusion.
> > > >
> > > So Sorry.
> > >
> > You usually seem a step or two behind the rest.
>
> No missteps here, Dave.

Let's see--no evidence that you have a clue here.

> There was no wrong
> > conclusion on my part.
>
> No, never!

No evidence that you have a clue here.

> There was a misstatement on your part after you
> > misread a post.
>
> Which post did I misread?

No evidence of a clue here. Are you going for a record or what?

Vipul assuredly has the edge at this point and he speaks English only as
a second language.

Dave K8MN

33. Re: Adding something extra to a CQ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 14:18:15 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E12F89F.E3580FC2@earthlink.net>
Source record: 59115

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E122DBD.AD783681@earthlink.net>...
> > AC6V wrote:
> > > CQ is NOT used on local VHF - its FM channelized and no need for it.
> >
> > I disagree. There is nothing at all wrong with "CQ from K8MN" on 2m or
> > 70cm FM, especially on a simplex calling frequency. Beats the heck out
> > of "monitoring" or "listening". Everyone is doing that whether they
> > announce it or not.
>
> Except when Larry is conducting an impromptu "SET." In which case no
> one is "listening" or "monitoring."

Oh--did you think I meant that folks were listening or monitoring when
they aren't actually listening and monitoring--like when they have their
transceivers turned off?

> Meanwhile, there's no reason why CQ won't work on FM. Its unusual
> enough there that you might actually get a response.

If CQ is used on 160m and CQ is used at 10m and CQ is used on 2m SSB or
CW, there is no reason that it can't be used on FM. The obvious caution
is that it isn't necessary to say it more than once, followed by your
callsign when using a repeater.

Dave K8MN

34. Re: Adding something extra to a CQ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 14:19:56 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E12F90B.13BD25D2@earthlink.net>
Source record: 59116

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E11CAEE.B68AA5E6@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20021230111011.01948.00000080@mb-mn.aol.com>...
> > > > >Subject: Re: Adding something extra to a CQ?
> > > > >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> > > > >Date: 12/30/02 9:40 AM Central Standard Time
> > > > >Message-id: <f45722ac.0212300740.5ffba5bd@posting.google.com>
> > >
> > > > >I knew it was a trap.
> > > >
> > > > What trap? You succumbed to your own rant. If there was a trap, you set
> > > > it!
> > > >
> > > > >Dave was a minuteman, and Jim and I rag chewed. Both were gentlemen.
> > > >
> > > > See...!
> > > >
> > > > 73
> > > >
> > > > Steve, K4YZ
> > >
> > > That was all prior to my participation on rrap.
> >
> > Looks like a chicken/egg scenario.

> Which were you?

That question would only be asked had you written, "That was all prior
to K8MN's participation on rrap". You didn't write that. Muse on your
sentence a bit longer and let us know what you come up with.

Dave K8MN

35. Re: Adding something extra to a CQ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 14:34:04 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E12FC53.6FFB5A32@earthlink.net>
Source record: 59117

```
Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E11CC29.7EC262A1@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E0F27BC.F4840B05@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E0E04C9.D3D32C01@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > > > > > > Just like you knew what I was saying about Somalia was wrong, wrong,
> > > > > > > > wrong, until I dug it out of the ARRL web site.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > It is apparent that only you, of all individuals operating from Somalia
> > > > > > > during that time period, neglected to get permission in writing from
> > > > > > > someone authorized to grant it. That it never dawned on you that this
> > > > > > > would be the thing to do, marks you as a rube.
> > >
> > > > > > That you said I was "wrong, wrong, wrong" then I pulled it out of a
> > > > > > readily available ARRL resource marks you, with all your vast overseas
> > > > > > operating experience, not even a novice, but merely a non-player in
> > > > > > operations from countries without a government.
> > > > >
> > > > > What you gathered from the League's web site in no way supports your
> > > > > supposed operation from Somalia.
> > > >
> > > > I operated exactly to the ARRL recommendation.
> > >
> > You continue to theorize that the couple of lines offered on the ARRL
> > web site is the sum total of information on the subject.
>
> It was 1,000 times more information than the World's Greatest DXer had
> when you told me I was wrong.

Don Wallace arose from the dead and gave you information? You continued
to believe that all the information necessary for permission was
contained in a couple of lines of text.

> > > In fact, you have nothing which
> > > > supports your operation from Somalia.
> > >
```

> > > Then you have nothing to bitch about.
> >
> > ...other than your bootlegging from T5 as described by you.
>
> I've never characterized it as bootlegging. Ever.

I have. You are free to continue the charade.

> > > > > You had no experience in such operations, yet you pass judgement on
> > > > > others who have. You and Ed.
> > > >
> > > > ...and you have yet to provide any evidence that your operation was
> > > > legal, accepted for DXCC credit or that it ever took place at all.
> > >
> > > Then you have nothing to bitch about.
> >
> > ...other than your claim of operating from Somalia without written
> > permission from someone authorized to do so.
>
> Meanwhile, I did have permission from someone authorized to do so,
> even when you said that a military commander could NOT do so.

Nope. You CLAIM to have had permission from someone just up the chain
from you. You must have assumed that the material on the League's web
site meant any officer over you. You must have assumed that it wasn't
important to have such permission in writing.

> > To summarize:
> >
> > It is apparent that only you, of all individuals operating from Somalia
> > during that time period, neglected to get permission in writing from
> > someone authorized to grant it. That it never dawned on you that this
> > would be the thing to do, marks you as a rube.

> Yes, yes, Dave. You've said that before. But saying it and saying it
> often doesn't make it true, no matter how hard you wish it so.

No, writing it doesn't make it true. It is true because it is
accurate. Writing it simply points it out again since you don't seem to
grasp the implications. Your prior statements on morality and ethics
ring hollow in the face of the reality that you had no proof of
permission to operate legally and that your operation won't be accepted
for DXCC credit.

I thought you might be sharper in 2003 than 2002.

Dave K8MN

36. Re: Adding something extra to a CQ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 14:41:28 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301010641.377fc60f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59118

"AC6V" <ac6v@amsat.org> wrote in message
news:<qRuQ9.12722$L61.1231026@news1.west.cox.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> Meanwhile, there's no reason why CQ won't work on FM. Its unusual
> > enough there that you might actually get a response.
> Yep you will get a response -- from 16 VHFers explaining why CQ is not used
> on repeaters. Have heard it many a time.
> --

True enough. But at least someone comes back to your call.

37. Re: What country?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 14:45:57 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E12FF1C.4E363B24@earthlink.net>
Source record: 59119
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E11CAB5.AEDE954C@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E0F282B.4DACAF4D@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E0E7DB8.2728433A@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E0D48F8.E243C02B@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > "K HB" <k hb@arrl.DOTORG> wrote in message news:<kV%O9.1862
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > The FCC could care less about DXCC
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > Dave confuses DXCC with FCC. Ditto his minions. You five need a one on
one.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Do you have a single reference of such a comment from me?
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Yes.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Then put up or shut up.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > You claimed my Somalia operation was illegal based upon ARRL DXCC rules.
> > > > >
> > > > > No, I claimed and still do, that your operation was not acceptable for
> > > > > DXCC credit. Without supporting documentation, you can never make it
> > > > > so.
> > > >
> > > > How do you characterize your use of the term "bootlegging?"
> > >
> > > I do not and did not claim that you were a bootlegger based upon
> > > violation of DXCC rules. You were a bootlegger because you have no
> > > documentation to support your claim that you had permission to
> > > operate. You have no military or UN issued paperwork? Too bad.
```

>
> You did, based upon DXCC rules, claim my operation was illegal.

Nope. Try again. I claimed that your operation was illegal. I also claimed that your operation was no good for DXCC credit.

> But
> you have been wrong on so many counts that you really don't recall
> what you've said anymore.

Izzat right?

> Tell us again how a military commander cannot authorize amateur
> operations.

Let's say you work as a weatherman for an airlift command post. Let's assume that the commander is a Colonel. You work directly for him. Would you believe that he is authorized to grant you permission to operate on the ham bands from your overseas post of assignment? Do you think it is necessary for such authorization to be in writing? Would you have nagging doubts about permission issued by such an individual given that he is not in charge of U.S. forces in the country? It wouldn't surprise me in the least if your "commander"--you know, the guy who supposedly told you it was okay for you to spray RF in the ham bands from Somalia--would respond, "The hell I did!" if quizzed by anyone on whether he ever gave you the go-ahead.

Dave K8MN

38. Re: Adding something extra to a CQ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 14:55:16 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301010655.5f16f746@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59120

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20021231160037.14241.00000457@mb-cr.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Adding something extra to a CQ?
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 12/31/02 9:05 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0212310705.44e0846b@posting.google.com>
>
> >> What you gathered from the League's web site in no way supports your
> >> supposed operation from Somalia.
> >
> >I operated exactly to the ARRL recommendation.
>
> Except that you do not have ONE shred of evidence that you had SOME
> authority to operate except "my commander said I could".
>
> In a "nation" where street murders, kidnapping and bribery are all daily
> fare, I am sure your Amateur Radio activites went unnoticed. However in the
> eyes of the International community, you were unlicensed and operated without
> authority.
>
> >> In fact, you have nothing which supports your operation from Somalia.
>
> >Then you have nothing to bitch about.
>
> Sure he (we) do...everytime you suggest that your operation was "legal" but
> cannot produce any evidence otherwise you prove yourself untrustworthy.

My government trusts me. That you do not is your problem.

39. Re: What country?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 14:59:24 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301010659.3c541bfb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59121
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:<3E124AA9.1C6B0F5B@ix.netcom.com>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > >
> > >
> > > Ther's a hydro job open on Saipan. The missus doesn't want to live on
> > > an island anymore.
> > >
> > > What should I do?
>
> With the economy in the toilet right now, I'd sit tight for maybe 6 months
> more. When things pick up, then leave Saipan.

But I'm not on Saipan, I'm in Ohio.

40. Re: Mini-HOWTO: Killing Dave Heil / W5TIT ego battles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 16:26:28 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v165lhblp5dfa@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 59122

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030101021645.01868.00000097@mb-mn.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Mini-HOWTO: Killing Dave Heil / W5TIT ego battles
> >From: "W5TIT" seventythree@eightyeight.net
> >Date: 12/31/02 6:34 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id:
> ><9D976F2DD27A930F.96F9F402A86B22A9.60441FE4E899E6EA@lp.airnews.net>
>
> >And, you're the only here that I'll say 88 to
> >
>
> MMMMMWWWWHUAH!
>
> 88 too!
> Steve, K4YZ

Please Captain, not in front of the Klingon's!
;^)

Have a "Hammy" New Year!
--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx

41. ARRL certification program

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 16:44:41 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030101114441.29733.00000332@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 59123

From Nickolaus E. Leggett N3NL
"Hello,
It would be useful if the ARRL certification
program developed over time into an engineering
apprenticeship program where hams could acquire
knowledge and certifications that would enable
them to participate in engineering activity. At
the present time, it is very difficult for adults
to get the required university instruction to jump
the various academic hurdles to engineering. However,
the ARRL could offer a series of modular courses and
credentials as well as credentials offered in
cooperation with other groups such as the Society of
Broadcast Engineers (SBE) and the National Association
of Radio and Telecommunication Engineers (NARTE) to
enable aspiring hams to work their way up the
technology ladder from the basics of Ohms law to the
fine points of radio engineering. The modular
structure of this program would allow the students to
work step-by-step in improving their knowledge with
the definite milestones of specific examinations and
credentials for each of the intermediate modules of
knowledge. This structure would be better suited to
busy adults and many bright youth than the
all-or-nothing engineering credentials granted by the
universities. Also, a student with a set of
intermediate credentials could establish his suitability
for an apprentice program in engineering. Such
apprentice programs would be a useful way for recruiting
new talent into the engineering profession. The ARRL
could contribute to this public service."

Good suggestion. This will help improve the technical competence of radio amateurs and will help keep the bands. Simply occupying the band (as in contesting) is not sufficient to prove meritorious use of the bands.

From surveys, there seems to be a lack of interest in the technical aspect. Antennas, operating, contesting, and Morse code had the highest interest levels. Those interested in the technical aspects don't join.

By increasing the technical competence, or by current testing to actually mean something, this enhances the image of amateur radio. Also, lets not tie code to the technical license classes.

Currently, most of the amateur radio clubs focus on operating. Let's have more technical clubs.

42. Re: "one step closer to extinction" (Was: Re: Followup from K4ZDH)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 16:49:34 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <0E16E4F538938A45.D7219D261CB972BE.664E01AFC557E247@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 59124

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:auukrf55b2@enews3.newsguy.com...
> Hopefully that also includes corporate welfare too!
>
>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF/MFR
> REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
>
> "Symbolism is for the simple minded....."
>
>

Excellent point, Ryan. Unfortunately, corporate welfare seems like "the thing" these days. Heck, what is up wid dat, anyway? If your business can't make it, the govt. just hands over some money, huh? Y'know, seems like countries in the rest of the world, and the corporate giants here get all the fringe benefits of our hard earned money.

Kim W5TIT

43. Re: Adding something extra to a CQ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 16:51:26 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <AC59E4CB994E795D.54768F13C1A19311.D6E5BC4631663B4A@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 59125

Some aren't too bad with it. But, I do know that I've relayed experiences
of making contacts--say, for instance, Japan--and retold the entire
conversation, what the Japanese station said the weather was like, etc., and
have been asked, "well, where's the QSL card?" If that card ain't there, to
some, it didn't happen...LOL

Kim W5TIT

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:auukrf65b2@enews3.newsguy.com...
> I did that for about the first year of operation myself. Now the only
ones
> I log are the ones that are infrequent or first time contacts.... Got rid
of
> that anal-retentiveness that seems to run prevalent in the ham world.
>
>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF/MFR
> REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
>
> "Symbolism is for the simple minded....."
>
>
> >
> > Yeah, that's what I think, too. I used to log every contact. All I
> needed
> > was to open that book and run down the list and be quite happy.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
> >
> >
>
>

44. Re: Wonder?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 17:05:06 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <B2B466CBD0028A1A.5C8BB93EB7DFAD1F.04B0BA4624987FF5@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 59126

"Voldemort" <Muggle@anon.com> wrote in message
news:auu8b1$da1$0@pita.alt.net...
> If it is OK for TIT to have such a call, since she claims to be doing
such
> for 'shock' value,
>

What an uneducated guess that is. Find where it has been *me* that says I
have it for shock value. I have it a) because I got it on a dare, and b)
because it's fun.

>
> then it should also, by her standards, to be OK to have a
> calll such as 'DIK' or 'FUK' or "KNT'.
> Why not?
>

Hey, go for it. There's already a KC5KNT. Didn't go much further than
that.

>
> Of course if one were to desire to obtain such calls one would also, by
> projection, think that such calls or persons requesting such calls be
> obliged to carry as much cellulite on and about their posteriers as Kim
> does.
>

And you, uh, know this, huh? So, one must be overweight to like sarcastic
humor, huh? I'll look in a Robin Williams audience next time and see all
those fat people.

>
> It is no secret that TIT is less than voluptuous and has years ago lost
> her "girly figure".
>

Did I? I have a wonderful girly figure!

>
> Sorry, Kim, but them's the ugly and indisputable facts. Your days of
7/8
> Petite are long gone if indeed they ever were.
>

What, pray tell, are you sorry about that for? Were you hoping for a date?

>
> Not to be personal, Kim, but just how many years ago WAS it when you
used
> to be able to squeeze into a 7/8? You were probably what? Nine or ten
years
> old?
>

Oh, that's not personal at all. Heck, that's a common lunch conversation
around here.

>
> No need to be ashamed...most women your age wear tents and very dark
> panty-hose...it helps hide your ever-widening hips and the dark panty-hose
> hides the varicose veins. Such is life...eh?
> Color me cruel...
>
>

Good grief, you're going to have to do much better than that, whomever you
are. You see, I'm liberated. I love me enough for the entire rest of the
world. Now, you, on the other hand, really seem like the type that needs
the approval, respect, and admiration of others in order to value yourself.
So, my suggestion to you is that you'd better get busy. There's still time.
It's never too late.

Kim W5TIT

45. Re: Adding something extra to a CQ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 17:28:36 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <av0abm$17t$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 59232

"K�HB" <k�hb@arrl.DOTORG> wrote in message
news:DgvQ9.7062$9N5.741758@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> "AC6V" <ac6v@amsat.org> wrote
>
> :
> : "Don't call CQ to initiate a conversation on a repeater." --- ARRL,
> : Repeaters - How To Use Them.
>
> That, in and of itself is a good argument to occasionally toss out a "CQ"
on
> a repeater. We need some contrarians around just to keep ARRL from
thinking
> they are the arbiter of proper radio procedure.
>
> Yes, I'm a fervent supporter of ARRL, but it gets up my nose when folks
> attempt to turn ARRL 'opinion' into 'The Rules'.
>
> QRZ?
>
> de Hans, K0HB/4ID

So it isn't the ARRL recommendation that bothers you, but rather those that, as you state: "attempt to turn ARRL 'opinion' into 'The Rules'"

I agree to a point, but in this case (CQ on a repeater) I haven't heard anyone do that in over 10 years here in the Northeast. That seems to be a pretty commonly accepted practice then (i.e. using "K2UNK Listening") instead of calling CQ on a repeater.

Would I care if someone did, not at all. Would I suggest to someone else that the common practice is not to call CQ on a repeater? Sure, why not? I wouldn't position it as "The Rules", but rather just as the common practice in use in the area.

Cheers and Happy New Year to all.
Bill K2UNK

46. Re: Adding something extra to a CQ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 17:38:46 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <GIFQ9.7819$9N5.822919@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 59127

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote (about keeping a log)

: I did that for about the first year of operation myself. Now the only
ones
: I log are the ones that are infrequent or first time contacts.... Got rid
of
: that anal-retentiveness that seems to run prevalent in the ham world.

Keeping a log is "anal-retentiveness"? C'mon, Ryan!

Certainly it's not something that every ham might care to do, and that's OK, but others enjoy having that sort of a detailed record of their operation.

I don't log UHF/VHF operations, which in my case are purely local chit-chat, but I keep a computer log of all HF operation. Partly that's a result of "habit" from the days when FCC required it, I suppose. But it's also fun to be able to use as a "notepad" to refer to the next time I run across a station I've worked before, it's useful to confirm QSL requests, or any of a number of other uses.

You're free to keep a log or not keep one --- I couldn't care less which you do --- but implying that log keepers are "anal retentive" strikes me as pretty "simple minded" (to steal a phrase from your tag-line).

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

47. Re: ARRL certification program

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 18:16:39 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030101131639.02012.00000236@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 59128

>By increasing the technical competence, or by current testing to actually
>mean
>something, this enhances the image of amateur radio.

Isnt this cute, we test Hams on Technical stuff. Then after they get there License the ARRL offers courses so they can learn the stuff. I thought that was the purpose of testing, to see how much someone really knew about the material. HAM WRITTEN TEST do away with them, there a JOKE.

48. Re: ARRL certification program

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 18:35:17 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030101133517.13990.00000435@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 59129

From: wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX)
>HAM WRITTEN TEST do away with them, there a JOKE.

The written test has good, relavant material - if one learns the material. The way the current test is given, one can pass it without learning the material.

From: wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX)
>Isnt this cute, we test Hams on Technical stuff. Then after they get there
>License the ARRL offers courses so they can learn the stuff. I thought that
>was
>the purpose of testing, to see how much someone really knew about the
>material.

The test covers these aspects briefly. Certification covers a particular aspect in more depth. So, this offers something not covered by the testing. For example, the "Antenna Modelling" class is not on the test, but provides more depth for certification.

49. Re: Wonder?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 19:23:06 UTC
From: Bob Johnson <screwu@screwu.org>
Message-ID: <8%GQ9.9493$us1.5489@news.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 59130

"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in mess You see, I'm liberated.
I love me enough for the entire rest of the
> world. > Kim W5TIT

Heh heh...just a picture, TIT, just one little binary picture. After all
this hype, we gotta see them jugs. Should be no problem for a liberated gal
like yerself!

50. Re: Wonder?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 19:40:02 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030101144002.06208.00001073@mb-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 59134

In article <B2B466CBD0028A1A.5C8BB93EB7DFAD1F.04B0BA4624987FF5@lp.airnews.net>,
"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>
>Good grief, you're going to have to do much better than that, whomever you
>are. You see, I'm liberated. I love me enough for the entire rest of the
>world.

Kim:

I'm glad to see that. With your attitude and behavior, it would seem to
be a very necessary and practical adjustment for you to make!

>Now, you, on the other hand, really seem like the type that needs
>the approval, respect, and admiration of others in order to value yourself.
>So, my suggestion to you is that you'd better get busy. There's still time.
>It's never too late.

Not even for you, Kim!

>Kim W5TIT

It's always nice to get a New Year off to a good start!

73 de Larry, K3LT

51. Re: Mini-HOWTO: Killing Dave Heil / W5TIT ego battles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 19:40:04 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030101144004.06208.00001075@mb-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 59132

In article <20030101021645.01868.00000097@mb-mn.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>And, you're the only here that I'll say 88 to
>>
>
> MMMMMWWWWHUAH!
>
>88 too!
>Steve, K4YZ
>

EEEEEEOOOOOOOOOOOOOOUUUUUUUUUUUUUUCCCCCKKKKKK!!!!

Steve, go get a tetanus shot and a psych eval -- quick!!!

73 de Larry, K3LT

52. Re: Mini-HOWTO: Killing Dave Heil / W5TIT ego battles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 19:40:04 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030101144004.06208.00001074@mb-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 59133

In article <auu6pc$94r$0@pita.alt.net>, "Voldemort" <Muggle@anon.com> writes:

>> > Loser with a LARGE "L".
>> >
>> > 73
>> >
>> > Steve,K4YZ
>>
>> And, you're the only here that I'll say 88 to
>>
>> 88, Kim W5TIT
>
>Hmm....as if that is any mark of distinction?
>

Naw, but it leaves a mark which requires disinfection!

73 de Larry, K3LT

53. Re: Happy New Year RRAP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 19:40:05 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030101144005.06208.00001077@mb-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 59135

In article <20021231072903.22930.00000294@mb-mf.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>
> A very happy New Year to one and all. Stay safe.
>
>73
>
>Steve, K4YZ

Thanks Steve, and allow me to add my own wishes for a safe, happy and prosperous 2003 to the entire RRAP community!

73 de Larry, K3LT

54. Re: Mini-HOWTO: Killing Dave Heil / W5TIT ego battles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 19:40:05 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030101144005.06208.00001076@mb-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 59136

In article <9D976F2DD27A930F.96F9F402A86B22A9.60441FE4E899E6EA@lp.airnews.net>,
"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>> Loser with a LARGE "L".
>>
>> 73
>>
>> Steve,K4YZ
>
>And, you're the only here that I'll say 88 to
>
>88, Kim W5TIT

Uh oh, Steve, now you went and done did it -- you've got Kim "warm for
your form!"

BTW I wonder if Kim says "88" to her husband?

Nawwww -- never mind. The thought of Kim giving "88's" to anyone is
enough to turn me off permanently!

73 de Larry, K3LT

55. Re: Adding something extra to a CQ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 19:40:39 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0301011140.5e512151@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59131

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0212311839.119faefa@posting.google.com>...
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E11CC29.7EC262A1@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E0F27BC.F4840B05@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E0E04C9.D3D32C01@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Brian wrote:
>
> > > > > > > Just like you knew what I was saying about Somalia was wrong, wrong,
> > > > > > > wrong, until I dug it out of the ARRL web site.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > It is apparent that only you, of all individuals operating from Somalia
> > > > > > during that time period, neglected to get permission in writing from
> > > > > > someone authorized to grant it. That it never dawned on you that this
> > > > > > would be the thing to do, marks you as a rube.
>
> > > > > That you said I was "wrong, wrong, wrong" then I pulled it out of a
> > > > > readily available ARRL resource marks you, with all your vast overseas
> > > > > operating experience, not even a novice, but merely a non-player in
> > > > > operations from countries without a government.
> > > >
> > > > What you gathered from the League's web site in no way supports your
> > > > supposed operation from Somalia.
> > >
> > > I operated exactly to the ARRL recommendation.
> >
> > You continue to theorize that the couple of lines offered on the ARRL
> > web site is the sum total of information on the subject.
>
> It was 1,000 times more information than the World's Greatest DXer had
> when you told me I was wrong.
>
> > > In fact, you have nothing which
> > > > supports your operation from Somalia.
> > >
> > > Then you have nothing to bitch about.
> >
> > ...other than your bootlegging from T5 as described by you.

>
> I've never characterized it as bootlegging. Ever.
>
> > > > > You had no experience in such operations, yet you pass judgement on
> > > > > others who have. You and Ed.
> > > > >
> > > > > ...and you have yet to provide any evidence that your operation was
> > > > > legal, accepted for DXCC credit or that it ever took place at all.
> > > >
> > > Then you have nothing to bitch about.
> >
> > ...other than your claim of operating from Somalia without written
> > permission from someone authorized to do so.
>
> Meanwhile, I did have permission from someone authorized to do so,
> even when you said that a military commander could NOT do so.
>
> > To summarize:
> >
> > It is apparent that only you, of all individuals operating from Somalia
> > during that time period, neglected to get permission in writing from
> > someone authorized to grant it. That it never dawned on you that this
> > would be the thing to do, marks you as a rube.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Yes, yes, Dave. You've said that before. But saying it and saying it
> often doesn't make it true, no matter how hard you wish it so.
>
> Brian

So who has cards from your operation? If they passed the test at the
ARRL dxcc desk . . .

w3rv

56. You have to be kidding!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 20:16:26 UTC
From: Gilbert Biro Simon <testing1234@cfl.rr.com>
Message-ID: <u0IQ9.200225$Db4.5618767@twister.tampabay.rr.com>
Source record: 59137

I signed on to this page looking for Ham Radio Rules, Regulations, and Policies. Now I find out that it is only populated by a bunch of teenagers with no minds and no place else to prove it.

I find no technical information, just a bunch of internet wanna-be's offering their opinion on everything from Mexican whores to American pigs.

As the hungarians put it Buz Meg to all of you!

57. Re: You have to be kidding!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 20:19:10 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E134D3E.1050105@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 59211

WA8ULX wrote:
>>I find no technical information
>
>
> And you wont, the technical aspect of HAM RADIO is DEAD. Dont believe it, look
> at the present written test for Ham Radio.

You got a point brucie, if there were any technical aspect of ham
radio left you wouldn't have been able to get a license.

58. Re: You have to be kidding!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 20:43:21 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030101154321.22944.00000314@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 59138

>I signed on to this page looking for Ham Radio Rules, Regulations, and
>Policies. Now I find out that it is only populated by a bunch of teenagers
>with no minds and no place else to prove it.

The newsgroup has degenerated into a personal playground.

This newsgroup is filled with: personal arguments, name calling, non policy related news (such as announcment of events), (non radio) conversation, radio items that should be in other newsgroups, ...etc.

Very little discussion of amateur radio policy occurs here.

59. Re: You have to be kidding!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 20:44:51 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <auvjvh$1q9$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 59139

Yep you got it.....and if you are serious go to www.arrl.org

Dan/W4NTI

"Gilbert Biro Simon" <testing1234@cfl.rr.com> wrote in message
news:u0IQ9.200225$Db4.5618767@twister.tampabay.rr.com...
> I signed on to this page looking for Ham Radio Rules, Regulations, and
> Policies. Now I find out that it is only populated by a bunch of
teenagers
> with no minds and no place else to prove it.
>
> I find no technical information, just a bunch of internet wanna-be's
> offering their opinion on everything from Mexican whores to American pigs.
>
> As the hungarians put it Buz Meg to all of you!
>
>

60. Re: ARRL certification program

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 21:08:57 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030101160857.18087.00000717@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 59140

>The test covers these aspects briefly.

Very Very briefly, who cares anyway, the Present written is a JOKE. Why dont they just get rid of the written and be done with it. Theres no reason to continue to drag this dumbing down process along. Just drop testing, fill out application and be done with it.

61. Re: You have to be kidding!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 21:12:19 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030101161219.18087.00000718@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 59141

>I find no technical information

And you wont, the technical aspect of HAM RADIO is DEAD. Dont believe it, look at the present written test for Ham Radio.

62. Re: Wonder?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 21:28:05 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <F9D3BEFAB11528DE.74AC156912A7DC8D.0B4322D5B398BE14@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 59142

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030101144002.06208.00001073@mb-fp.aol.com...
> In article
<B2B466CBD0028A1A.5C8BB93EB7DFAD1F.04B0BA4624987FF5@lp.airnews.net>,
> "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >
> >Good grief, you're going to have to do much better than that, whomever
you
> >are. You see, I'm liberated. I love me enough for the entire rest of
the
> >world.
>
> Kim:
>
> I'm glad to see that. With your attitude and behavior, it would seem to
> be a very necessary and practical adjustment for you to make!
>
> >Now, you, on the other hand, really seem like the type that needs
> >the approval, respect, and admiration of others in order to value
yourself.
> >So, my suggestion to you is that you'd better get busy. There's still
time.
> >It's never too late.
>
> Not even for you, Kim!
>
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> It's always nice to get a New Year off to a good start!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

So, your therapist was open on New Year's Day?

Kim W5TIT

63. Re: Mini-HOWTO: Killing Dave Heil / W5TIT ego battles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 21:29:20 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <CCC070D054DFDC87.8F95498C58A2E1B9.02EA94FD25DC24B4@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 59143

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030101144004.06208.00001075@mb-fp.aol.com...
> In article <20030101021645.01868.00000097@mb-mn.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
(Steve
> Robeson K4YZ) writes:
>
> >>And, you're the only here that I'll say 88 to
> >>
> >
> > MMMMMWWWWHUAH!
> >
> >88 too!
> >Steve, K4YZ
> >
>
> EEEEEEOOOOOOOOOOOOOOUUUUUUUUUUUUUUCCCCCKKKKKK!!!!
>
> Steve, go get a tetanus shot and a psych eval -- quick!!!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Yeah, Steve!!! Larry says he's gotten the New Year off to a good start. I
was surprised to see that his therapist was open today. And now he's even
willing to share!

Kim W5TIT

64. Re: Mini-HOWTO: Killing Dave Heil / W5TIT ego battles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 21:31:47 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <98DF0AC090A1F3C8.0AF1B33BDF7AB63E.4A9483A90C72C5C7@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 59144

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030101144005.06208.00001076@mb-fp.aol.com...
> In article
<9D976F2DD27A930F.96F9F402A86B22A9.60441FE4E899E6EA@lp.airnews.net>,
> "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >> Loser with a LARGE "L".
> >>
> >> 73
> >>
> >> Steve,K4YZ
> >
> >And, you're the only here that I'll say 88 to
> >
> >88, Kim W5TIT
>
> Uh oh, Steve, now you went and done did it -- you've got Kim "warm for
> your form!"
>
> BTW I wonder if Kim says "88" to her husband?
>

No, my husband and I speak in real language to each other. Maybe if you
tried that, Larry, you'd finally be unlonely.

>
> Nawwww -- never mind. The thought of Kim giving "88's" to anyone is
> enough to turn me off permanently!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

"73/88 all 'round" is my customary signing whenever I am on the air. Oh,
and you're turned off permanently anyway, Larry.

Kim W5TIT

65. Re: Wonder?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 21:34:41 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <D87BC2EA68C48BC3.33F117892C7561DB.B21AB557531A9BB4@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 59146

"Bob Johnson" <screwu@screwu.org> wrote in message
news:8%GQ9.9493$us1.5489@news.bellsouth.net...
>
> "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in mess You see, I'm
liberated.
> I love me enough for the entire rest of the
> > world. > Kim W5TIT
>
> Heh heh...just a picture, TIT, just one little binary picture. After all
> this hype, we gotta see them jugs. Should be no problem for a liberated
gal
> like yerself!
>
>
>

Binary, eh? Well, here you go:

(o) (o)

There. Ya happy?

Kim W5TIT

66. Re: You have to be kidding!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 21:43:47 UTC
From: Bill Newkirk <wnewkirk@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <ddJQ9.27761$nc7.2399@news.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 59145

Didja try a site that might actually present this information, such as
http://www.fcc.gov or http://www.arrl.org or maybe even http://www.qrz.com ?

news groups are bulletin boards -- and there's nothing stopping you from
posting questions or presenting what you know....

--

Bill Newkirk wnewkirk@bellsouth.net
Amateur Radio Station WB9IVR
Melbourne, FL - Birthplace of Jim Morrison
The web site says you like pizza.

"Gilbert Biro Simon" <testing1234@cfl.rr.com> wrote in message
news:u0IQ9.200225$Db4.5618767@twister.tampabay.rr.com...
> I signed on to this page looking for Ham Radio Rules, Regulations, and
> Policies. Now I find out that it is only populated by a bunch of
teenagers
> with no minds and no place else to prove it.
>
> I find no technical information, just a bunch of internet wanna-be's
> offering their opinion on everything from Mexican whores to American pigs.
>
> As the hungarians put it Buz Meg to all of you!
>
>

67. Re: Wonder?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 22:02:15 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <89F257AF35B982D0.08DA690DAA57D908.36E1BA089C8487DC@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 59150

"Dit Dit Dit Dah" <Whinerz@anon.com> wrote in message
news:auvos4tjd0@pita.alt.net...
>
> "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> news:D87BC2EA68C48BC3.33F117892C7561DB.B21AB557531A9BB4@lp.airnews.net...
> > "Bob Johnson" <screwu@screwu.org> wrote in message
> > news:8%GQ9.9493$us1.5489@news.bellsouth.net...
> > >
> > > "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in mess You see, I'm
> > liberated.
> > > I love me enough for the entire rest of the
> > > > world. > Kim W5TIT
> > >
> > > Heh heh...just a picture, TIT, just one little binary picture. After
all
> > > this hype, we gotta see them jugs. Should be no problem for a
liberated
> > gal
> > > like yerself!
> > >
> > >
> > >
> >
> > Binary, eh? Well, here you go:
> >
> > (o) (o)
> >
> > There. Ya happy?
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
> >
> That's right at your waistline, right?
>
>

Now, do you *see* a waistline in that binary picture? It's New Year's Day,
time to sober up!!

Kim W5TIT

68. Re: You have to be kidding!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 22:07:08 UTC
From: Dit Dit Dit Dah <Whinerz@anon.com>
Message-ID: <auvop5tbv0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 59147

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030101154321.22944.00000314@mb-mf.aol.com...
> >I signed on to this page looking for Ham Radio Rules, Regulations, and
> >Policies. Now I find out that it is only populated by a bunch of
teenagers
> >with no minds and no place else to prove it.
>
> The newsgroup has degenerated into a personal playground.
>
> This newsgroup is filled with: personal arguments, name calling, non
policy
> related news (such as announcment of events), (non radio) conversation,
radio
> items that should be in other newsgroups, ...etc.
>
> Very little discussion of amateur radio policy occurs here.

Yes, and your whining isn't going to change a thing and only adds to the
din.
Wah! Wah! Wah! Wah!

69. Re: Wonder?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 22:08:46 UTC
From: Dit Dit Dit Dah <Whinerz@anon.com>
Message-ID: <auvos4tjd0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 59148

"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:D87BC2EA68C48BC3.33F117892C7561DB.B21AB557531A9BB4@lp.airnews.net...
> "Bob Johnson" <screwu@screwu.org> wrote in message
> news:8%GQ9.9493$us1.5489@news.bellsouth.net...
> >
> > "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in mess You see, I'm
> liberated.
> > I love me enough for the entire rest of the
> > > world. > Kim W5TIT
> >
> > Heh heh...just a picture, TIT, just one little binary picture. After all
> > this hype, we gotta see them jugs. Should be no problem for a liberated
> gal
> > like yerself!
> >
> >
> >
>
> Binary, eh? Well, here you go:
>
> (o) (o)
>
> There. Ya happy?
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
That's right at your waistline, right?

70. Re: ARRL certification program

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 22:11:34 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3E136796.7B8FA61E@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 59149

Vshah101 wrote:

> From Nickolaus E. Leggett N3NL
> "Hello,
> It would be useful if the ARRL certification
> program developed over time into an engineering
> apprenticeship program where hams could acquire
> knowledge and certifications that would enable
> them to participate in engineering activity. At
> the present time, it is very difficult for adults
> to get the required university instruction to jump
> the various academic hurdles to engineering. However,
> the ARRL could offer a series of modular courses and
> credentials as well as credentials offered in
> cooperation with other groups such as the Society of
> Broadcast Engineers (SBE) and the National Association
> of Radio and Telecommunication Engineers (NARTE) to
> enable aspiring hams to work their way up the
> technology ladder from the basics of Ohms law to the
> fine points of radio engineering. The modular
> structure of this program would allow the students to
> work step-by-step in improving their knowledge with
> the definite milestones of specific examinations and
> credentials for each of the intermediate modules of
> knowledge. This structure would be better suited to
> busy adults and many bright youth than the
> all-or-nothing engineering credentials granted by the
> universities. Also, a student with a set of
> intermediate credentials could establish his suitability
> for an apprentice program in engineering. Such
> apprentice programs would be a useful way for recruiting
> new talent into the engineering profession. The ARRL
> could contribute to this public service."
> ---

Without an engineering college degree (BSEE), you'll just
be a "technician". They do lab lackey work like soldering
wires, ordering parts and such.

Now if the above ARRL credentials were worth college
credit that you could apply towards a real college degree,
then it would be worthwhile. One thing that would be
needed is proctored exams. Maybe using VEs, or maybe
going to a local college with a sealed envelope with the
exam inside, and they (for a fee) verify the seal, open

it, then sit you down in a classroom and hand you the exam. You answer the questions, and hand it back to them. You and they sign off on it, and they mail it in. Purpose is to prevent cheating.

Most colleges will likely want you to take at least half the courses in house though. But you could get the first two years completed via the above.

71. Re: ARRL certification program

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 22:15:39 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <auvp9p$h80$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 59201

Perhaps someone will recommend that at the WARC coming up. They could call it No Test International. GRIN.

Dan/W4 N T I

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message news:20030101160857.18087.00000717@mb-mv.aol.com...
> >The test covers these aspects briefly.
>
> Very Very briefly, who cares anyway, the Present written is a JOKE. Why dont
> they just get rid of the written and be done with it. Theres no reason to
> continue to drag this dumbing down process along. Just drop testing, fill out
> application and be done with it.

72. Re: What country?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 22:15:55 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3E13689B.8F700404@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 59202
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Doug Smith wrote:

>
> Yikes. I didn't think there was a worse CW call than WB9NME. You've
> proven me wrong<grin>!

Guess my call WA2ISE would have a CW friendly suffix.

Or you could pound out "whiskey bravo nine november mary echo" in CW. :-)

73. Re: ARRL certification program

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 22:20:50 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <auvpjg$b4s$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 59203

Then how do you explain my repairing to component level Avionics and two
way radio equipment? Oh and the parts ordering was done by the supply folks.

Lets not make such a broad statement.

Dan/W4NTI

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3E136796.7B8FA61E@ix.netcom.com...

> Without an engineering college degree (BSEE), you'll just
> be a "technician". They do lab lackey work like soldering
> wires, ordering parts and such.
>

74. Re: ARRL certification program

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 22:25:53 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3E136AF1.44799B44@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 59204

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

> Then how do you explain my repairing to component level Avionics and two
> way radio equipment? Oh and the parts ordering was done by the supply folks.
>
> Lets not make such a broad statement.
>
>

Sorry, was thinking of someone wanting to design said equipment.
And most companies that do such design work will require college
degrees.

Repair and design are related but different skill sets.

75. Re: ARRL certification program

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 22:41:02 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0301011441.47311cd4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59205

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030101131639.02012.00000236@mb-fi.aol.com>...
> >By increasing the technical competence, or by current testing to actually
> >mean
> >something, this enhances the image of amateur radio.
>
> Isnt this cute, we test Hams on Technical stuff. Then after they get there
> License the ARRL offers courses so they can learn the stuff. I thought that was
> the purpose of testing, to see how much someone really knew about the material.
> HAM WRITTEN TEST do away with them, there a JOKE.

The ARRL handbook & other similar ARRL educational materials were out
there long before you were and they will teach everything needed op
pass any FCC ham test.

The ARRL certifiction programs have little or nothing to do with
passing license exams, the intent is to provide in-depth education on
specific areas of personal interest.

w3rv

76. Re: "one step closer to extinction" (Was: Re: Followup from K4ZDH)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 22:42:04 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <uhr61v0cl3ph064uuit8viei9m4hb8uvfu@4ax.com>
Source record: 59206

On Tue, 31 Dec 2002 19:52:38 -0500, "KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote:

>Hopefully that also includes corporate welfare too!

Right!

It was proven in the late 1700's that we can't survive without
some sort of taxation, but propping up a company that can't make it on
it's own is a general bad thing.

Just take a look at Japan today.

- Mike KB3EIA -

77. Re: You have to be kidding!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 22:43:22 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v16ro7s783qv6b@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 59207

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030101154321.22944.00000314@mb-mf.aol.com...
> >I signed on to this page looking for Ham Radio Rules, Regulations, and
> >Policies. Now I find out that it is only populated by a bunch of
teenagers
> >with no minds and no place else to prove it.
>
> The newsgroup has degenerated into a personal playground.
>
> This newsgroup is filled with: personal arguments, name calling, non
policy
> related news (such as announcment of events), (non radio) conversation,
radio
> items that should be in other newsgroups, ...etc.
>
> Very little discussion of amateur radio policy occurs here.

And when there is no policy changes being made at the FCC
there is nothing to discuss here except K4YZ & W5TIT's
new found friendship, and of course Larry puking at the
thought of it! ;^)

I'm ready to discuss something useful for once, if someone
could think of something OTHER than code/no code and/or
dumbed down license testing, that is.

Have a "Hammy" New Year!
--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx

78. Re: What country?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 23:13:12 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <auvsll$6uh$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 59208
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

The main advantage of on of those calls (BHH for example..mine) was that I got dang good at CW...real quick. And so did those trying to copy my hand keying of KN8BHH.

Dan/W4NTI
"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message news:3E13689B.8F700404@ix.netcom.com...
> Doug Smith wrote:
>
> >
> > Yikes. I didn't think there was a worse CW call than WB9NME. You've
> > proven me wrong<grin>!
>
> Guess my call WA2ISE would have a CW friendly suffix.
>
> Or you could pound out "whiskey bravo nine november mary echo" in CW.
:-)
>

79. Re: You have to be kidding!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 23:14:47 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <auvsokgen1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 59209

How about a discussion of why we 'hams' think we deserve the 5 mhz band?

Dan/W4NTI

"KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com> wrote in message
news:v16ro7s783qv6b@corp.supernews.com...
>
> "Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030101154321.22944.00000314@mb-mf.aol.com...
> > >I signed on to this page looking for Ham Radio Rules, Regulations, and
> > >Policies. Now I find out that it is only populated by a bunch of
> teenagers
> > >with no minds and no place else to prove it.
> >
> > The newsgroup has degenerated into a personal playground.
> >
> > This newsgroup is filled with: personal arguments, name calling, non
> policy
> > related news (such as announcment of events), (non radio) conversation,
> radio
> > items that should be in other newsgroups, ...etc.
> >
> > Very little discussion of amateur radio policy occurs here.
>
> And when there is no policy changes being made at the FCC
> there is nothing to discuss here except K4YZ & W5TIT's
> new found friendship, and of course Larry puking at the
> thought of it! ;^)
>
>
> I'm ready to discuss something useful for once, if someone
> could think of something OTHER than code/no code and/or
> dumbed down license testing, that is.
>
> Have a "Hammy" New Year!
> --
> '73' From KB9TMP
> "The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
> if you can fake that, you've got it made."
> -Groucho Marx
>
>
>

80. Re: What country?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 23:15:46 UTC
From: Landrover <Landrover@hahanastyboy.com>
Message-ID: <auvsqn$8uh$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 59210
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

You wouldn't know how to use a Doppler DF to find your own
asshole! And you say drive right up to my front door? Sure!
Come on right over White Boy!!! You'd really stand out here in
the hood. HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA
I was on 14341 all day today talking to my bud in Michigan,
did you hear me? We didn't give a call sign not once, all day!

Landrover,

"Jerry Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:JiNP9.20004$nc7.18835@news.bellsouth.net...
>
> We don't even CARE what you believe! The scenario that Jim Hampton and
> others describe happens pretty often. Hams often know the original
holders
> of callsigns and the sounds of their
> voices--even if they have been inactive for years. It just isn't easy to
> bootleg a call and get away with it. I've pinpointed unlicensed operators
> with the most unsophistocated equipment and, then again, I have access to
> some pretty darned accurate Doppler DF equipment that is used by USAF to
> locate downed aircraft. With that, I can drive right up to YOUR front
door
> and say with 99.99% accuracy that the offending signal is originating from
> your residence if, indeed, it is.
> We (USAF Auxiliary) have even determined that an ELT (emergency locator
> transmitter) is moving
> down the highway, have isolated it, and stopped the offending UPS truck
that
> was shipping/carrying
> the accidentally activated unit to get it turned off.
>
> You are trolling, of course, and are incredibly stupid if you truly
believe
> that you would not be punished for operating an unlicensed ham station.
But
> then, that is the reason that I see CB antennas on run-down houses with
> chipped bricks and plywood in the windows, and the requisite
> '74 Buick with flapping fenders in the yard. Oh, there's that bad smell
> that seems to permeate the
> see, those stereotypes can be promoted and/or defended against.
>
> Jerry
>

81. Re: ARRL certification program

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 23:23:50 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030101182350.15150.00000967@mb-fe.aol.com>
Source record: 59212

>The ARRL certifiction programs have little or nothing to do with
>passing license exams, the intent is to provide in-depth education on
>specific areas of personal interest.
>
>w3rv
>

BS, there just another way for the ARRL to take money from people.

82. Re: ARRL certification program

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-01 23:26:18 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030101182618.15150.00000968@mb-fe.aol.com>
Source record: 59213

>Perhaps someone will recommend that at the WARC coming up. They could call
>it No Test International. GRIN.
>
>Dan/W4 N T I
>

Dan that would not surprise me, if NCI gets input on this that will probably be there next goal.NCI is nothing but a CB group anyway

83. Re: Adding something extra to a CQ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-02 00:06:11 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301011606.66e1944@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59214

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0301011140.5e512151@posting.google.com>...
>
> So who has cards from your operation? If they passed the test at the
> ARRL dxcc desk . . .
>
> w3rv

Hopefully the amateurs that I sent cards to have them. What they did
with them is out of my hands.

But you're not in my log, so I didn't send one to you.

84. Re: You have to be kidding!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-02 00:06:11 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <9BF67D373E28FCF9.A205BA61CD2E1240.D9DC5CF4FFDB17DD@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 59216

"KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com> wrote in message
news:v16ro7s783qv6b@corp.supernews.com...
>
> "Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030101154321.22944.00000314@mb-mf.aol.com...
> > >I signed on to this page looking for Ham Radio Rules, Regulations, and
> > >Policies. Now I find out that it is only populated by a bunch of
> teenagers
> > >with no minds and no place else to prove it.
> >
> > The newsgroup has degenerated into a personal playground.
> >
> > This newsgroup is filled with: personal arguments, name calling, non
> policy
> > related news (such as announcment of events), (non radio) conversation,
> radio
> > items that should be in other newsgroups, ...etc.
> >
> > Very little discussion of amateur radio policy occurs here.
>
> And when there is no policy changes being made at the FCC
> there is nothing to discuss here except K4YZ & W5TIT's
> new found friendship, and of course Larry puking at the
> thought of it! ;^)
>

Steve and I's friendship isn't newfound--just FYI. It's about two years
old...eh, Steve? Oh, and Larry's jealousy over it isn't new, either...<BEG>

>
> I'm ready to discuss something useful for once, if someone
> could think of something OTHER than code/no code and/or
> dumbed down license testing, that is.
>
> Have a "Hammy" New Year!
> --
> '73' From KB9TMP
> "The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
> if you can fake that, you've got it made."
> -Groucho Marx
>

How 'bout stirring up the pot on CCRs again?

Kim W5TIT

85. Re: Adding something extra to a CQ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-02 00:17:31 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301011617.6d8415b9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59215

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E12FC53.6FFB5A32@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E11CC29.7EC262A1@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E0F27BC.F4840B05@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E0E04C9.D3D32C01@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > Brian wrote:
>
> > > > > > > > Just like you knew what I was saying about Somalia was wrong, wrong,
> > > > > > > > wrong, until I dug it out of the ARRL web site.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > It is apparent that only you, of all individuals operating from Somalia
> > > > > > > > during that time period, neglected to get permission in writing from
> > > > > > > > someone authorized to grant it. That it never dawned on you that this
> > > > > > > > would be the thing to do, marks you as a rube.
>
> > > > > > > That you said I was "wrong, wrong, wrong" then I pulled it out of a
> > > > > > > readily available ARRL resource marks you, with all your vast overseas
> > > > > > > operating experience, not even a novice, but merely a non-player in
> > > > > > > operations from countries without a government.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > What you gathered from the League's web site in no way supports your
> > > > > > supposed operation from Somalia.
> > > > >
> > > > > I operated exactly to the ARRL recommendation.
> > > >
> > > > You continue to theorize that the couple of lines offered on the ARRL
> > > > web site is the sum total of information on the subject.
> > >
> > > It was 1,000 times more information than the World's Greatest DXer had
> > > when you told me I was wrong.
>
> Don Wallace arose from the dead and gave you information?

How could he do that? You've been watching too much Buffy.

You continued
> to believe that all the information necessary for permission was

> contained in a couple of lines of text.

I continue to believe that it was 1,000 better than the information
you gave.

> > > > In fact, you have nothing which
> > > > > supports your operation from Somalia.
> > > > >
> > > > > Then you have nothing to bitch about.
> > > >
> > > > ...other than your bootlegging from T5 as described by you.
> > >
> > I've never characterized it as bootlegging. Ever.
> >
> I have. You are free to continue the charade.

I am free to do as I wish.

> > > > > > You had no experience in such operations, yet you pass judgement on
> > > > > > > others who have. You and Ed.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > ...and you have yet to provide any evidence that your operation was
> > > > > > legal, accepted for DXCC credit or that it ever took place at all.
> > > > >
> > > > > Then you have nothing to bitch about.
> > > >
> > > > ...other than your claim of operating from Somalia without written
> > > permission from someone authorized to do so.
> > >
> > Meanwhile, I did have permission from someone authorized to do so,
> > even when you said that a military commander could NOT do so.
> >
> Nope. You CLAIM to have had permission from someone just up the chain
> from you.

No, I said commander.

You must have assumed that the material on the League's web
> site meant any officer over you.

No, the material on the ARRL web site was read by me 10 years after my
tour in Somalia. It essentially state the same thing as the other
amateur on station told me.

You must have assumed that it wasn't
> important to have such permission in writing.

That is correct.

> > > To summarize:
> > >
> > > It is apparent that only you, of all individuals operating from Somalia
> > > during that time period, neglected to get permission in writing from

> > > someone authorized to grant it. That it never dawned on you that this
> > > would be the thing to do, marks you as a rube.
>
> > Yes, yes, Dave. You've said that before. But saying it and saying it
> > often doesn't make it true, no matter how hard you wish it so.
>
> No, writing it doesn't make it true.

Hmmm.

It is true because it is
> accurate.

And my statement that I had permission from my commander is accurate.
Him putting it in writing doesn't make it any truer.

Writing it simply points it out again since you don't seem to
> grasp the implications. Your prior statements on morality and ethics
> ring hollow in the face of the reality that you had no proof of
> permission to operate legally and that your operation won't be accepted
> for DXCC credit.

I don't work people out of band, if that's what you meant.

> I thought you might be sharper in 2003 than 2002.

Nope, I'm the same.

86. Why hams think we deserve the 5 mhz band (was: You have to be kidding!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-02 00:20:54 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v171f6e2tnoc3e@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 59217

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:auvsokgen1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
> How about a discussion of why we 'hams' think we deserve the 5 mhz band?
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>

Sounds good to me! My opinion is because with the crowding we
now have on the HF bands in that general area (40 & 80) it would
be a good band to give us more "elbow" room in, and provide
more frequencies for the emergency communications when needed.
OTOH anytime someone discusses the possibility of more spectrum
we should jump on the band wagon with both feet, so long as it don't
cost us the "ARS farm" in the long run.

BTW I made my first CW contact last night.
I still have the sweaty palms to prove it. ;^)

BTU W4NTI de KB9TMP

--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx

> "KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:v16ro7s783qv6b@corp.supernews.com...
<SNIP>
> >
> > And when there is no policy changes being made at the FCC
> > there is nothing to discuss here except K4YZ & W5TIT's
> > new found friendship, and of course Larry puking at the
> > thought of it! ;^)
> >
> >
> > I'm ready to discuss something useful for once, if someone
> > could think of something OTHER than code/no code and/or
> > dumbed down license testing, that is.
> >
> > Have a "Hammy" New Year!
> > --
> > '73' From KB9TMP
> > "The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
> > if you can fake that, you've got it made."
> > -Groucho Marx

> >
> >
> >
>
>

87. Re: County Issuing Radio Licenses

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-02 00:26:15 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301011626.1b5ad9c0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59218

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E12F74A.2A60834A@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E122EBC.627EF63A@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E10714C.4DF31B39@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
>
> > > > > Maybe I rated you higher than you are. Kim didn't make any statements
> > > > > about homebrewing components. She doesn't need help from you in putting
> > > > > her hoof in her yap.
>
> > > > And you certainly don't need any help from me coming to the wrong conclusion.
> > > >
> > > > So Sorry.
> > >
> > > You usually seem a step or two behind the rest.
> >
> > No missteps here, Dave.
>
> Let's see--no evidence that you have a clue here.
>
> > There was no wrong
> > > conclusion on my part.
> >
> > No, never!
>
> No evidence that you have a clue here.
>
> > There was a misstatement on your part after you
> > > misread a post.
> >
> > Which post did I misread?
>
> No evidence of a clue here. Are you going for a record or what?
>
> Vipul assuredly has the edge at this point and he speaks English only as
> a second language.
>
> Dave K8MN

And you remember english only as a second language. You ought to at least remember the things you say.

88. Re: You have to be kidding!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-02 00:31:43 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v1723cm691jsf9@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 59219

"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:9BF67D373E28FCF9.A205BA61CD2E1240.D9DC5CF4FFDB17DD@lp.airnews.net...
> "KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:v16ro7s783qv6b@corp.supernews.com...
> >
> > "Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20030101154321.22944.00000314@mb-mf.aol.com...
> > > >I signed on to this page looking for Ham Radio Rules, Regulations,
and
> > > >Policies. Now I find out that it is only populated by a bunch of
> > teenagers
> > > >with no minds and no place else to prove it.
> > > >
> > > The newsgroup has degenerated into a personal playground.
> > >
> > > This newsgroup is filled with: personal arguments, name calling, non
> > policy
> > > related news (such as announcment of events), (non radio)
conversation,
> > radio
> > > items that should be in other newsgroups, ...etc.
> > >
> > > Very little discussion of amateur radio policy occurs here.
> >
> > And when there is no policy changes being made at the FCC
> > there is nothing to discuss here except K4YZ & W5TIT's
> > new found friendship, and of course Larry puking at the
> > thought of it! ;^)
> >
>
> Steve and I's friendship isn't newfound--just FYI. It's about two years
> old...eh, Steve? Oh, and Larry's jealousy over it isn't new,
either...<BEG>
>

OK I didn't know. Larrys jealous over your friendship with Steve?
I thought he was jealous over your ummm...ah...nevermind....I
didn't say anything.....just ignore me! ;^)

> >
> > I'm ready to discuss something useful for once, if someone
> > could think of something OTHER than code/no code and/or
> > dumbed down license testing, that is.
> >
> > Have a "Hammy" New Year!

> > --
> > '73' From KB9TMP
> > "The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
> > if you can fake that, you've got it made."
> > -Groucho Marx
> >
>
> How 'bout stirring up the pot on CCRs again?
>
> Kim W5TIT
>

I hate them!! How can any group tell you (or me)
what I can and can't put up over my house, and
what gives them the right to choose for the fellow
on the other side of the fence what he/she builds?

Have a "Hammy" New Year!
--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx

89. Re: ARRL certification program

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-02 00:34:26 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030101193426.29759.00000321@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 59220

From: Robert Casey wa2ise@ix.netcom.com
>Without an engineering college degree (BSEE), you'll just
>be a "technician". They do lab lackey work like soldering
>wires, ordering parts and such.

Even with a BSEE, you may be some kind of the many forms of "test engineer". This may include statistical failures, fixturing, soldering, ordering parts, maybe some troubleshooting.

This work may be higher skilled or LOWER skilled than a technician (yet they want someone with a BSEE to do the job). Also, it is getting common to append the word "engineer" to every low skilled task.

I am digressing, but it should be noted that it is very common for people with BSEEs to do the lackey work.

>Now if the above ARRL credentials were worth college
>credit that you could apply towards a real college degree,
>then it would be worthwhile.

There are few such courses now in colleges that cover the relevant material. If the quality material is covered at the equivalent hours and equivalent level, it should be accredited. Some topics may be only worth 1 credit instead of 3, but may be valuable additions.

It would be good to see some design (eg filter design) courses, as well as the emergency communications and other courses offered currently.

>Most colleges will likely want you to take at least half the
>courses in house though. But you could get the first
>two years completed via the above.

Colleges have offered credit for off campus courses. The ARRL courses would be a real plus. Also, they could have the benefit of being offered regularly, while colleges often offer the course every other semester, or even every other year.

>Sorry, was thinking of someone wanting to design said equipment.
>And most companies that do such design work will require college
>degrees.
Naturally, design is the most desired work. Few people with BSEEs actually do design work. Certifications in the specific area may help you obtain a higher level than otherwise.

90. Re: What country?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-02 00:47:07 UTC
From: Bill M <don'tspamme-exray@caribe.net>
Message-ID: <v172rvk76hem1e@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 59221
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Robert Casey wrote:
> Doug Smith wrote:
>
>
>>Yikes. I didn't think there was a worse CW call than WB9NME. You've
>>proven me wrong<grin>!
>
>
> Guess my call WA2ISE would have a CW friendly suffix.

Thats not such a bad call. My old TO Keyer will send that automatically when the 'ratio' adjustment isn't set correctly and I spill beer on the paddle.
:-)
Bill M WX4A

91. CCR Issue Revisited

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-02 01:04:06 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <C663A6F2EA57E3CB.297184971CE7C514.9EAF75F267313972@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 59222

"KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com> wrote in message
news:v1723cm691jsf9@corp.supernews.com...
>
> "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
*****Subject Was: RE: YOU HAVE TO BE KIDDING!
> >
> > How 'bout stirring up the pot on CCRs again?
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
> >
>
> I hate them!! How can any group tell you (or me)
> what I can and can't put up over my house, and
> what gives them the right to choose for the fellow
> on the other side of the fence what he/she builds?
>
> Have a "Hammy" New Year!
> --
> '73' From KB9TMP
> "The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
> if you can fake that, you've got it made."
> -Groucho Marx
>
>

Well, absolutely. I don't like "Neighborhood Associations" either. I'll speak out of turn, though, and state that I think the CCR issue that the ARRL was trying to get through Congress last year deals not only with Neighborhood Associations, but deed restrictions as well.

Our dislike of them aside, though: what do you think of the ARRL asking congress to pass a bill that would, essentially, render a signed-and-agreed-to-contract useless? While I disagree wholeheartedly with CCRs, and read the deed restrictions on this property before we bought it, the question still remains: should I request congress to support my amateur radio interest by passing a bill that says I don't have to abide by the contract I agreed to? Isn't that the same as someone who relishes antique cars being able to get a bunch of like-minded people together and go to congress to pass a bill that says they can now have a "junkyard" (in the eyes of their neighbors) because they are "special."

I don't agree with it. I also don't think it's good publicity to challenge contractual agreements because of our interest in amateur radio. If I signed a contract, I don't then turn around and "come up with" a way to get out of it. The bigger issue, as I see it, would be to challenge the deed

restriction or neighborhood associations--and even take them to court on our own. Does the ARRL feel strongly enough about the CCR issue to allow use of ARRL Counsel? I hardly think so.

This did degrade, the last time around--and I was one of the folks who joined in--into an argument about whether Neighborhood Associations and/or deed restrictions were a good or bad thing. It would be nice to see a true debate about the true issue. Let's accept that Neighborhood Associations and deed restrictions are present and here to stay. Yeah, they suck--or not; and yeah, they are overbearing--or not. The issue is: should special interest groups take issue against a contract they have signed? Was the ARRL right to spend so much time on this issue?

Kim W5TIT

92. Another Morse Code Opinion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-02 01:27:38 UTC
From: "Mike H. KC8UBH" <mhaas@nospam.insight.rr.com>
Message-ID: <eAMQ9.10908$GF.5096557@twister.columbus.rr.com>
Source record: 59223

Well...if anything, I made ya look...

I'm about 3 1/4 weeks into studying for the 5WPM. I'm taking the General on Jan. 11.

I used the ARRL "You're introduction to Morse Code" and Nu-Morse.

My only complaint about the tape is that in about a week, if you're listening to everything twice and going back over stuff you didn't get the first (second, or third) time, is that at the end of side 1 of tape 2, the guy says, "...by now you should be gettting pretty good at copying code at 5wpm...) and you feel like heaving the tape across the room.

Code was really kicking me in the ass but now I'm starting to feel like I'm kicking back.

Will I pass the test? I might just squeak by. But with another week and 1/4 of practice, I'm hoping I'll feel even more confident.

So what's my opinion?

I'm glad I studied it. :) Even if I never use code again after I upgrade, it was a great experience I wouldn't trade for anything.

Considering how easy the written test is going to be, it was INCONVENIENT AND TOOK SOME EFFORT to learn code at 5wpm.

Do I care if they do away with code? Not really - but they damn well better make the written test one hell of a lot harder. When its as easy to get your General as it is to get your Tech - HF is going to get really stinky.

By the way - I heard a guy on 2 meters say "10-4" the other day. He caught himself and apologized...just wait till you start hearing that on HF!!!

Take care,

Mike H. - KC8UBH

93. Re: Why hams think we deserve the 5 mhz band (was: You have to be kidding!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-02 01:42:31 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns92F6D294E24E0elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 59224

"KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com> wrote in
news:v171f6e2tnoc3e@corp.supernews.com:

>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:auvsokgen1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
>> How about a discussion of why we 'hams' think we deserve the 5 mhz
band?
>>
>> Dan/W4NTI
>>
>
> Sounds good to me! My opinion is because with the crowding we
> now have on the HF bands in that general area (40 & 80) it would
> be a good band to give us more "elbow" room in, and provide
> more frequencies for the emergency communications when needed.
> OTOH anytime someone discusses the possibility of more spectrum
> we should jump on the band wagon with both feet, so long as it don't
> cost us the "ARS farm" in the long run.
>
> BTW I made my first CW contact last night.
> I still have the sweaty palms to prove it. ;^)
>
> BTU W4NTI de KB9TMP
>
>
> --
> '73' From KB9TMP
> "The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
> if you can fake that, you've got it made."
> -Groucho Marx
>
>
>
>> "KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com> wrote in message
>> news:v16ro7s783qv6b@corp.supernews.com...
> <SNIP>
>> >
>> > And when there is no policy changes being made at the FCC
>> > there is nothing to discuss here except K4YZ & W5TIT's
>> > new found friendship, and of course Larry puking at the
>> > thought of it! ;^)
>> >
>> >

>> > I'm ready to discuss something useful for once, if someone
>> > could think of something OTHER than code/no code and/or
>> > dumbed down license testing, that is.
>> >
>> > Have a "Hammy" New Year!
>> > --
>> > '73' From KB9TMP
>> > "The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing, if you can fake
>> > that, you've got it made." -Groucho Marx
>> >
>> >
>> >
>>
>>
>
>

60m phone would be dead useful. Either that or a 40m phone allocation that actually falls where the rest of the world use phone, or maybe a 30m phone allocation.

It is completely beyond me why only those US hams --outside-- Region 2 get to have a phone allocation at 7075-7100 kHz and not those in Region 2. Everyone else in the world can use phone anywhere above 7040 kHz, and everyone in Region 3 can use phone anywhere above 7030 kHz. Nobody else outside the US uses phone above 7100 kHz even when they can (and in Region 1 they can't) because of the Region 1 broadcasters putting out hundreds of kW up there.

Realignment of the 40m band to 6900-7200 kHz is a pipe dream, because it would only benefit us here in the US, so the ITU will never go for it, and the broadcasters wouldn't even move off if the spectrum was officiallly taken away from them, anyway. It would be so much easier if the FCC would just make a 'tiny' change so that all US-licenced hams in all regions (except Technicians, of course) could use phone from 7075-7100 kHz, not just a few in the Pacific. Won't happen, of course, too many CW and digital ops would oppose it.

I think the chances of getting phone somewhere around 5 MHz are actually much higher than those of ever getting a decent phone allocation near 7 MHz. Of course, a wider 30m band with a phone allocation would be a dream come true as well, but I'm not holding my breath.

If I want to work any DX above 3.8 and below 14.15 MHz, I have to use split VFOs, and hope that someone will listen up above 7.15 while I am listening below 7.1, and this will get more important again as the sunspots go away. 5 MHz looks like the best hope right now.

Is this a serious enough policy discussion for you? It's still phone ops v CW ops, though, or at least someone will turn it into that within the next two posts!

73 de Alun, N3KIP

94. Re: Another Morse Code Opinion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-02 01:53:22 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v176sg6gm8bl5c@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 59225

"Mike H. KC8UBH" <mhaas@nospam.insight.rr.com> wrote in message
news:eAMQ9.10908$GF.5096557@twister.columbus.rr.com...
> Well...if anything, I made ya look...
>
> I'm about 3 1/4 weeks into studying for the 5WPM. I'm taking the General
on
> Jan. 11.
>
> I used the ARRL "You're introduction to Morse Code" and Nu-Morse.
>
> My only complaint about the tape is that in about a week, if you're
> listening to everything twice and going back over stuff you didn't get the
> first (second, or third) time, is that at the end of side 1 of tape 2, the
> guy says, "...by now you should be gettting pretty good at copying code at
> 5wpm...) and you feel like heaving the tape across the room.
>
> Code was really kicking me in the ass but now I'm starting to feel like
I'm
> kicking back.
>
> Will I pass the test? I might just squeak by. But with another week and
> 1/4 of practice, I'm hoping I'll feel even more confident.
>
> So what's my opinion?
>
> I'm glad I studied it. :) Even if I never use code again after I upgrade,
> it was a great experience I wouldn't trade for anything.
>
> Considering how easy the written test is going to be, it was INCONVENIENT
> AND TOOK SOME EFFORT to learn code at 5wpm.
>
> Do I care if they do away with code? Not really - but they damn well
better
> make the written test one hell of a lot harder. When its as easy to get
> your General as it is to get your Tech - HF is going to get really stinky.
>
> By the way - I heard a guy on 2 meters say "10-4" the other day. He
caught
> himself and apologized...just wait till you start hearing that on HF!!!
>
> Take care,
>
> Mike H. - KC8UBH

Mike
I listened to the code practice from the ARRL on their web site.
It is in MP3 & M3U files and can be downloaded and played
on your portable MP3 player. Check out the web page at:
http://www.arrl.org/w1aw/morse.html
I used the 5 & 7.5 WPM files, that way I was always hearing
it at a faster speed than the test was going to be.
And it's in real English not just random letters or words, and
each time the page is updated you get a new file instead of
the same old stuff off the tape.

Good luck on your test!
If I can do it ANYONE can!

Have a "Hammy" New Year!
--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx

95. Re: Why hams think we deserve the 5 mhz band (was: You have to be kidding!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-02 02:06:47 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v177llm5rqtg68@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 59226

"Alun Palmer" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns92F6D294E24E0elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> "KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com> wrote in
> news:v171f6e2tnoc3e@corp.supernews.com:
>
> > >
> > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > news:auvsokgen1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
> > >> How about a discussion of why we 'hams' think we deserve the 5 mhz
> > band?
> > >>
> > >> Dan/W4NTI
> > >>
> > >
> > > Sounds good to me! My opinion is because with the crowding we
> > > now have on the HF bands in that general area (40 & 80) it would
> > > be a good band to give us more "elbow" room in, and provide
> > > more frequencies for the emergency communications when needed.
> > > OTOH anytime someone discusses the possibility of more spectrum
> > > we should jump on the band wagon with both feet, so long as it don't
> > > cost us the "ARS farm" in the long run.
> > >
> > > BTW I made my first CW contact last night.
> > > I still have the sweaty palms to prove it. ;^)
> > >
> > > BTU W4NTI de KB9TMP
> > >
> > >
> > > --
> > > '73' From KB9TMP
> > > "The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
> > > if you can fake that, you've got it made."
> > > -Groucho Marx
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >> "KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com> wrote in message
> > >> news:v16ro7s783qv6b@corp.supernews.com...
> > > <SNIP>
> > >> >
> > >> > And when there is no policy changes being made at the FCC
> > >> > there is nothing to discuss here except K4YZ & W5TIT's
> > >> > new found friendship, and of course Larry puking at the
> > >> > thought of it! ;^)

> >> >
> >> >
> >> > I'm ready to discuss something useful for once, if someone
> >> > could think of something OTHER than code/no code and/or
> >> > dumbed down license testing, that is.
> >> >
> >> > Have a "Hammy" New Year!
> >> > --
> >> > '73' From KB9TMP
> >> > "The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing, if you can fake
> >> > that, you've got it made." -Groucho Marx
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >
> >>
> >>
> >
> >
>
> 60m phone would be dead useful. Either that or a 40m phone allocation that
> actually falls where the rest of the world use phone, or maybe a 30m phone
> allocation.
>
> It is completely beyond me why only those US hams --outside-- Region 2 get
> to have a phone allocation at 7075-7100 kHz and not those in Region 2.
> Everyone else in the world can use phone anywhere above 7040 kHz, and
> everyone in Region 3 can use phone anywhere above 7030 kHz. Nobody else
> outside the US uses phone above 7100 kHz even when they can (and in Region
> 1 they can't) because of the Region 1 broadcasters putting out hundreds of
> kW up there.
>
> Realignment of the 40m band to 6900-7200 kHz is a pipe dream, because it
> would only benefit us here in the US, so the ITU will never go for it, and
> the broadcasters wouldn't even move off if the spectrum was officiallly
> taken away from them, anyway. It would be so much easier if the FCC would
> just make a 'tiny' change so that all US-licenced hams in all regions
> (except Technicians, of course) could use phone from 7075-7100 kHz, not
> just a few in the Pacific. Won't happen, of course, too many CW and
> digital ops would oppose it.
>
> I think the chances of getting phone somewhere around 5 MHz are actually
> much higher than those of ever getting a decent phone allocation near 7
> MHz. Of course, a wider 30m band with a phone allocation would be a dream
> come true as well, but I'm not holding my breath.
>
> If I want to work any DX above 3.8 and below 14.15 MHz, I have to use
> split VFOs, and hope that someone will listen up above 7.15 while I am
> listening below 7.1, and this will get more important again as the
> sunspots go away. 5 MHz looks like the best hope right now.
>

> Is this a serious enough policy discussion for you? It's still phone ops v
> CW ops, though, or at least someone will turn it into that within the next
> two posts!
>
> 73 de Alun, N3KIP

It's the best I've seen in here for a while.
Maybe if we put blinders on we won't see
it drifts away from the subject.

I don't understand why all of the "world wide" frequencies
don't match "world wide" it's like the 3 Stooges did the
band planning for all the countries.

I've never even thought about a phone allocation in the 30m
range before, and I agree with you it's just a dream. But
it does seem kinda odd that all the bands have a voice
allocation except 30m.

If nothing else having a 5 MHz allocation would
give me a good reason to "clip" the Kenwood.
(It isn't now, and won't be without that kind of a reason!)

Have a "Hammy" New Year!
--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx

96. Re: Another Morse Code Opinion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-02 02:12:13 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030101211213.01778.00000436@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 59227
Body handling: HTML body converted to readable text

>Well...if anything, I made ya look...
>
>I'm about 3 1/4 weeks into studying for the 5WPM. I'm taking the General on
>Jan. 11.
>
>I used the ARRL "You're introduction to Morse Code" and Nu-Morse.
>
>My only complaint about the tape is that in about a week, if you're
>listening to everything twice and going back over stuff you didn't get the
>first (second, or third) time, is that at the end of side 1 of tape 2, the
>guy says, "...by now you should be gettting pretty good at copying code at
>5wpm...) and you feel like heaving the tape across the room.
>
>Code was really kicking me in the ass but now I'm starting to feel like I'm
>kicking back.
>
>Will I pass the test? I might just squeak by. But with another week and
>1/4 of practice, I'm hoping I'll feel even more confident.

This is a story, not an opinion.

>I'm glad I studied it. :) Even if I never use code again after I upgrade,
>it was a great experience I wouldn't trade for anything.

Not only you don't use it, but the military, hospitals, etc do not use it
anymore. Its now obsolete.

Great experience is arguable. I know that, for me, Morse is not a great
experience. I know I can do Morse code. I just don't want to.

>Considering how easy the written test is going to be, it was INCONVENIENT
>AND TOOK SOME EFFORT to learn code at 5wpm.

"Took some effort" does not equal relavant.

>Do I care if they do away with code? Not really - but they damn well better
>make the written test one hell of a lot harder. When its as easy to get
>your General as it is to get your Tech - HF is going to get really stinky.

Or, maybe it will get better. You are just supposing.

>By the way - I heard a guy on 2 meters say "10-4" the other day. He caught
>himself and apologized...just wait till you start hearing that on HF!!!

Irrelavant. The "10-4" comment is just a way for you to introduce CB into the
argument.

'An only-coder is never a villian in his own eyes. Keep this in mind; it may offer a way to make him your friend. If not you can kill him without hate - and quickly.'

News

Sports

Money & Business

Movies

TV

Celebrity

Music

Games

Love & Personals

Fun

News

Sports

Money & Business

Movies

TV

Celebrity

Music

Games

Love & Personals

Fun

Autos

Careers & Jobs

Computing

Holidays

Home & Real Estate

Shopping

Style

Travel

Tools

• Browser
Central

• White Pages

• Yellow Pages
• AOL Instant Messenger
• My Netscape
• Quick Checkout
• Book a
Flight
• Maps
• Calendar
• More
Tools

CNN.com News:

Get the latest news from CNN.com.....

These
Will Be the Most
Profitable More »

Try These
Surefire Hangover Cures

Tips: Look Great
Naked in 2003

Fortune Says These
Stocks Will Be Hot

Last Year's Five
Best Music Videos

Rose, Orange &
More: Follow Bowl Game Action

Market Update

• Symbol Lookup

• My Portfolio

DJ30
8341.63
8.78

NASD<
/a>
1335.51
-4.03

97. Re: CCR Issue Revisited

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-02 02:22:00 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v178rosls18ed3@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 59228

"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:C663A6F2EA57E3CB.297184971CE7C514.9EAF75F267313972@lp.airnews.net...
<SNIP>
> Well, absolutely. I don't like "Neighborhood Associations" either. I'll
> speak out of turn, though, and state that I think the CCR issue that the
> ARRL was trying to get through Congress last year deals not only with
> Neighborhood Associations, but deed restrictions as well.
>
> Our dislike of them aside, though: what do you think of the ARRL asking
> congress to pass a bill that would, essentially, render a
> signed-and-agreed-to-contract useless? While I disagree wholeheartedly
with
> CCRs, and read the deed restrictions on this property before we bought it,
> the question still remains: should I request congress to support my
amateur
> radio interest by passing a bill that says I don't have to abide by the
> contract I agreed to? Isn't that the same as someone who relishes antique
> cars being able to get a bunch of like-minded people together and go to
> congress to pass a bill that says they can now have a "junkyard" (in the
> eyes of their neighbors) because they are "special."

I think all CCRs that are in effect now should stand. Like you said it's a
signed contract, but no future ones should be allowed, or at least regulated
so as not to be to restrictive. I would never sign a deal that included my
not being able to put up antennas or anything else. BTW I do understand
the ones about junk yards, sheep, hog, and other farm related stuff inside
city or housing addition boundrys, that's a little different.

>
> I don't agree with it. I also don't think it's good publicity to
challenge
> contractual agreements because of our interest in amateur radio. If I
> signed a contract, I don't then turn around and "come up with" a way to
get
> out of it. The bigger issue, as I see it, would be to challenge the deed
> restriction or neighborhood associations--and even take them to court on
our
> own. Does the ARRL feel strongly enough about the CCR issue to allow use
of
> ARRL Counsel? I hardly think so.
>

Now since I'm not a member of the ARRL I can't say anything much for
or against them, but I don't see where they are doing all that much good
for the ARS. It's kinda like a guy I worked with a few years ago, he

would come up and say "You know WW you ain't much, but your
all we got!" I always wanted to deck him for it to, but I knew better.

> This did degrade, the last time around--and I was one of the folks who
> joined in--into an argument about whether Neighborhood Associations and/or
> deed restrictions were a good or bad thing. It would be nice to see a
true
> debate about the true issue.

Every posting in the NGs seems to "degrade" with time.
I wonder if a posting has a half life like nuclear waste does. ;^)

> Let's accept that Neighborhood Associations
> and deed restrictions are present and here to stay. Yeah, they suck--or
> not; and yeah, they are overbearing--or not.

I say let those that stand stay, but NO NEW ONES!

>The issue is: should special
> interest groups take issue against a contract they have signed? Was the
> ARRL right to spend so much time on this issue?

At least it keeps them off the streets at night! ;^)

>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>
Have a "Hammy" New Year!
--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx

98. Re: CCR Issue Revisited

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-02 02:28:32 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.h826593.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 59229

On Wed, 1 Jan 2003 19:04:06 -0600, W5TIT wrote:

>Does the ARRL feel strongly enough about the CCR issue to allow use of
>ARRL Counsel? I hardly think so.

That's what we ARRL VCs do.....the average attorney hasn't a clue
about communications or amateur radio law.

>Was the ARRL right to spend so much time on this issue?

Abso-positively.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
ARRL Volunteer Counsel

99. Re: Why hams think we deserve the 5 mhz band (was: You have to be kidding!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-02 02:36:53 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.h826wr4.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 59230

On Wed, 1 Jan 2003 21:06:47 -0500, KB9TMP wrote:

>I don't understand why all of the "world wide" frequencies
>don't match "world wide" it's like the 3 Stooges did the
>band planning for all the countries.

Ah, I see that you've sat in on some ITU frequency allocation
conferences....

Most of it is "I got mine...."

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

100. Re: Why hams think we deserve the 5 mhz band (was: You have to be kidding!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-02 02:39:28 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <av08oc$c2s$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 59231

Good show on the CW....if you want to try a sked...let me know. Be glad to
slow it down and chat.

Dan/W4NTI

"KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com> wrote in message
news:v171f6e2tnoc3e@corp.supernews.com...
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:auvsokgen1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
> > How about a discussion of why we 'hams' think we deserve the 5 mhz band?
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
>
> Sounds good to me! My opinion is because with the crowding we
> now have on the HF bands in that general area (40 & 80) it would
> be a good band to give us more "elbow" room in, and provide
> more frequencies for the emergency communications when needed.
> OTOH anytime someone discusses the possibility of more spectrum
> we should jump on the band wagon with both feet, so long as it don't
> cost us the "ARS farm" in the long run.
>
> BTW I made my first CW contact last night.
> I still have the sweaty palms to prove it. ;^)
>
> BTU W4NTI de KB9TMP
>
>
> --
> '73' From KB9TMP
> "The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
> if you can fake that, you've got it made."
> -Groucho Marx
>
>
>
> > "KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com> wrote in message
> > news:v16ro7s783qv6b@corp.supernews.com...
> <SNIP>
> > >
> > > And when there is no policy changes being made at the FCC
> > > there is nothing to discuss here except K4YZ & W5TIT's

> > > new found friendship, and of course Larry puking at the
> > > thought of it! ;^)
> > >
> > >
> > > I'm ready to discuss something useful for once, if someone
> > > could think of something OTHER than code/no code and/or
> > > dumbed down license testing, that is.
> > >
> > > Have a "Hammy" New Year!
> > > --
> > > '73' From KB9TMP
> > > "The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
> > > if you can fake that, you've got it made."
> > > -Groucho Marx
> > >
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

101. Re: CCR Issue Revisited

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-02 03:08:34 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.h827rw5.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 59233

On Wed, 1 Jan 2003 21:22:00 -0500, KB9TMP wrote:

>I think all CCRs that are in effect now should stand. Like you said it's a
>signed contract, but no future ones should be allowed, or at least regulated
>so as not to be to restrictive.

The issue isn't the validity of contracts but the regulation of the
conduct of those who will deny the amateur the ability to put up a
reasonable antenna.

In my professional experience advising amateurs and handling their
cases as a Volunteer Counsel, the CC&Rs that flatly prohibit
antennas greatly outnumber those which provide some mechanism for
obtaining permission, and even in the latter cases the absolute
power of the "association" - usually one officer who cows all the
others or the professional property manager who cows the board - is
rarely disposed to permitting installation of antennas and support
structures.

The heroes (or are they cowardly lions in this matter) at the FCC
have flatly said that it won't do anything unless The Congress tells
them to do it, as happened with the pre-emption of anti-TV and dish
provisions of CC&Rs.

If they can do it for them they can do it for us. That's why
we are pushing through this bill.

>I would never sign a deal that included my
>not being able to put up antennas or anything else. BTW I do understand
>the ones about junk yards, sheep, hog, and other farm related stuff inside
>city or housing addition boundrys, that's a little different.

It's a lot different - we all know that properly-installed
antenna towers are things of beauty !!

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
ARRL Volunteer Counsel

102. Re: Equipment Purchases for the year 2003?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-02 03:13:15 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030101221315.11569.00000446@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 59235

In article <d22b54c3.0301010513.41b02337@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>> >On receive, the limiting factor here when receiving weak signals is
>> >atmospheric
>> >noise. Said noise is easily heard on any of my receivers. Reducing the
>> >feedline
>> >loss in the way you propose will simply make the noise a little louder,
>but
>> >won't affect S/N in any real-world manner. To hear weaker signals on the
>> >bands
>> >described requires a better antenna, not a lower loss feedline.
>>
>> Hmmm. Hadn't thought about from the noise angle. OK, Jim -- you win!
>> Shall
>
>'Snot really Jim's point. In your situation with short coax runs the
>flavor of the coax used is a total no-counter, as a practical matter I
>seriously doubt that you could discern any any difference in the S/N
>ratios between RG-174 and two inch Heliax feedlines.

'Specially on receive.

>> BTW -- I've thought of trying some 450-ohm ladder line to feed my dipole,
>> but the total length would be around 15 feet. Is this good or bad?
>
>Neither. Feedline length, any feedline, doesn't make any difference if
>ya efficiently transfer the watts coming out of yer TX to the dipole.

Transmission lines 101. Figure the system efficiency.

>The whole trick is the tuner in practical situations.

Yeah, verily!!
>
>> Am I
>> going to have a "radiating" feedline?
>
>Where did you get the notion that radiating feedlines are necessarily
>a bad thing? N2EY was there one Field Day midnite when I worked a VK
>and a JA back-to-back on 20 cw with what, for all practical purposes,
>was a radiating feedline.

That was from EPA with 100 W and a TS-440, as I recall. When most of the others had said "band is dead". BWAAHAAHAA!
>

>> Currently the antenna is fed by
>> a scrap piece of RG-58 about 12 feet long. I also have heavy-duty 300-
>> ohm twinlead -- would that be just as good?
>
>A balanced line like TV twinlead or 450 ohm ladder line should be fed
>with a balanced tuner. Which the 949E very decidely is NOT despite the
>advertising hype. The thing will introduce huge losses despite the
>warm fuzzy SWRs the meter displays if ya use it in it's "balanced
>tuner" mode. Real balanced tuners today are homebrew country. The 949E
>is another example of the dumbing-down of ham radio when ya try to use
>one as a "balanced tuner". You need a coax-fed dipole which is "sorta
>resonant" and the 949E will pretty efficiently trim the SWRs down to a
>level which makes yer TX happy.
>
All true. The bad actor in most tuners is the "balun", which is simply not
meant to deal with highly reactive loads, or loads that differ markedly from
the design impedance (typically 50 or 200 ohms, depending on the ratio). Of
course if you can present the balun with a low-reactance 50 or 200 ohm load,
you don't really need a tuner....

Look up AG6K (Rick Measures) website on balanced tuners for a start.

>> I'm also thinking about creating
>> a new dipole which would be a half-wave on 40 meters, but it would have
>> to be folded quite drastically. What are the issues here?
>
>The only issue is folding any part of either one of the two legs of
>the dipole back on itself or ya run into the "cancellation effect".
>Total length of a 40m dipole is 66 feet give or take. One leg is
>roughly 33 feet long. The first segment per leg can go west, the
>second segment can go south (or north) from there and the third
>segment can go down (or up) vertically. There is nothing at all sacred
>about the segment lengths as long as they add up to 33 or so feet.
>Just don't run two segments in the north-south, east-west or on the
>up-down axes, etc., i.e., don't run any segements paralell with each
>other. Ditto the leg on the other side of the coax feedpoint. Also the
>other side does not have to be symmetrical wrt to the other side. At
>all. Should open up a lotta installation possibilities particulrly in
>scrunched spaces. For even bigger kicks run yer usual 20/10 (15?)
>parallel wires alongside the 40m legs and ya get it all, no EZNEC, no
>traps, no bullshit.

Well said.
>
>The best investment you could possibly make wrt to building HF dipoles
>is an MFJ 259B antenna analyzer. If ya trim the wire lengths right and
>the 259B at the coax connector to the radio shows a 10:1 or less SWR
>the 949 will clean up the remaining SWRs OK.

Should be able to get ~3:1 "raw" and the tuner does the rest. Half size G5RV is
how big? (~52 feet)

>
>Don't have a damned thing to do with ham radio policy.

This is the only statement of 'RV's that I'm gonna disagree with. I see all sorts of pontificating on the "technical level" of today's hams, yesterday's hams, written tests, certifications, alleged "dumbing down", etc. All sound and fury, signifying nothing.

In the past, hams needed a certain kind of techno know-how to even get a rig on the air. Not knowing how to zero beat, properly tune up a pi-net, order a crystal, set your mike gain or read an analog dial could get ya in big trouble! In a ham radio world where homebrew and home repair was as common as QRM, technical knowledge was essential to all hams.

But much of that is gone now, unless a ham is into specialized parts of amateur radio. Most of the ham gear manufactured in the past 15-20 years needs no tune-up, has a digital dial, and is pretty reliable and foolproof. Not much techno knowledge needed, though it's always helpful.

But the one area where almost all hams really need to know their stuff is antennas. Particularly on HF, where much misinformation is treated as gospel, and where antennas often present the biggest challenge to amateur operation.

So antenna knowledge is definitely a policy issue.

73 de Jim, N2EY

103. Re: CCR Issue Revisited

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-02 03:13:17 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030101221317.11569.00000447@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 59234

First let me say I am neither an attorney nor a real estate expert, but I do have a bit of info on this subject.

In article <C663A6F2EA57E3CB.297184971CE7C514.9EAF75F267313972@lp.airnews.net>, "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>Well, absolutely. I don't like "Neighborhood Associations" either. I'll
>speak out of turn, though, and state that I think the CCR issue that the
>ARRL was trying to get through Congress last year deals not only with
>Neighborhood Associations, but deed restrictions as well.

The main point of the bill being pushed is preemption of deed restrictions, just like TV antennas get.

Here's the blurb:

"A bill, HR-4720, has been introduced in the House of Representatives to provide relief for Amateur Radio Operators faced with private deed covenants, conditions and restrictions (CC&Rs) in erecting antennas. The measure would require private land-use regulators, such as homeowners' associations, to "reasonably accommodate" Amateur Radio communication consistent with the PRB-1 limited federal preemption. PRB-1 now applies only to states and municipalities. You can find more info at ARRL's web site..."

http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2002/05/14/102/?nc=1

>
>Our dislike of them aside, though: what do you think of the ARRL asking
>congress to pass a bill that would, essentially, render a
>signed-and-agreed-to-contract useless?

That's not what's being proposed.

The bill would simply require that ham antennas get the same consideration as TV antennas, which have preemption.

>While I disagree wholeheartedly with
>CCRs, and read the deed restrictions on this property before we bought it,
>the question still remains: should I request congress to support my amateur
>radio interest by passing a bill that says I don't have to abide by the
>contract I agreed to?

In a word, yes.

>Isn't that the same as someone who relishes antique
>cars being able to get a bunch of like-minded people together and go to
>congress to pass a bill that says they can now have a "junkyard" (in the

>eyes of their neighbors) because they are "special."

Nope. Not at all.
>
>I don't agree with it. I also don't think it's good publicity to challenge
>contractual agreements because of our interest in amateur radio. If I
>signed a contract, I don't then turn around and "come up with" a way to get
>out of it.

Contracts are challenged all the time. Look at all the divorces in the US, even
though many of the people who get divorced agreed to "until death" when they
"signed" the contract. Bankruptcy is similar - creditors often accept less than
full value of the money owed them.

>The bigger issue, as I see it, would be to challenge the deed
>restriction or neighborhood associations--and even take them to court on our
>own.

How does one challenge a deed restriction? Sue yourself?

>Does the ARRL feel strongly enough about the CCR issue to allow use of
>ARRL Counsel? I hardly think so.

Exactly the opposite is true.
>
>This did degrade, the last time around--and I was one of the folks who
>joined in--into an argument about whether Neighborhood Associations and/or
>deed restrictions were a good or bad thing. It would be nice to see a true
>debate about the true issue. Let's accept that Neighborhood Associations
>and deed restrictions are present and here to stay. Yeah, they suck--or
>not; and yeah, they are overbearing--or not. The issue is: should special
>interest groups take issue against a contract they have signed? Was the
>ARRL right to spend so much time on this issue?
>
Answer: YES, on both counts.

Here's why:

First, buying real estate is not like other purchases. There's no "new" real
estate being created - only reused and converted from other uses. The amount of
residential real estate on the market at any given time in a particular area is
finite and not easily changed. So a person seeking to buy a house often faces
extremely limited choices. And as deed restrictions become more pervasive, the
percentage of available housing that is unrestricted continues to drop. The
pervasiveness of anti-antenna deed restrictions effectively eliminates choice
in many areas. End result is that "don't buy a restricted house" is not an
option for many people.

Second, the mere fact that a "contract" was signed doesn't mean it cannot be
changed at a later date. Contracts are renegotiated all the time - that's a big
part of contract law. And a valid contract cannot violate a person's civil
rights or the law. For example, deed restrictions that prohibit sale of a
property to "non-white" people exist - and have been declared null and void by

the courts.

Third, what is proposed is not a blanket preemption of all antenna restrictions. Rather, it would require reasonable accomodation. Big difference between a 90 foot tower with multiple beams and a G5RV in the trees, for example. Deed restrictions that prohibit all antennas are unreasonably restrictive.

And consider why such restrictions were put in the deeds. It's not about interference, because receiving antennas are included. It's not about appearance, because all types of antennas are prohibited, regardless of appearance. The real issue was to effectively force homeowners to sign up for cable!

Fourth, while many states require disclosure of deed restrictions, the requirement is not universal, nor timely. Often they are not revealed until closing. Of course that's classic caveat emptor, but when real estate sales require termite inspection, radon inspection, seller's disclosure, title search and insurance, escrow and a host of other things, it's not unreasonable for the deed restrictions to be presented up-front. But try and get them!

You mention antique cars. Consider the following scenario:

(It's HYPOTHETICAL, folks!)

Suppose you went to buy a new car or truck, and found a model you liked at a decent price. You make the deal and all is smiles and handshakes. But when you go to pick up the car, the dealer wants you to sign an "owner's contract" or some such, that requires you to do and not do certain things for the entire time you own the car.

You look at the agreement and note that all sorts of things are required, like keeping the car washed, properly maintained by authorized dealers using only approved parts and not performing unauthorized modifications. Failure to comply not only voids the warranty, it may cause you to incur fines and even have the car reposessed by the manufacturer - even after it's paid for and out of warranty! These restrictions are for the life of the car, not just the original owner, and you cannot get out of them except by selling the car. And they have nothing to do with safety or pollution standards - those things are already protected by applicable laws.

You ask what this is all about, and the dealer says the car company is concerned about its image being tarnished by owners who don't take care of their cars, hence the restrictions.

Now at this point, most folks would storm out of the dealership and take their business elsewhere. But they find most of the other manufacturers have similar rules, and buying a new car without such restrictions limits the choices enormously. Used car? The newer models all have the restrictions, and you don't want the problems of an older car.

What to do?

(end hypothetical situation)

Not everybody can move to areas where there are no restrictions. Here's a typical example:

Young professional couple - he's a doctor, she's an attorney. Both are hams. They move to a new city when he completes his training and gets a new job at a very respected hospital. He needs to live near the hospital, she needs to live near the county seat. They plan to have kids very soon so school quality is a big issue. Yet they find that most of the real estate on the market has unacceptable restrictions. What should they do - give up ham radio?

73 de Jim, N2EY

104. Re: Why hams think we deserve the 5 mhz band (was: You have to be kidding!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-02 03:13:18 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030101221318.11569.00000448@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 59236

In article <v171f6e2tnoc3e@corp.supernews.com>, "KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com>
writes:

>My opinion is because with the crowding we
>now have on the HF bands in that general area (40 & 80) it would
>be a good band to give us more "elbow" room in,

While I agree with this in principle, it's a hard sell to the regulators. They
can simply say "use another band" and "use more spectrum efficent techniques".
Also, if 40 becomes 300 kHz worldwide amateur....

>and provide
>more frequencies for the emergency communications when needed.

Same arguments as above. Main point of emergency comms is regional propagation
on 5 MHz, particularly during low sunspot times.

>OTOH anytime someone discusses the possibility of more spectrum
>we should jump on the band wagon with both feet, so long as it don't
>cost us the "ARS farm" in the long run.

Agreed! If we don't ask we'll never get.
>
>BTW I made my first CW contact last night.
>I still have the sweaty palms to prove it. ;^)
>
GREAT!!! Congratulations!

73 es HNY de Jim, N2EY

105. Re: Another Morse Code Opinion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-02 03:20:16 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <28b71v0lht7c9fhravtae8hr6eunmrh6o7@4ax.com>
Source record: 59237

On Thu, 02 Jan 2003 01:27:38 GMT, "Mike H. KC8UBH"
<mhaas@nospam.insight.rr.com> wrote:

>Well...if anything, I made ya look...
>
>I'm about 3 1/4 weeks into studying for the 5WPM. I'm taking the General on
>Jan. 11.
>
>I used the ARRL "You're introduction to Morse Code" and Nu-Morse.
>
>My only complaint about the tape is that in about a week, if you're
>listening to everything twice and going back over stuff you didn't get the
>first (second, or third) time, is that at the end of side 1 of tape 2, the
>guy says, "...by now you should be gettting pretty good at copying code at
>5wpm...) and you feel like heaving the tape across the room.

It took me around 6 months of hard work to learn Morse code.
For some people it is easy, and others it isn't easy at all.

Morse code isn't a gauge of a person's intelligence, radio
ability, or goodness or badness as a ham. All it means is that the
person knows Morse code.

So if it is difficult for you, don't feel inadequate or
stupid. It's just harder for you.

>So what's my opinion?
>
>I'm glad I studied it. :) Even if I never use code again after I upgrade,
>it was a great experience I wouldn't trade for anything.

Yup, me too.

>Do I care if they do away with code? Not really - but they damn well better
>make the written test one hell of a lot harder. When its as easy to get
>your General as it is to get your Tech - HF is going to get really stinky.

Agreed. The test should be harder. Even then though, it won't
necessarily "keep the neighborhood clean" Lots of offenders have been
licensed for a long time, before presumed dumbed-down tests were
around. The key to keeping things on the up and up is hams who won't
tolerate on air abuse, and an enforcement system that backs them up.

>By the way - I heard a guy on 2 meters say "10-4" the other day. He caught
>himself and apologized...just wait till you start hearing that on HF!!!

We have a fellow who says 10-4 on our repeater, and a few who
ask for "handles". All are fine hams.

- Mike KB3EIA -

106. Re: ARRL certification program

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-02 05:16:02 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E13CB07.BAEC05D5@earthlink.net>
Source record: 59238

Vshah101 wrote:

> Good suggestion. This will help improve the technical competence of radio
> amateurs and will help keep the bands. Simply occupying the band (as in
> contesting) is not sufficient to prove meritorious use of the bands.
>
> From surveys, there seems to be a lack of interest in the technical aspect.
> Antennas, operating, contesting, and Morse code had the highest interest
> levels. Those interested in the technical aspects don't join.
>
> By increasing the technical competence, or by current testing to actually mean
> something, this enhances the image of amateur radio. Also, lets not tie code to
> the technical license classes.
>
> Currently, most of the amateur radio clubs focus on operating. Let's have more
> technical clubs.

Just when Brian Burke starts to falter, Vipul comes to his rescue.

Brian has just moved several steps up the ladder, only pausing his
ascent briefly to dodge the form of Vshah as it hurtles past.

Dave K8MN

107. Re: Adding something extra to a CQ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-02 05:32:16 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E13CED5.5F323D3C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 59239

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E12FC53.6FFB5A32@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E11CC29.7EC262A1@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E0F27BC.F4840B05@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E0E04C9.D3D32C01@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > Brian wrote:

> > > > You continue to theorize that the couple of lines offered on the ARRL
> > > > web site is the sum total of information on the subject.
> > > >
> > > It was 1,000 times more information than the World's Greatest DXer had
> > > when you told me I was wrong.
> > >
> > Don Wallace arose from the dead and gave you information?
> >
> How could he do that? You've been watching too much Buffy.

It was a question directed to you.

> You continued
> > to believe that all the information necessary for permission was
> > contained in a couple of lines of text.
> >
> I continue to believe that it was 1,000 better than the information
> you gave.

So we encounter yet another of your difficulties.

>
> > > > > In fact, you have nothing which
> > > > > > supports your operation from Somalia.
> > > > > >
> > > > > Then you have nothing to bitch about.
> > > > >
> > > > ...other than your bootlegging from T5 as described by you.

> > >
> > > I've never characterized it as bootlegging. Ever.
> >
> > I have. You are free to continue the charade.
>
> I am free to do as I wish.

...including to swing slowly in the wind.

> > > > > > > You had no experience in such operations, yet you pass judgement on
> > > > > > > others who have. You and Ed.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > ...and you have yet to provide any evidence that your operation was
> > > > > > > legal, accepted for DXCC credit or that it ever took place at all.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Then you have nothing to bitch about.
> > > > > >
> > > > > ...other than your claim of operating from Somalia without written
> > > > > permission from someone authorized to do so.
> > > >
> > > Meanwhile, I did have permission from someone authorized to do so,
> > > even when you said that a military commander could NOT do so.
> >
> > Nope. You CLAIM to have had permission from someone just up the chain
> > from you.
>
> No, I said commander.

The commander of U.S. forces in Somalia during your stay can't be that
difficult to locate.

> You must have assumed that the material on the League's web
> > site meant any officer over you.
>
> No, the material on the ARRL web site was read by me 10 years after my
> tour in Somalia. It essentially state the same thing as the other
> amateur on station told me.
>
> You must have assumed that it wasn't
> > important to have such permission in writing.
>
> That is correct.

Well ain't you da fool!

> > > > To summarize:
> > > >
> > > > It is apparent that only you, of all individuals operating from Somalia
> > > > during that time period, neglected to get permission in writing from
> > > > someone authorized to grant it. That it never dawned on you that this
> > > > would be the thing to do, marks you as a rube.
> >

> > > Yes, yes, Dave. You've said that before. But saying it and saying it
> > > often doesn't make it true, no matter how hard you wish it so.
> >
> > No, writing it doesn't make it true.
>
> Hmmm.
>
> It is true because it is
> > accurate.
>
> And my statement that I had permission from my commander is accurate.

Your proof for the above is?

> Him putting it in writing doesn't make it any truer.

We'll never know if your statement was true since he didn't put it in
writing.

> Writing it simply points it out again since you don't seem to
> > grasp the implications. Your prior statements on morality and ethics
> > ring hollow in the face of the reality that you had no proof of
> > permission to operate legally and that your operation won't be accepted
> > for DXCC credit.
>
> I don't work people out of band, if that's what you meant.

I meant what I wrote. Maybe you can have someone explain it to you.

> > I thought you might be sharper in 2003 than 2002.
>
> Nope, I'm the same.

So I see.

Dave K8MN

108. Re: Another Morse Code Opinion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-02 05:49:40 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030102004940.02081.00000093@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 59240

>Subject: Re: Another Morse Code Opinion
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 1/1/03 8:12 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030101211213.01778.00000436@mb-fx.aol.com>

>This is a story, not an opinion.

Thank you, Dr Shah.

>>I'm glad I studied it. :) Even if I never use code again after I upgrade,
>>it was a great experience I wouldn't trade for anything.
>
>Not only you don't use it, but the military, hospitals, etc do not use it
>anymore. Its now obsolete.

The military DOES use it and hospitals never did. So what? The guy was
saying that the learning experience was a good one.

>Great experience is arguable

THAT was an opinion, Dr Shah.

>I know that, for me, Morse is not a great
>experience. I know I can do Morse code. I just don't want to.

You sound like my daughter fussing about doing the dishes. She KNOWS she
can do them, but she just doesn't want to.

>"Took some effort" does not equal relavant.

To him it IS relevent, Vipul. You started off this post by redirecting
the poster on what is or is not an opinion. You obvioulsy ahve a very
difficult time yourself making the distinction.

>>By the way - I heard a guy on 2 meters say "10-4" the other day. He caught
>>himself and apologized...just wait till you start hearing that on HF!!!
>
>Irrelavant.

To those who are concerned about the thinning out of the Amateur Radio
gene pool, it is VERY relevent.

>The "10-4" comment is just a way for you to introduce CB into the
>argument.

And it is that influx of CB-like lingo that has many people concerned,
ergo VERY relevent, and unfortunately it goes hand-in-hand with the effort to
dispense with Morse Code testing.

Steve, K4YZ

109. Re: You have to be kidding!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-02 05:51:20 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030102005120.02081.00000094@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 59242

>Subject: Re: You have to be kidding!
>From: "W5TIT" seventythree@eightyeight.net
>Date: 1/1/03 6:06 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id:
><9BF67D373E28FCF9.A205BA61CD2E1240.D9DC5CF4FFDB17DD@lp.airnews.net>

>Steve and I's friendship isn't newfound--just FYI. It's about two years
>old...eh, Steve? Oh, and Larry's jealousy over it isn't new, either...<BEG>

'Bout right!

73

Steve, K4YZ

110. Re: Kevin Mitnick gets his ham license back!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-02 06:02:18 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030102010218.02081.00000095@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 59243

>Subject: Re: Kevin Mitnick gets his ham license back!
>From: Henrik Persson nix@socialism.nu
>Date: 12/30/02 9:59 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20021230165911.5f06b122.nix@socialism.nu>
>

>Anyhow.. The repression from the state in this case is horrible, as in most
>cases when both hackers and US.gov is involved.. And the US state talks about
>their freedom.. Pff.

"Repression" is the overt or covert actions of a government intended to
supress the opinions or actions of a people for social engineering purposes.

Mr. Mitnick was incarcerated for criminal acts that caused damage and
loss-of-service to his victims. He was afforded the full protection of the
United States legal system in his defense. He was guilty and lost.

Please take the time to learn the difference.

Steve Robeson, LPN
K4YZ

111. Re: "one step closer to extinction" (Was: Re: Followup from K4ZDH)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-02 06:42:00 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <av1feu11vv@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 59151

What about another form of corporate welfare other that corporate subsidies, and grants, what about abatements? If these corporations paid their fair share, then the tax burden would be smaller on all of us. For example I will pick on the local largest corporation near me, Dow Chemical. If they paid even something as small as 1% percent of the value of the property they own in Midland County, MI where the corporation is based, the tax burden on the residences would be alot less..... One percent is not much on thier bottom line, but for the average middle class or less person the relief would be great.

Obviously this would be in that "ideal" world.... Another spin on the "I gotta/had to do it, so do they" attitude.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
"Symbolism is for the simple minded....."

"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:0E16E4F538938A45.D7219D261CB972BE.664E01AFC557E247@lp.airnews.net...
> "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
> news:auukrf55b2@enews3.newsguy.com...
> > Hopefully that also includes corporate welfare too!
> >
> >
> > --
> > Ryan, KC8PMX
> > FF/MFR
> > REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
> >
> > "Symbolism is for the simple minded....."
> >
> >
>
> Excellent point, Ryan. Unfortunately, corporate welfare seems like "the
> thing" these days. Heck, what is up wid dat, anyway? If your business
> can't make it, the govt. just hands over some money, huh? Y'know, seems
> like countries in the rest of the world, and the corporate giants here get
> all the fringe benefits of our hard earned money.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

112. Re: Adding something extra to a CQ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-02 06:54:45 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <av1fev21vv@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 59152

```
\>
> : I did that for about the first year of operation myself. Now the only
> ones
> : I log are the ones that are infrequent or first time contacts.... Got
rid
> of
> : that anal-retentiveness that seems to run prevalent in the ham world.
>
> Keeping a log is "anal-retentiveness"? C'mon, Ryan!

In todays world, since we do not have to log anymore, yeah, I guess it
might. For that first year, I logged every single conversation, but have
not since. Only log the new ones for the most part. Although, I have
noticed that when I have chatted with some people recently, having access to
that log help to refresh my memory.

> You're free to keep a log or not keep one --- I couldn't care less which
you
> do --- but implying that log keepers are "anal retentive" strikes me as
> pretty "simple minded" (to steal a phrase from your tag-line).
>

No... I was implying that there is "anal retentiveness" in the ham world,
with overzealous logging at this day and age would be a bit "anal
retentive." Regardless of band, mode etc., logging contacts that I already
have in the log seems a bit anal retentive to me. I see some hams around
here that do impact studies, do flowcharts etc, and other paperwork just
for something simple as mounting a mag mount antenna!

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
"Symbolism is for the simple minded....."
```

113. Re: Mini-HOWTO: Killing Dave Heil / W5TIT ego battles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-02 07:10:50 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <av1ff031vv@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 59153

"Lloyd Braxilwartenoski" <Lloyd@no.spammmmm> wrote in message
news:steve.robeson.sucks.eggs@taranews.net...
> On Tue, 31 Dec 2002 20:12:36 -0500, KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
wrote:
> > Easier to do that with Outlook Express.... Go to MESSAGE in the toolbar,
> > then choose BLOCK SENDER.
>
> While that is a start, it doesn't give you the ability to delete some
> posts by a writer while at the same time keeping other posts by that
> same writer. Regular expression based filters can do that easily.

Well... if the person is distastefull enough to me to even consider blocking
them in the first place, I am sure I won't want to see anything posted by
them. There is a "Create Rule From Message" function which does seem to
work somewhat like you described above.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

"Symbolism is for the simple minded....."

114. Re: Wonder?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-02 07:17:01 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <av1ff141vv@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 59154

If it is okay..... If you have a problem with Kim's (or any other call deemed offensive by you) then get off of your freakin' ass and complain to the authorizing agency that issued the call in the first place, vanity call or not. As far as your post is otherwise concerned, it does not carry any weight due to your essentially spineless, anonymous post.

All the whining and bitching here is not gonna change anything....

"Voldemort" <Muggle@anon.com> wrote in message
news:auu8b1$da1$0@pita.alt.net...
> If it is OK for TIT to have such a call, since she claims to be doing
such
> for 'shock' value, then it should also, by her standards, to be OK to have
a
> calll such as 'DIK' or 'FUK' or "KNT'.
> Why not?
> Of course if one were to desire to obtain such calls one would also, by
> projection, think that such calls or persons requesting such calls be
> obliged to carry as much cellulite on and about their posteriers as Kim
> does.
> It is no secret that TIT is less than voluptuous and has years ago lost
> her "girly figure".
> Sorry, Kim, but them's the ugly and indisputable facts. Your days of
7/8
> Petite are long gone if indeed they ever were.
> Not to be personal, Kim, but just how many years ago WAS it when you
used
> to be able to squeeze into a 7/8? You were probably what? Nine or ten
years
> old?
> No need to be ashamed...most women your age wear tents and very dark
> panty-hose...it helps hide your ever-widening hips and the dark panty-hose
> hides the varicose veins. Such is life...eh?
> Color me cruel...
>
>

115. Re: Adding something extra to a CQ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-02 11:29:34 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301020329.3f663184@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59244

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E13CED5.5F323D3C@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:

> > You continued
> > > to believe that all the information necessary for permission was
> > > contained in a couple of lines of text.
> >
> > I continue to believe that it was 1,000 better than the information
> > you gave.
>
> So we encounter yet another of your difficulties.

Not if we accept that you were simply wrong. I do.

> > > > Meanwhile, I did have permission from someone authorized to do so,
> > > > even when you said that a military commander could NOT do so.
> > >
> > > Nope. You CLAIM to have had permission from someone just up the chain
> > > from you.
> >
> > No, I said commander.
>
> The commander of U.S. forces in Somalia during your stay can't be that
> difficult to locate.

I briefed him daily. He wasn't hard to find at all.

> > You must have assumed that the material on the League's web
> > > site meant any officer over you.
> >
> > No, the material on the ARRL web site was read by me 10 years after my
> > tour in Somalia. It essentially state the same thing as the other
> > amateur on station told me.
> >
> > You must have assumed that it wasn't
> > > important to have such permission in writing.
> >
> > That is correct.
>
> Well ain't you da fool!

Well, yes. But it doesn't mean that I was a bootleger, nor does it mean I'm a liar.

> > > > > To summarize:
> > > > >
> > > > > It is apparent that only you, of all individuals operating from Somalia

> > > > > during that time period, neglected to get permission in writing from
> > > > > someone authorized to grant it. That it never dawned on you that this
> > > > > would be the thing to do, marks you as a rube.
>
> > > > > Yes, yes, Dave. You've said that before. But saying it and saying it
> > > > > often doesn't make it true, no matter how hard you wish it so.
> > > >
> > > > No, writing it doesn't make it true.
> > >
> > Hmmm.
> > >
> > It is true because it is
> > > accurate.
> > >
> > And my statement that I had permission from my commander is accurate.
>
> Your proof for the above is?

Didn't you just say that writing it doesn't make it true?

> > Him putting it in writing doesn't make it any truer.
>
> We'll never know if your statement was true since he didn't put it in
> writing.

Didn't you just say that writing it doesn't make it true?

> > Writing it simply points it out again since you don't seem to
> > > grasp the implications. Your prior statements on morality and ethics
> > > ring hollow in the face of the reality that you had no proof of
> > > permission to operate legally and that your operation won't be accepted
> > > for DXCC credit.
> > >
> > I don't work people out of band, if that's what you meant.
>
> I meant what I wrote. Maybe you can have someone explain it to you.
>
> > > I thought you might be sharper in 2003 than 2002.
> > >
> > Nope, I'm the same.
>
> So I see.

How different will you be in 2003?

116. Re: Another Morse Code Opinion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-02 12:12:30 UTC
From: "Mike H. KC8UBH" <mhaas@nospam.insight.rr.com>
Message-ID: <O0WQ9.11755$GF.5510788@twister.columbus.rr.com>
Source record: 59245

>
> It took me around 6 months of hard work to learn Morse code.
> For some people it is easy, and others it isn't easy at all.
>

All in all, that sounds just about right. I might be able to pass the 5WPM, but by no means feel I've "learned" Morse Code. I talked to a guy recently who can do 40WPM...in his car...yikes!!!

> Morse code isn't a gauge of a person's intelligence, radio
> ability, or goodness or badness as a ham. All it means is that the
> person knows Morse code.
>
> So if it is difficult for you, don't feel inadequate or
> stupid. It's just harder for you.

Agreed, absolutely.

Also - look up "Early Telegraphy" on the 'Net, and take a look at our predecesors...when their networks were called in their own day, "The Highway of Intelligence". Sound familiar? These guys (and gals) would go back to the office at night, get on the key, and talk to their friends all over the US and even across the ocean. I'd love to know what those conversations were like 160 years ago!!!

>
>
> >So what's my opinion?
> >
> >I'm glad I studied it. :) Even if I never use code again after I upgrade,
> >it was a great experience I wouldn't trade for anything.
>
> Yup, me too.
>
> >Do I care if they do away with code? Not really - but they damn well better
> >make the written test one hell of a lot harder. When its as easy to get
> >your General as it is to get your Tech - HF is going to get really stinky.
>
> Agreed. The test should be harder. Even then though, it won't
> necessarily "keep the neighborhood clean" Lots of offenders have been
> licensed for a long time, before presumed dumbed-down tests were
> around. The key to keeping things on the up and up is hams who won't
> tolerate on air abuse, and an enforcement system that backs them up.

>
>
> >By the way - I heard a guy on 2 meters say "10-4" the other day. He
caught
> >himself and apologized...just wait till you start hearing that on HF!!!
>
> We have a fellow who says 10-4 on our repeater, and a few who
> ask for "handles". All are fine hams.

I personally find it disconcerting. The guy really did apologize but I'd
really rather not hear CB lingo. Its an awful reminder of what the bands
could degenerate into if we're not careful.

I'm not suggesting however that Code will keep that from happening. As long
as the standards are high enough where it takes some work to get your
ticket - I think we'll be fine.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

de KC8UBH (Mike H.)

117. Re: ARRL certification program

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-02 12:17:52 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <8C77A0205277FCD1.61F4CA179B44B8E9.4D468C8490391955@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 59247

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3E13CB07.BAEC05D5@earthlink.net...
> Vshah101 wrote:
>
> > Good suggestion. This will help improve the technical competence of
radio
> > amateurs and will help keep the bands. Simply occupying the band (as in
> > contesting) is not sufficient to prove meritorious use of the bands.
> >
> > From surveys, there seems to be a lack of interest in the technical
aspect.
> > Antennas, operating, contesting, and Morse code had the highest interest
> > levels. Those interested in the technical aspects don't join.
> >
> > By increasing the technical competence, or by current testing to
actually mean
> > something, this enhances the image of amateur radio. Also, lets not tie
code to
> > the technical license classes.
> >
> > Currently, most of the amateur radio clubs focus on operating. Let's
have more
> > technical clubs.
>
> Just when Brian Burke starts to falter, Vipul comes to his rescue.
>
> Brian has just moved several steps up the ladder, only pausing his
> ascent briefly to dodge the form of Vshah as it hurtles past.
>
> Dave K8MN
>

So, nothing of sustenance or intellect to add.

Kim W5TIT

118. Re: Adding something extra to a CQ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-02 12:18:06 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <586310ECC41B16E4.34546AEBC95B23C6.C4D457470675C945@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 59246

```
Still nothing...

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3E13CED5.5F323D3C@earthlink.net...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E12FC53.6FFB5A32@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E11CC29.7EC262A1@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E0F27BC.F4840B05@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E0E04C9.D3D32C01@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
>
> > > > > > You continue to theorize that the couple of lines offered on the
ARRL
> > > > > web site is the sum total of information on the subject.
> > > > >
> > > > It was 1,000 times more information than the World's Greatest DXer
had
> > > > when you told me I was wrong.
> > > >
> > > Don Wallace arose from the dead and gave you information?
> > >
> > How could he do that? You've been watching too much Buffy.
>
> It was a question directed to you.
>
> > You continued
> > > to believe that all the information necessary for permission was
> > > contained in a couple of lines of text.
> > >
> > I continue to believe that it was 1,000 better than the information
> > you gave.
>
> So we encounter yet another of your difficulties.
```

>
> >
> > > > > > In fact, you have nothing which
> > > > > > > supports your operation from Somalia.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Then you have nothing to bitch about.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > ...other than your bootlegging from T5 as described by you.
> > > > >
> > > > > I've never characterized it as bootlegging. Ever.
> > >
> > > I have. You are free to continue the charade.
> >
> > I am free to do as I wish.
>
> ...including to swing slowly in the wind.
>
> > > > > > > > You had no experience in such operations, yet you pass
judgement on
> > > > > > > > others who have. You and Ed.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > ...and you have yet to provide any evidence that your
operation was
> > > > > > > legal, accepted for DXCC credit or that it ever took place at
all.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Then you have nothing to bitch about.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > ...other than your claim of operating from Somalia without written
> > > > > permission from someone authorized to do so.
> > > > >
> > > > > Meanwhile, I did have permission from someone authorized to do so,
> > > > even when you said that a military commander could NOT do so.
> > >
> > > Nope. You CLAIM to have had permission from someone just up the chain
> > > from you.
> >
> > No, I said commander.
>
> The commander of U.S. forces in Somalia during your stay can't be that
> difficult to locate.
>
> > You must have assumed that the material on the League's web
> > > site meant any officer over you.
> >
> > No, the material on the ARRL web site was read by me 10 years after my
> > tour in Somalia. It essentially state the same thing as the other
> > amateur on station told me.
> >
> > You must have assumed that it wasn't

> > > important to have such permission in writing.
> >
> > That is correct.
>
> Well ain't you da fool!
>
> > > > > To summarize:
> > > > > >
> > > > > It is apparent that only you, of all individuals operating from
Somalia
> > > > > during that time period, neglected to get permission in writing
from
> > > > > someone authorized to grant it. That it never dawned on you that
this
> > > > > would be the thing to do, marks you as a rube.
> > > >
> > > > Yes, yes, Dave. You've said that before. But saying it and saying
it
> > > > often doesn't make it true, no matter how hard you wish it so.
> > > >
> > > No, writing it doesn't make it true.
> > >
> > Hmmm.
> >
> > It is true because it is
> > > accurate.
> >
> > And my statement that I had permission from my commander is accurate.
>
> Your proof for the above is?
>
> > Him putting it in writing doesn't make it any truer.
>
> We'll never know if your statement was true since he didn't put it in
> writing.
>
> > Writing it simply points it out again since you don't seem to
> > > grasp the implications. Your prior statements on morality and ethics
> > > ring hollow in the face of the reality that you had no proof of
> > > permission to operate legally and that your operation won't be
accepted
> > > for DXCC credit.
> >
> > I don't work people out of band, if that's what you meant.
>
> I meant what I wrote. Maybe you can have someone explain it to you.
>
> > > I thought you might be sharper in 2003 than 2002.
> >
> > Nope, I'm the same.

>
> So I see.
>
> Dave K8MN

119. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-02 12:34:30 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030102073430.21031.00000418@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 59248

Here are the number of unexpired FCC ARS licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:

As of May 14, 2000:

Novice - 49,329
Tech - 205,394
Tech Plus - 128,860
General - 112,677
Advanced - 99,782
Extra - 78,750
Total - 674,792

As of December 31, 2002:

Novice - 36,074 (decrease of 13,255)
Tech - 248,395 (increase of 42,401)
Tech Plus - 73,426 (decrease of 55,434)
General - 139,859 (increase of 27,182)
Advanced - 84,330 (decrease of 15,452)
Extra - 103,276 (increase of 24,526)
Total - 685,360 (increase of 10,568)

73 de Jim, N2EY

120. Re: What country?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-02 13:42:56 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301020542.f97d717@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59249
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E12FF1C.4E363B24@earthlink.net>...

> > Tell us again how a military commander cannot authorize amateur
> > operations.
>
> Let's say you work as a weatherman for an airlift command post. Let's
> assume that the commander is a Colonel. You work directly for him.
> Would you believe that he is authorized to grant you permission to
> operate on the ham bands from your overseas post of assignment? Do you
> think it is necessary for such authorization to be in writing? Would
> you have nagging doubts about permission issued by such an individual
> given that he is not in charge of U.S. forces in the country? It
> wouldn't surprise me in the least if your "commander"--you know, the guy
> who supposedly told you it was okay for you to spray RF in the ham bands
> from Somalia--would respond, "The hell I did!" if quizzed by anyone on
> whether he ever gave you the go-ahead.
>
> Dave K8MN

Dave, you are still under the assumption that a military commander
cannot authorize amateur operations. Now you wrongly assume that a
Colonel cannot be a commander, whereas Steve saw a commander under
every pair of butter bars.

Do I need to start counting cadence so you won't trip over your own
bootlaces?

Naw, too late. Just dust yourself off and keep going.

Brian

121. Re: What country?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-02 13:52:23 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030102085223.23009.00000336@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 59250

>Subject: Re: What country?
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 1/2/03 7:42 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0301020542.f97d717@posting.google.com>

>Now you wrongly assume that a
>Colonel cannot be a commander, whereas Steve saw a commander under
>every pair of butter bars.

WHOA, Senor Blowhard! WHERE did you pull THAT one from?

122. Re: Another Morse Code Opinion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-02 14:17:55 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3E144A13.4070403@psu.edu>
Source record: 59155

Vshah101 wrote:

> This is a story, not an opinion.

What on earth are you talking about? There's plenty of opinion in his
story!

>
>>I'm glad I studied it. :) Even if I never use code again after I upgrade,
>>it was a great experience I wouldn't trade for anything.
>
>
> Not only you don't use it, but the military, hospitals, etc do not use it
> anymore. Its now obsolete.

AM is obsolete - yet people use it
SSB is obsolete - yet people use it.
Homebrewing is not necessary as it was at one time. It is obsolete. -
Yet it is the biggest part of my hobby.
Morse CW is obsolete - yet people use it.
HF is obsolete. Why aren't more hams using the great frontier of RHF?
(ridiculously high frequencies) And yet here we are trying to get some
spectrum at 160 some kHz
FM is obsolete. -yet people use it

Why aren't we all using only digital modes for everything? After all
they aren't obsolete.

> Great experience is arguable. I know that, for me, Morse is not a great
> experience. I know I can do Morse code. I just don't want to.

You have expended more effort here complaining about Morse/CW than I
did actually learning it. And it wasn't easy for me.

Your statement is just another way of saying that the hf priveleges are
not worth the effort of learning Morse. So be it. Why do you complain so
much then? You don't have the priveleges because you don't want to take
the effort.

I took the liberty of clipping off the html you sent long with your post.

- mike KB3EIA -

123. Re: Why hams think we deserve the 5 mhz band (was: You have to be kidding!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-02 15:24:38 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0301020724.7ea69721@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59156

>
> BTW I made my first CW contact last night.
> I still have the sweaty palms to prove it. ;^)

A half century later I still rememeber that nite. Good show -
congratulations! Helluva kick huh?

>
> BTU W4NTI de KB9TMP
>
>
> --
> '73' From KB9TMP

w3rv

124. Re: Why hams think we deserve the 5 mhz band (was: You have to be kidding!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-02 15:35:15 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns92F76B9EFB94Eelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 59157

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in
news:cuvyxnansvbet.h826wr4.pminews@netnews.attbi.com:

> On Wed, 1 Jan 2003 21:06:47 -0500, KB9TMP wrote:
>
>>I don't understand why all of the "world wide" frequencies
>>don't match "world wide" it's like the 3 Stooges did the band planning
>>for all the countries.
>
> Ah, I see that you've sat in on some ITU frequency allocation
> conferences....
>
> Most of it is "I got mine...."
>
> ---
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>
>

Exactly why 40 won't be realigned. I suppose I ought to petition the FCC
myself to get the allocations changed within 40m. N3KIP

125. Re: ARRL certification program

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-02 15:36:50 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0301020736.7931921d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59158

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<auvpjg$b4s$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>...
> Then how do you explain my repairing to component level Avionics and two
> way radio equipment? Oh and the parts ordering was done by the supply folks.
>
> Lets not make such a broad statement.

Fixing 'em is one level, but who *designs* those radios in the first place?

>
> Dan/W4NTI

w3rv

126. Re: K1MAN

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-02 15:43:26 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E145E1E.6070901@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 59164
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

QSL wrote:
> K1MAN has made the FCC and Riley the laughing stock of
> the world! The commission has been dicking around for close
> to 15 years with MAN. The commission is even on record as
> saying his activities are legal and comply with all FCC rules &
> regulations. Learn to live with MAN. He's here to stay! You
> jam him, and you are the rule violator. Turn the dial on your
> radio if you don't like MAN. Case Closed!
>
> QSL

Don't ya just love these dickheads that end their blather with
"case closed" as if they had the final say?
K1MAN will get his in due time.

127. Re: You have to be kidding! I saw it coming.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-02 16:02:57 UTC
From: "Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" <vlfiscus@mcn.net>
Message-ID: <RoZQ9.8263$134.939170@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 59159

"Gilbert Biro Simon" <testing1234@cfl.rr.com> wrote in
news:u0IQ9.200225$Db4.5618767@twister.tampabay.rr.com:

> I signed on to this page looking for Ham Radio Rules, Regulations, and
> Policies. Now I find out that it is only populated by a bunch of
> teenagers with no minds and no place else to prove it.

Yup Gil, You got it. That's what happens when you push for restructuring
and dumb down ham radio. I blame the ARRL.

73 de KB7ADL

128. Re: You have to be kidding! I saw it coming.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-02 17:06:30 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030102120630.03649.00000269@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 59160

>Yup Gil, You got it. That's what happens when you push for restructuring
>and dumb down ham radio. I blame the ARRL.
>
>73 de KB7ADL
>

I also blame the ARRL, and the CBplusser whinners. By the way most of the CBplussers are right here on this group. Couple examples TIT, and Brian, brians also know as Karls Love child.

129. Re: You have to be kidding! I saw it coming.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-02 17:09:18 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030102120918.03827.00000292@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 59161

>Couple examples TIT, and Brian, brians
> also know as Karls Love child.
>
>

I forgot TIT, she is also know as the" Jersey of Ham Radio"

130. K1MAN

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-02 17:10:54 UTC
From: k3vr@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <4bfc7bb.0301020910.35f0e9b3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59162
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Interesting reading related to K1MAN's IARN activities world-wide.

http://users.adelphia.net/~k3vr/trex.htm

131. Re: K1MAN

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-02 17:34:24 UTC
From: QSL <QRL@qslqrzqrlxxx.net>
Message-ID: <av1t6n$k30$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 59163
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

K1MAN has made the FCC and Riley the laughing stock of
the world! The commission has been dicking around for close
to 15 years with MAN. The commission is even on record as
saying his activities are legal and comply with all FCC rules &
regulations. Learn to live with MAN. He's here to stay! You
jam him, and you are the rule violator. Turn the dial on your
radio if you don't like MAN. Case Closed!

QSL

"Brian" <k3vr@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:4bfc7bb.0301020910.35f0e9b3@posting.google.com...
> Interesting reading related to K1MAN's IARN activities world-wide.
>
> http://users.adelphia.net/~k3vr/trex.htm

132. Re: You have to be kidding! I saw it coming.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-02 18:53:19 UTC
From: NoName <user@computer.net>
Message-ID: <ii191vofi9n05fc3f2sbbb43f9pdhp8ngd@4ax.com>
Source record: 59165

On Thu, 02 Jan 2003 16:02:57 GMT, "Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL"
<vlfiscus@mcn.net> wrote:

>
>Yup Gil, You got it. That's what happens when you push for restructuring
>and dumb down ham radio. I blame the ARRL.
>
>73 de KB7ADL

You blame the ARRL because you're an idiot Fiscus.
Let's discuss the
code test because that's the real rub with you.

Having several years of bitching the FCC staffers got fed up with the
controversy WRT Physician Waivers for code speeds greater than
5WPM suggested 5WPM for all classes of HF with no waivers.

The ARRL did the best it could with the counter suggestion of 5WPM for
General and 12WPM for higher classes. Since that would not have
completely ended the waivers the staffers opted to keep pushing
for the 5WPM no waiver plan and that is what we have. It is
not the ARRLs fault they tried but news flash they do not run
the FCC or any other branch of government.

If you are so far out in Montana that you just don't get how
government works let me fill you in. The FCC Commissioners are there
for a few years, the staffers are there for ever. If you think the
staffers are not driving the train you are sadly mistaken. You want
to be annoyed with someone over this non-problem I suggest you
start with the FCC GSA employees rather than the ARRL.

133. Re: What country?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-02 20:21:13 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3E149F39.9060200@psu.edu>
Source record: 59166
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Sivac wrote:
> Why on Earth you Americans always take for granted that all hams
> worldwide have computer and internet right next to their radio?

Internet access, no, but in contesting now, a computer is hard to do without. My computer is as much essential to my operations as is my hf rig.

> I am sure that at any given time, of all amateurs currently opearting on
> HF bands not more than 10% are connected to internet. And many many have
> not internet access at all.

I don't know how many have computers. But when a computer is less than the price of a hf rig, it shouldn't be too hard to get one. Most (all?) of the software will run on 486 machines and possibly even 386 machines. And especially when a person is contesting, if they are trying to finess it, they need something to look up who is where.

> If I am in the contest and I hear station K2G CQing, if I am multiplier
> station I'll just walk over him, just another USA - Zone 5, no thanks I
> have it. And poor guy is on Guam, a new multiplier indeed. How would I
> know ? Internet ? Give me a break.

Give yourself and the other guy a break and talk to him!

- Mike KB3EIA -

134. Re: CCR Issue Revisited

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-02 21:12:36 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.51.0301022047330.7051@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 59167

On Wed, 1 Jan 2003, W5TIT wrote:
>Well, absolutely. I don't like "Neighborhood Associations" either. I'll
>speak out of turn, though, and state that I think the CCR issue that the
>ARRL was trying to get through Congress last year deals not only with
>Neighborhood Associations, but deed restrictions as well.
>
>Our dislike of them aside, though: what do you think of the ARRL asking
>congress to pass a bill that would, essentially, render a
>signed-and-agreed-to-contract useless? While I disagree wholeheartedly with
>CCRs, and read the deed restrictions on this property before we bought it,
^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^
Not all properties are acquired by purchase. Especially with bequests
(inheritances), the [new] owner had no such opportunity, and such is not a
transfer (like a foreclosure is) that will clear off the CC&R's by itself.

>the question still remains: should I request congress to support my amateur
>radio interest by passing a bill that says I don't have to abide by the
>contract I agreed to? Isn't that the same as someone who relishes antique
>cars being able to get a bunch of like-minded people together and go to
>congress to pass a bill that says they can now have a "junkyard" (in the
>eyes of their neighbors) because they are "special."

...But you are "special." You have been granted a federal license to engage in
an activity that an unlicensed individual can't (ignoring "third-party"
transmissions). Under the 10th Amendment, the U.S. Government has reserved the
authority to regulate [most] radio to itself - so where do the state and local
governments, or the people themselves have the authority to impose any law,
rule, regulation, or agreement which infringes upon your federal license? So,
it can be argued from the Constitutional point of view that the CC&R's weren't
valid for you to begin with - and I think PRB-1 got at that at least with
regard to the lower government laws, regulations, etc., ...

>I don't agree with it. I also don't think it's good publicity to challenge
>contractual agreements because of our interest in amateur radio. If I
>signed a contract, I don't then turn around and "come up with" a way to get
>out of it. The bigger issue, as I see it, would be to challenge the deed
>restriction or neighborhood associations--and even take them to court on our
>own. Does the ARRL feel strongly enough about the CCR issue to allow use of
>ARRL Counsel? I hardly think so.

With not-so-recent events, it's not really "our" interest in amateur radio, but
the nation's interest. I have actually heard of a couple of situations
(completely hearsay and unverified) that in some local communities, the local
government wanted to set up a back-up communications plan with their local
amateurs, and those amateurs told their city/town to get lost unless they

revoke the citywide tower/antenna bans, etc., ... Guess what: No communications plan. However, in a real emergency, who is this town supposed to look to for help?....

>This did degrade, the last time around--and I was one of the folks who
>joined in--into an argument about whether Neighborhood Associations and/or
>deed restrictions were a good or bad thing. It would be nice to see a true
>debate about the true issue. Let's accept that Neighborhood Associations
>and deed restrictions are present and here to stay. Yeah, they suck--or
>not; and yeah, they are overbearing--or not. The issue is: should special
>interest groups take issue against a contract they have signed? Was the
>ARRL right to spend so much time on this issue?

In my case, I signed no contract whatsoever, having inherited the property. Fortunately, the CC&R's had an "escape clause" which I promptly followed (but apparently many of the more modern written ones do not). The only issue I effectively has is that one of my four neighbors bordering my property doesn't want to see it, so I simply planted trees at the property line to shield his view of the antenna farm on my house's roof. The other three don't care and/or can't see it anyway. It's been 12.5 years since I became owner, and no one in the neighborhood has complained. I even have an 8.5' C-band satellite dish on my roof.

In my neighborhood, the CC&R's go as far as requiring permission to change the color a house is painted!

135. Re: ARRL certification program

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-02 21:32:18 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E14AFE2.C60B0364@earthlink.net>
Source record: 59168

W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3E13CB07.BAEC05D5@earthlink.net...
> > Vshah101 wrote:
> >
> > > Good suggestion. This will help improve the technical competence of
> radio
> > > amateurs and will help keep the bands. Simply occupying the band (as in
> > > contesting) is not sufficient to prove meritorious use of the bands.
> > >
> > > From surveys, there seems to be a lack of interest in the technical
> aspect.
> > > Antennas, operating, contesting, and Morse code had the highest interest
> > > levels. Those interested in the technical aspects don't join.
> > >
> > > By increasing the technical competence, or by current testing to
> actually mean
> > > something, this enhances the image of amateur radio. Also, lets not tie
> code to
> > > the technical license classes.
> > >
> > > Currently, most of the amateur radio clubs focus on operating. Let's
> have more
> > > technical clubs.
> >
> > Just when Brian Burke starts to falter, Vipul comes to his rescue.
> >
> > Brian has just moved several steps up the ladder, only pausing his
> > ascent briefly to dodge the form of Vshah as it hurtles past.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
> >
>
> So, nothing of sustenance or intellect to add.

It's humor. Would you like for me to pause and allow you to catch up?

Dave K8MN

136. Re: You have to be kidding! I saw it coming.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-02 21:33:32 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3E14B02C.C08C7F42@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 59169

NoName wrote:

>
> Having several years of bitching the FCC staffers got fed up with the
> controversy WRT Physician Waivers for code speeds greater than
> 5WPM suggested 5WPM for all classes of HF with no waivers.
>
> The ARRL did the best it could with the counter suggestion of 5WPM for
> General and 12WPM for higher classes. Since that would not have
> completely ended the waivers the staffers opted to keep pushing
> for the 5WPM no waiver plan and that is what we have. It is
> not the ARRLs fault they tried but news flash they do not run
> the FCC or any other branch of government.

Add the assertion that the higher code speeds no longer serve any
regulatory purpose, the staffers said the hell with it. The FCC is
not in the business of handing out gold stars. The FCC's got bigger
fish to fry than to worry if high speed code is really necessary for
access to all of HF.

>
>
> If you are so far out in Montana that you just don't get how
> government works let me fill you in. The FCC Commissioners are there
> for a few years, the staffers are there for ever. If you think the
> staffers are not driving the train you are sadly mistaken. You want
> to be annoyed with someone over this non-problem I suggest you
> start with the FCC GSA employees rather than the ARRL.

The commissioners set the general course and the staffers fill in
the details. Code speed is a detail. Even if the commissioners
even gave more than a few minutes of thought at ham radio.
Things like cellular phones, Howard Stern and TV attract
more attention. Aside from a few idiots (ex newbies who never
learned from newbie type mistakes), ham radio is fairly well
behaved.

137. Re: What country?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-02 21:37:46 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E14B11F.3A62C4FA@earthlink.net>
Source record: 59170
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E12FF1C.4E363B24@earthlink.net>...
>
> > > Tell us again how a military commander cannot authorize amateur
> > > operations.
> >
> > Let's say you work as a weatherman for an airlift command post. Let's
> > assume that the commander is a Colonel. You work directly for him.
> > Would you believe that he is authorized to grant you permission to
> > operate on the ham bands from your overseas post of assignment? Do you
> > think it is necessary for such authorization to be in writing? Would
> > you have nagging doubts about permission issued by such an individual
> > given that he is not in charge of U.S. forces in the country? It
> > wouldn't surprise me in the least if your "commander"--you know, the guy
> > who supposedly told you it was okay for you to spray RF in the ham bands
> > from Somalia--would respond, "The hell I did!" if quizzed by anyone on
> > whether he ever gave you the go-ahead.

> Dave, you are still under the assumption that a military commander
> cannot authorize amateur operations. Now you wrongly assume that a
> Colonel cannot be a commander, whereas Steve saw a commander under
> every pair of butter bars.

No, I haven't assumed that at all. I pointed out that someone can be
directly in charge of you and still not be the commander who can
authorize amateur radio operation in a country. It doesn't matter
much. You didn't get written permission from anyone at all.

> Do I need to start counting cadence so you won't trip over your own
> bootlaces?
>
> Naw, too late. Just dust yourself off and keep going.

You can count all the cadence you like. I'm no longer in the military
and I'm wearing moccasins.

Dave K8MN

138. Re: Adding something extra to a CQ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-02 21:44:28 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E14B2FB.572A774F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 59171

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E13CED5.5F323D3C@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
>
> > > You continued
> > > > to believe that all the information necessary for permission was
> > > > contained in a couple of lines of text.
> > >
> > > I continue to believe that it was 1,000 better than the information
> > > you gave.
> >
> > So we encounter yet another of your difficulties.
>
> Not if we accept that you were simply wrong. I do.

You are an army of one.

> > > > > Meanwhile, I did have permission from someone authorized to do so,
> > > > > even when you said that a military commander could NOT do so.
> > > >
> > > > Nope. You CLAIM to have had permission from someone just up the chain
> > > > from you.
> > >
> > > No, I said commander.
> >
> > The commander of U.S. forces in Somalia during your stay can't be that
> > difficult to locate.
>
> I briefed him daily. He wasn't hard to find at all.

Great. What does he say about the permission you say he granted you?

> > > You must have assumed that the material on the League's web
> > > > site meant any officer over you.
> > >
> > > No, the material on the ARRL web site was read by me 10 years after my
> > > tour in Somalia. It essentially state the same thing as the other
> > > amateur on station told me.

You mean the guy who got it in writing?

> > > You must have assumed that it wasn't
> > > > important to have such permission in writing.
> > >

> > > That is correct.
> >
> > Well ain't you da fool!
>
> Well, yes. But it doesn't mean that I was a bootleger, nor does it mean I'm a liar.

If there is nothing in existence which backs up your claim to have had
permission, you could be either.

> > > > > > To summarize:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > It is apparent that only you, of all individuals operating from Somalia
> > > > > > during that time period, neglected to get permission in writing from
> > > > > > someone authorized to grant it. That it never dawned on you that this
> > > > > > would be the thing to do, marks you as a rube.
> > >
> > > > > Yes, yes, Dave. You've said that before. But saying it and saying it
> > > > > often doesn't make it true, no matter how hard you wish it so.
> > > > >
> > > > No, writing it doesn't make it true.
> > > >
> > > Hmmm.
> > > >
> > > It is true because it is
> > > > accurate.
> > > >
> > > And my statement that I had permission from my commander is accurate.
> > >
> > Your proof for the above is?
>
> Didn't you just say that writing it doesn't make it true?

No. Pay attention. I wrote that about the statement I made earlier.

> > > Him putting it in writing doesn't make it any truer.
> > >
> > We'll never know if your statement was true since he didn't put it in
> > writing.
>
> Didn't you just say that writing it doesn't make it true?

No. Your oscillator is drifting. I wrote that about my statement, not
about your statement.

> > > Writing it simply points it out again since you don't seem to
> > > > grasp the implications. Your prior statements on morality and ethics
> > > > ring hollow in the face of the reality that you had no proof of
> > > > permission to operate legally and that your operation won't be accepted
> > > > for DXCC credit.
> > > >
> > > I don't work people out of band, if that's what you meant.
> > >

> > I meant what I wrote. Maybe you can have someone explain it to you.
> >
> > > > I thought you might be sharper in 2003 than 2002.
> > >
> > > Nope, I'm the same.
> >
> > So I see.
>
> How different will you be in 2003?

I'll still be sharp.

Dave K8MN

139. Re: County Issuing Radio Licenses

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-02 21:54:03 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E14B53A.D07A84F8@earthlink.net>
Source record: 59172

Brian wrote:

> And you remember english only as a second language. You ought to at
> least remember the things you say.

Just a couple of days ago, you accused me of a faulty memory about what I'd written concerning legality of operation vis a vis the DXCC desk. I know for a fact that you don't remember everything you've written. I surely don't accurately recall each thing I've written over the years. I have a reasonably good idea of the essence of the things I've written. For anything more detailed, there is Google (as evidence by):

"From: Dave Heil (k8mn@earthlink.net)
Subject: Re: Pictures Nobody Wants To See
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-09-02 02:56:23 PST

Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3D7289D3.4A3F8136@earthlink.net...
> > Brian P Burke wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3D71A336.B37658AE@earthlink.net...
> > > > Brian P Burke wrote:
> > > > I'm sure the gang would have been quite happy to work a legitimate op
> > > > from Somalia using SSB. They didn't find one in you.
> > >
> > > Certainly I'm legitimate. Why do you say I'm not? I asked permission,
> > > permission was granted. I operated.
> >
> > Oh, I believe your parents married. Why do I say your operation from
> > Somalia isn't kosher?--Because you don't have anything which says
> > permission to operate an amateur radio station was granted. How do you
> > go about proving that you had permission?
>
> It was granted. Prove it wasn't.

You'll have to prove that you were authorized to operate, Brian. You can't do so because, as you've stated, you had only verbal permission. Maybe you can dig up your military commander of the time and have him issue retroactive permission.

> > > I don't know of
> > > > any award program which sanctions operations from those not holding a

> > > > valid license in the country of operation.
> > >
> > > There is no government in Somalia, thus there are no valid Somalia licenses,
> > > unless you want to consider some UN issued licenses Somalian. You must
> > > accept the fact that Somalia is a paradox. I operated legally, yet I have
> > > not provided the ARRL's DXCC desk with anything.
> >
> > If your miilitary commander had provided written permission like that
> > issued by the United Nations, you'd have been operating legally. You
> > operated on some guy's verbal authorization. You don't have anything to
> > provide to the DXCC desk.
>
> Hmmm, back to the ARRL's DXCC desk. Is the dxcc desk the final authority on
> legal amateur operations everywhere?

For whether an operation will be accepted for DXCC credit or not? Yes.

>
> It would appear that Len is correct. You do view the ARRL as a
> quasi-governmental entity capable of authorizing amateur operations in
> foreign countries. Wow.

This is the part where you begin to be the real Brian. You read
something and draw an incorrect conclusion. The ARRL doesn't authorize
operations. The ARRL sponsors DXCC. The DXCC desk decides whether an
operation will be accepted for DXCC purposes. Where there is any
question of an operation's legitimacy, the desk may request proof of
licensing along with copies of passport entry or exit stamps and/or
visas.

<snip>"

It doesn't appear that I said what you attributed to me.

Dave K8MN

140. Re: What country?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-02 22:14:37 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E14BA0D.52E24E8F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 59174
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E11CAB5.AEDE954C@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E0F282B.4DACAF4D@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E0E7DB8.2728433A@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E0D48F8.E243C02B@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > "K HB" <k hb@arrl.DOTORG> wrote in message news:<kV%O9.1862
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > The FCC could care less about DXCC
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > Dave confuses DXCC with FCC. Ditto his minions. You five need a one on
one.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Do you have a single reference of such a comment from me?
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Yes.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Then put up or shut up.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > You claimed my Somalia operation was illegal based upon ARRL DXCC rules.
> > > > > >
> > > > > No, I claimed and still do, that your operation was not acceptable for
> > > > > DXCC credit. Without supporting documentation, you can never make it
> > > > > so.
> > > >
> > > How do you characterize your use of the term "bootlegging?"
> > >
> > I do not and did not claim that you were a bootlegger based upon
> > violation of DXCC rules. You were a bootlegger because you have no
> > documentation to support your claim that you had permission to
> > operate. You have no military or UN issued paperwork? Too bad.
```

>
> You did, based upon DXCC rules, claim my operation was illegal. But
> you have been wrong on so many counts that you really don't recall
> what you've said anymore.

Google does:

quote From: Dave Heil (k8mn@earthlink.net)
Subject: Re: ARRL Members -- protest this action to your director
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-09-12 06:15:32 PST

Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3D7E8A0D.ACC5D04D@earthlink.net...
> > Brian P Burke wrote:

> So DXCC is the final licensing authority in the world?
>
> I guess you're back to that again.

How many times must I tell you before it sinks in:

1) The DXCC desk (with advice from the DXAC) is the final arbiter on
what is accepted for DXCC credit.

2) (a separate issue) You have no proof of permission to operate from
Somalia at all *punto* unquote

Now, what was it that you were sure I told you?

Dave K8MN

141. Re: ARRL certification program

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-02 22:15:31 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301021415.5b5c4aae@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59173

"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:<8C77A0205277FCD1.61F4CA179B44B8E9.4D468C8490391955@lp.airnews.net>...
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3E13CB07.BAEC05D5@earthlink.net...
> > Vshah101 wrote:
> >
> > > Good suggestion. This will help improve the technical competence of
> radio
> > > amateurs and will help keep the bands. Simply occupying the band (as in
> > > contesting) is not sufficient to prove meritorious use of the bands.
> > >
> > > From surveys, there seems to be a lack of interest in the technical
> aspect.
> > > Antennas, operating, contesting, and Morse code had the highest interest
> > > levels. Those interested in the technical aspects don't join.
> > >
> > > By increasing the technical competence, or by current testing to
> actually mean
> > > something, this enhances the image of amateur radio. Also, lets not tie
> code to
> > > the technical license classes.
> > >
> > > Currently, most of the amateur radio clubs focus on operating. Let's
> have more
> > > technical clubs.
> >
> > Just when Brian Burke starts to falter, Vipul comes to his rescue.
> >
> > Brian has just moved several steps up the ladder, only pausing his
> > ascent briefly to dodge the form of Vshah as it hurtles past.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
> >
>
> So, nothing of sustenance or intellect to add.
>
> Kim W5TIT

Kim, whatever it is you're doing, your making me hungry. Keep it up. ;))

Brian

142. Re: What country?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-02 22:23:05 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301021423.3d9596e9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59175

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030102085223.23009.00000336@mb-mf.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: What country?
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 1/2/03 7:42 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0301020542.f97d717@posting.google.com>
>
> >Now you wrongly assume that a
> >Colonel cannot be a commander, whereas Steve saw a commander under
> >every pair of butter bars.
>
> WHOA, Senor Blowhard! WHERE did you pull THAT one from?

You.

143. Re: K1MAN

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-02 23:05:16 UTC
From: wf3h@ptnospam.com
Message-ID: <3e14c3a2.2822366@news.ptdprolog.net>
Source record: 59176
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

On Thu, 2 Jan 2003 12:34:24 -0500, "QSL" <QRL@qslqrzqrlxxx.net> wrote:

> K1MAN has made the FCC and Riley the laughing stock of
>the world! T

funny...riley got a standing ovation at dayton this year.

oh well, morons have a reality all their own.

---
check my blog at:
http://www.bobview.blogspot.com/
updated 1/1/03

144. Re: K1MAN

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-02 23:15:41 UTC
From: LRod@removethispartpobox.com
Message-ID: <3e14c7b8.122909946@netnews.att.net>
Source record: 59177
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

On Thu, 02 Jan 2003 23:05:16 GMT, wf3h@ptnospam.com wrote:

>On Thu, 2 Jan 2003 12:34:24 -0500, "QSL" <QRL@qslqrzqrlxxx.net> wrote:
>
>> K1MAN has made the FCC and Riley the laughing stock of
>>the world! T
>
>funny...riley got a standing ovation at dayton this year.
>
>oh well, morons have a reality all their own.

Dan, W4NTI, whether you like him or not, said it best:
"you cain't fix stupid."

LRod

Master Woodbutcher and seasoned termite

Shamelessly whoring my website since 1999

http://www.woodbutcher.net

145. Re: "one step closer to extinction" (Was: Re: Followup from K4ZDH)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-02 23:46:21 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <483495FB945D98F5.06886E62BD332F94.C9FEEE0CEF88F089@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 59178

What I really, really don't get...other than whatever financial experts might be able to explain, is why there are "cuts" for companies. C'mon. Enough is enough. It cannot be explained to me why it's beneficial to provide for corporations so that the working class can be protected and keep jobs.

Kim W5TIT

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message news:av1feu11vv@enews3.newsguy.com...
> What about another form of corporate welfare other that corporate subsidies,
> and grants, what about abatements? If these corporations paid their fair
> share, then the tax burden would be smaller on all of us. For example I
> will pick on the local largest corporation near me, Dow Chemical. If they
> paid even something as small as 1% percent of the value of the property they
> own in Midland County, MI where the corporation is based, the tax burden on
> the residences would be alot less..... One percent is not much on thier
> bottom line, but for the average middle class or less person the relief
> would be great.
>
> Obviously this would be in that "ideal" world.... Another spin on the "I
> gotta/had to do it, so do they" attitude.
>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF/MFR
> REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
> "Symbolism is for the simple minded....."
>
>
> "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> news:0E16E4F538938A45.D7219D261CB972BE.664E01AFC557E247@lp.airnews.net...
> > "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
> > news:auukrf55b2@enews3.newsguy.com...
> > > Hopefully that also includes corporate welfare too!
> > >
> > >
> > > --
> > > Ryan, KC8PMX
> > > FF/MFR
> > > REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
> > >

> > > "Symbolism is for the simple minded....."
> > >
> > >
> >
> > Excellent point, Ryan. Unfortunately, corporate welfare seems like "the
> > thing" these days. Heck, what is up wid dat, anyway? If your business
> > can't make it, the govt. just hands over some money, huh? Y'know, seems
> > like countries in the rest of the world, and the corporate giants here
get
> > all the fringe benefits of our hard earned money.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
> >
> >
>
>

146. Re: CCR Issue Revisited

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-03 00:02:25 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <A0C1EBD48F9AF30D.8BFAF06EEF9E2E67.8593C35983829224@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 59179

"KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com> wrote in message
news:v178rosls18ed3@corp.supernews.com...
>
>
> I think all CCRs that are in effect now should stand. Like you said it's a
> signed contract, but no future ones should be allowed, or at least
regulated
> so as not to be to restrictive.
>

Well, I do agree, but that is the bigger battle to win. Neighborhood Associations and CCRs are, apparently, not on the shortlist of pet peeves for a lot of people. Heck, it isn't for me, either *IF AND UNTIL* I went to buy property/home, etc. I think that given the popularity of CCRs and Neighborhood Associations, it would be a better battle to "go to the top" as it were--but it would be a much harder one. So, for me, it makes sense to decide whether or not I want to get involved with a battle like that (and I do not) or decide if I support an effort like the ARRL's venture to get this issue raised and taken care of in Congress. I don't think I want that--for a lot of reasons, explained in the first post. Namely, that a contract was signed--maybe even negotiated and signed--and it doesn't seem right to take that contract to task for my hobby I am involved with. I think to ask Congress to relax for amateur radio sets the precedent for other requests for Congress to relax--and I'm not so sure I want that much time taken.

>
> I would never sign a deal that included my
> not being able to put up antennas or anything else.
>

Absolutely. I am perfectly willing to do what I might have to not to be involved in something I don't want to be involved with. If it came down to it, and there were no other choice, then I'd grumble for a few days and get over it. But, I wouldn't be going to Congress--not for something like this.

>
> BTW I do understand
> the ones about junk yards, sheep, hog, and other farm related stuff inside
> city or housing addition boundrys, that's a little different.
>

Well, with all due respect, I understand and empathize with your comment. However, I am a fellow amateur. WE know antennas are beautiful (LOL). But, a car junkie probably figures all kinds of wrecks to work on are beautiful in his/her yard.

>
> >
> > I don't agree with it. I also don't think it's good publicity to
> challenge
> > contractual agreements because of our interest in amateur radio. If I
> > signed a contract, I don't then turn around and "come up with" a way to
> get
> > out of it. The bigger issue, as I see it, would be to challenge the
deed
> > restriction or neighborhood associations--and even take them to court on
> our
> > own. Does the ARRL feel strongly enough about the CCR issue to allow
use
> of
> > ARRL Counsel? I hardly think so.
> >
>
> Now since I'm not a member of the ARRL I can't say anything much for
> or against them, but I don't see where they are doing all that much good
> for the ARS.
>

I just ended a two-year membership, or it will be ending soon. I think the ARRL is a needed organization, but it's not an organization for me. I just ain't into that part of it all that much--and it's way too much politicing to get and stay involved. I had that energy for it a few years ago, but I don't any more. HOWEVER, I'll speak for or against practices the ARRL undertakes just like I always have. I am now a potential "customer."

>
> It's kinda like a guy I worked with a few years ago, he
> would come up and say "You know WW you ain't much, but your
> all we got!" I always wanted to deck him for it to, but I knew better.
>
>
> > This did degrade, the last time around--and I was one of the folks who
> > joined in--into an argument about whether Neighborhood Associations
and/or
> > deed restrictions were a good or bad thing. It would be nice to see a
> true
> > debate about the true issue.
>
> Every posting in the NGs seems to "degrade" with time.
> I wonder if a posting has a half life like nuclear waste does. ;^)
>

Yeah, true.

> >
> > Let's accept that Neighborhood Associations
> > and deed restrictions are present and here to stay. Yeah, they suck--or
> > not; and yeah, they are overbearing--or not.

>
> I say let those that stand stay, but NO NEW ONES!
>
> >The issue is: should special
> > interest groups take issue against a contract they have signed? Was the
> > ARRL right to spend so much time on this issue?
>
> At least it keeps them off the streets at night! ;^)
>
>
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
> >
> >
> Have a "Hammy" New Year!
> --
> '73' From KB9TMP
> "The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
> if you can fake that, you've got it made."
> -Groucho Marx
>
>
>

Kim W5TIT

147. Re: What country?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-03 00:27:28 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030102192728.02019.00000093@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 59180

>Subject: Re: What country?
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 1/2/03 4:23 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0301021423.3d9596e9@posting.google.com>

>> >Now you wrongly assume that a
>> >Colonel cannot be a commander, whereas Steve saw a commander under
>> >every pair of butter bars.
>>
>>WHOA, Senor Blowhard! WHERE did you pull THAT one from?
>
>You.

You'd better back up and reassess that one, Brainiac. The only "butter bars" I ever found a "commander" under were two and a half gold stripes (for a Lieutenant Commander) or thee full stripes (for a full commander) of the shoulder boards of a United States Naval Officer.

"Butter bars" rarely "command" anything above the platoon level and SURELY would not have the temerity to "authorize" anyone to operate a radio station of ANY service...EXCEPT, of course, the gay pagan chemical corps officer who thinks HE can lie at will...

Anything else is a by-product of YOUR overactive imagination.

Steve, K4YZ

148. Re: CCR Issue Revisited

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-03 00:31:05 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <017A02BE546E4CEB.8526366CD8B79EE3.4345195053D2BAD3@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 59181

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030101221317.11569.00000447@mb-fy.aol.com...
>
> The main point of the bill being pushed is preemption of deed
restrictions,
> just like TV antennas get.
>
> Here's the blurb:
>
> "A bill, HR-4720, has been introduced in the House of Representatives
> to provide relief for Amateur Radio Operators faced with private deed
> covenants, conditions and restrictions (CC&Rs) in erecting antennas. The
> measure would require private land-use regulators, such as homeowners'
> associations, to "reasonably accommodate" Amateur Radio communication
> consistent with the PRB-1 limited federal preemption. PRB-1 now applies
> only to states and municipalities. You can find more info at ARRL's web
> site..."
>
> http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2002/05/14/102/?nc=1
>

Around here, I see no homeowner areas with any visible antennas, TV or
otherwise. Maybe they are low to the ground or something.

>
> The bill would simply require that ham antennas get the same consideration
as
> TV antennas, which have preemption.
>

Is this something not a lot of people know about? Like I said, I can cruise
any "new" or "newer" neighborhood here and the only thing I see
is--MAYBE--satellite dishes in the backyard or up on the roof. TV antennas,
sure, but is that the kind of antenna we're talking about? I don't see any
of the yagi-type TV antennas.

W5TIT wrote:
> >
> >While I disagree wholeheartedly with
> >CCRs, and read the deed restrictions on this property before we bought
it,
> >the question still remains: should I request congress to support my
amateur
> >radio interest by passing a bill that says I don't have to abide by the
> >contract I agreed to?

>
> In a word, yes.
>

See. I don't think this is an issue for Congress.

> >
> >Isn't that the same as someone who relishes antique
> >cars being able to get a bunch of like-minded people together and go to
> >congress to pass a bill that says they can now have a "junkyard" (in the
> >eyes of their neighbors) because they are "special."
>
> Nope. Not at all.
>

I'm not sure I understand why not.

> >
> >I don't agree with it. I also don't think it's good publicity to
challenge
> >contractual agreements because of our interest in amateur radio. If I
> >signed a contract, I don't then turn around and "come up with" a way to
get
> >out of it.
>
> Contracts are challenged all the time. Look at all the divorces in the US,
even
> though many of the people who get divorced agreed to "until death" when
they
> "signed" the contract. Bankruptcy is similar - creditors often accept less
than
> full value of the money owed them.
>

Then, let individual homeowners decide to challenge their contract--in civil courts or whatever. I don't have a problem with someone challenging a contract. My problem is in taking this issue to Congress, when there are probably much more important matters to be debated there.

> >
> >The bigger issue, as I see it, would be to challenge the deed
> >restriction or neighborhood associations--and even take them to court on
our
> >own.
>
> How does one challenge a deed restriction? Sue yourself?
>

As I understand it, I would have to obtain the agreement of everyone affected by the Deed Restrictions that are with this "part and parcel" piece of land. I think that is the way to put it. Then, I would have to go to the County Courthouse and get a ruling.

> >
> >Does the ARRL feel strongly enough about the CCR issue to allow use of
> >ARRL Counsel? I hardly think so.
>
> Exactly the opposite is true.
>

So, there are homeowners/property owners who are challenging this stuff outside Congress?

> >
> >This did degrade, the last time around--and I was one of the folks who
> >joined in--into an argument about whether Neighborhood Associations and/or
> >deed restrictions were a good or bad thing. It would be nice to see a true
> >debate about the true issue. Let's accept that Neighborhood Associations
> >and deed restrictions are present and here to stay. Yeah, they suck--or
> >not; and yeah, they are overbearing--or not. The issue is: should special
> >interest groups take issue against a contract they have signed? Was the
> >ARRL right to spend so much time on this issue?
> >
> Answer: YES, on both counts.
>
> Here's why:
>
> First, buying real estate is not like other purchases. There's no "new" real
> estate being created - only reused and converted from other uses. The amount of
> residential real estate on the market at any given time in a particular area is
> finite and not easily changed. So a person seeking to buy a house often faces
> extremely limited choices. And as deed restrictions become more pervasive, the
> percentage of available housing that is unrestricted continues to drop. The
> pervasiveness of anti-antenna deed restrictions effectively eliminates choice
> in many areas. End result is that "don't buy a restricted house" is not an
> option for many people.
>

I don't agree that market conditions should be a determination of whether something is valid for debate in Congress or not. A person seeking to buy a house may want all kinds of other things not amateur related. Let them individually take that up with the Neighborhood Association or the neighborhood.

If "don't buy a restricted house" is not an option for many people, they join the many others who confront issues like this every day.

> Second, the mere fact that a "contract" was signed doesn't mean it cannot be changed at a later date. Contracts are renegotiated all the time - that's a big part of contract law.

And, so they can do it outside the Congressional venue.

> And a valid contract cannot violate a person's civil rights or the law. For example, deed restrictions that prohibit sale of a property to "non-white" people exist - and have been declared null and void by the courts.

But, no time was taken in Congress for this, right? The courts is where all this stuff needs to happen.

> Third, what is proposed is not a blanket preemption of all antenna restrictions. Rather, it would require reasonable accomodation. Big difference between a 90 foot tower with multiple beams and a G5RV in the trees, for example. Deed restrictions that prohibit all antennas are unreasonably restrictive.

Why not a ventenna? Isn't that what those things are called? It's my understanding that, for the most part, the "restrictions" of CCRs and Neighborhood Associations deal mostly with stuff that can be seen. Low antennas and wires, etc. cannot be seen. Well, wait, I am thinking down here, where there's a privacy fence in ever housing development. What's up there, Jim?

> And consider why such restrictions were put in the deeds. It's not about interference, because receiving antennas are included. It's not about appearance, because all types of antennas are prohibited, regardless of appearance. The real issue was to effectively force homeowners to sign up for cable!

Well, now that's an issue, then, that I definitely don't think belongs in Congress. Hey, cable companies suck...and they are a growing nusiance. But, once again, get the neighbors riled, get the public interest going, etc. If it's not a big issue for other people, then why should it be a big issue in Congress--where time is money and more important bills can be

debated.

>
> Fourth, while many states require disclosure of deed restrictions, the
> requirement is not universal, nor timely. Often they are not revealed
until
> closing. Of course that's classic caveat emptor, but when real estate
sales
> require termite inspection, radon inspection, seller's disclosure, title
search
> and insurance, escrow and a host of other things, it's not unreasonable
for the
> deed restrictions to be presented up-front. But try and get them!
>

Tell ya what. I think the average home around here (in a new neighborhood) is around $150,000. That's for, as the other folks say, just a house (I wouldn't mind at all being in one of those just a houses). If I am spending money like that, I am in control--no one else. I know you think I am being simplistic, but I am serious. If I don't get what I want when I am dealing, then off to Hell with the folks whom I am dealing with. I'd rather keep my money and eat steak every night before I go home to my apartment.

>
> You mention antique cars. Consider the following scenario:
>
> (It's HYPOTHETICAL, folks!)
>
> Suppose you went to buy a new car or truck, and found a model you liked at
a
> decent price. You make the deal and all is smiles and handshakes. But when
you
> go to pick up the car, the dealer wants you to sign an "owner's contract"
or
> some such, that requires you to do and not do certain things for the
entire
> time you own the car.
>
> You look at the agreement and note that all sorts of things are required,
like
> keeping the car washed, properly maintained by authorized dealers using
only
> approved parts and not performing unauthorized modifications. Failure to
comply
> not only voids the warranty, it may cause you to incur fines and even have
the
> car reposessed by the manufacturer - even after it's paid for and out of
> warranty! These restrictions are for the life of the car, not just the
> original owner, and you cannot get out of them except by selling the car.
And
> they have nothing to do with safety or pollution standards - those things

are
> already protected by applicable laws.
>
> You ask what this is all about, and the dealer says the car company is
> concerned about its image being tarnished by owners who don't take care of
> their cars, hence the restrictions.
>
> Now at this point, most folks would storm out of the dealership and take
their
> business elsewhere. But they find most of the other manufacturers have
similar
> rules, and buying a new car without such restrictions limits the choices
> enormously. Used car? The newer models all have the restrictions, and you
don't
> want the problems of an older car.
>
> What to do?
>

I start taking the old car for repairs, or I decide to learn how to do it myself. I'm telling you, I am the customer, and I am going to have it my way or no way at all. Too many people are letting things *happen* to them, and that's why they keep happening and while they'll happen more and more frequently. It takes the word, NO.

>
> (end hypothetical situation)
>
> Not everybody can move to areas where there are no restrictions. Here's a
> typical example:
>
> Young professional couple - he's a doctor, she's an attorney. Both are
hams.
> They move to a new city when he completes his training and gets a new job
at a
> very respected hospital. He needs to live near the hospital, she needs to
live
> near the county seat. They plan to have kids very soon so school quality
is a
> big issue. Yet they find that most of the real estate on the market has
> unacceptable restrictions. What should they do - give up ham radio?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Yes. Or change their situation. Do not be governed by things that happen to you, make your own things happen. If he's a great doctor, then he can make tons of money and she can stay home and school the children, or vice versa. Hold off having kids until they've stashed away tons of money, leave the city, retire, and go have kids in some remote area--fast because remote is disappearing!

Kim W5TIT

149. Re: "one step closer to extinction" (Was: Re: Followup from K4ZDH)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-03 00:43:43 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <av2mb3$lo3$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 59182

I'll give it a try ... if companies/corporations go down...under...as in
gone then you have no jobs. If no jobs...no taxes being paid....no money
being spent...etc.

To simplify.....'trickle down economics'.

Dan/W4NTI

"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:483495FB945D98F5.06886E62BD332F94.C9FEEE0CEF88F089@lp.airnews.net...
> What I really, really don't get...other than whatever financial experts
> might be able to explain, is why there are "cuts" for companies. C'mon.
> Enough is enough. It cannot be explained to me why it's beneficial to
> provide for corporations so that the working class can be protected and
keep
> jobs.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>
> "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
> news:av1feu11vv@enews3.newsguy.com...
> > What about another form of corporate welfare other that corporate
> subsidies,
> > and grants, what about abatements? If these corporations paid their
fair
> > share, then the tax burden would be smaller on all of us. For example I
> > will pick on the local largest corporation near me, Dow Chemical. If
they
> > paid even something as small as 1% percent of the value of the property
> they
> > own in Midland County, MI where the corporation is based, the tax burden
> on
> > the residences would be alot less..... One percent is not much on thier
> > bottom line, but for the average middle class or less person the relief
> > would be great.
> >
> > Obviously this would be in that "ideal" world.... Another spin on the
"I
> > gotta/had to do it, so do they" attitude.
> >
> > --
> > Ryan, KC8PMX
> > FF/MFR
> > REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

> > "Symbolism is for the simple minded....."
> >
> >
> > "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> >
news:0E16E4F538938A45.D7219D261CB972BE.664E01AFC557E247@lp.airnews.net...
> > > "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
> > > news:auukrf55b2@enews3.newsguy.com...
> > > > Hopefully that also includes corporate welfare too!
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > --
> > > > Ryan, KC8PMX
> > > > FF/MFR
> > > > REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
> > > >
> > > > "Symbolism is for the simple minded....."
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > > Excellent point, Ryan. Unfortunately, corporate welfare seems like
"the
> > > thing" these days. Heck, what is up wid dat, anyway? If your
business
> > > can't make it, the govt. just hands over some money, huh? Y'know,
seems
> > > like countries in the rest of the world, and the corporate giants here
> get
> > > all the fringe benefits of our hard earned money.
> > >
> > > Kim W5TIT
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

150. Re: K1MAN

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-03 01:51:48 UTC
From: ole bignose <mananwoman44@aol.com>
Message-ID: <3e14ecd2@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 59183
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"QSL" <QRL@qslqrzqrlxxx.net> after a good session
of wacking off his 3" pee-pee on 14.275 wrote in
message like the proverbal chimpanzee on the keyboard
news:av1t6n$k30$0@pita.alt.net...
> K1MAN has made the FCC and Riley the laughing stock of
> the world! The commission has been dicking around for close
> to 15 years with MAN. The commission is even on record as
> saying his activities are legal and comply with all FCC rules &
> regulations. Learn to live with MAN. He's here to stay! You
> jam him, and you are the rule violator. Turn the dial on your
> radio if you don't like MAN. Case Closed!
>
> QSL

Why don't you just switch off the radio and
go back to the West Memphis Greyhound
bus station, with a cooked knockwurst taped to your
left inner leg like you used to do back when
you usd to stir the shit on 14.313 Years ago, and
get you some of that nice dark-meat transvestite
"evening bootaye"..... If that don;t work try
the Warner Robbins Ga bus stop for some other
ham shitstain you need to ham-slam too.... ;)

151. Re: Equipment Purchases for the year 2003?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-03 02:15:23 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0301021815.7e2908d8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59184

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message news:<20030101221315.11569.00000446@mb-fy.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0301010513.41b02337@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>

> Half size G5RV is how big? (~52 feet)

Since you brought it up a 40M G5RV antenna might not be a bad idea in
Larry's case. It's shorter than a 40m dipole and the "matching
section" is only 16 feet long. It would only involve one wire per leg
(vs. several) and would give him 40, 20 & 10 plus 15 with a survivable
mismatch. Leave the 8X coiled up on the floor. Pattern & SWRs could
get interesting when ya fold it around the attic. I'd at least try it.
Out where the theory hits reality and it's only $25 from HRO.

> >
> >Don't have a damned thing to do with ham radio policy.
>
> This is the only statement of 'RV's that I'm gonna disagree with. I see all
> sorts of pontificating on the "technical level" of today's hams, yesterday's
> hams, written tests, certifications, alleged "dumbing down", etc. All sound and
> fury, signifying nothing.

. . . welcome to RRAP . . .

>
> In the past, hams needed a certain kind of techno know-how to even get a rig on
> the air. Not knowing how to zero beat, properly tune up a pi-net, order a
> crystal, set your mike gain or read an analog dial could get ya in big trouble!
> In a ham radio world where homebrew and home repair was as common as QRM,
> technical knowledge was essential to all hams.

Exactly. In many respects it was actually easier back then BUT ya had
to know what was going on under the hood. No such thing as plug 'n
play ham radio.

> But much of that is gone now, unless a ham is into specialized parts of amateur
> radio. Most of the ham gear manufactured in the past 15-20 years needs no
> tune-up, has a digital dial, and is pretty reliable and foolproof. Not much
> techno knowledge needed, though it's always helpful.

Right on the money again.

>
> But the one area where almost all hams really need to know their stuff is
> antennas. Particularly on HF, where much misinformation is treated as gospel
> and where antennas often present the biggest challenge to amateur operation.

>
> So antenna knowledge is definitely a policy issue.

Agreed, sort of. Ya can pour heaps of money into the radios but if you don't have decent antennas ya wasted the money. Taking it further, if ya don't know how to homebrew antennas that work in difficult installation situations yer in trouble. Which today is more often than not the case. The answers are not in the question pools and HRO can't solve the problem of ducking around CC&Rs with stealthy antennas. Fer instance.

I agree again, The volume of entrenched flat out wrong folk lore about HF antennas is appalling at best. Makes it easy for the clues to tap the wallets of the no-clues. Lot more Brainiacs out there to pluck today than there were in days of yore.

The good news about antenna design is that you don't have to have to be an EE to get a respectable grip on the subject. As far as the math goes a bit of high school algebra & trig is all anybody needs and they don't need much of either. Beyond that some understanding of alternating current theory is needed and that doesn't take an Einstein to get into. I gave up even trying to keep up with equipment circuit design years ago when they went all solid state and became as complex as they are today. Antennas however are another whole story. A good working-level grip on antenna design can be obtained by simply starting at page one of the ARRL Antenna Book and carrying it through. One $40 book can get a ham more actually useful results than any desk full of pricey radios. Add some of the cheap and/or free antenna design software which is available now and anybody with any numbers sense at all can, with a bit of study, become the neighborhood radio club antenna genius.

Based on the dwindling percentage of hams who actually know the difference between a Coke and a Beverage there is a problem out there.

Is this a policy issue? Dunno, really. It's certainly another symptom of the dumbed-down syndrome.

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

152. Re: Another Morse Code Opinion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-03 02:45:56 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030102214556.22983.00000376@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 59185

From K4YZ
>>Great experience is arguable
>
> THAT was an opinion, Dr Shah.
The original poster said it was a great experience (for everyone). I said it's arguable. You said it's an opinion. So, you agree with me.

From K4YZ
>>"Took some effort" does not equal relavant.
>
> To him it IS relevent, Vipul.
The original poster was stating it "takes some effort" to represent amateur radio. That's why he put the statement in all capitol letters. The original poster was not talking about whether or not it was relevant to him.

Just because something takes effort, does not mean its relevant to amateur radio.

From K4YZ
>>>By the way - I heard a guy on 2 meters say "10-4" the other day. He caught
>>>himself and apologized...just wait till you start hearing that on HF!!!
>>
>>Irrelavant.
>
> To those who are concerned about the thinning out of the Amateur Radio
>gene pool, it is VERY relevent.

Gene pool?

From Mike H. - KC8UBH
>By the way - I heard a guy on 2 meters say "10-4" the other day. He caught
>himself and apologized...just wait till you start hearing that on HF!!!

Except for saying your call sign every 10 min, you can say what you want. Why should this person apologize for saying "10-4"?

From Mike KB3EIA
>I'd
>really rather not hear CB lingo. Its an awful reminder of what the bands
>*could* degenerate into if we're not careful.

"Reminder" does not equal band degenerate. Its only because you feel that way. You just hate CBers.

Lets keep all "lingo" to a minimum.

From Mike KB3EIA
>I'm not suggesting however that Code will keep that from happening. As long
>as the standards are high enough where it takes some work to get your
>ticket - I think we'll be fine.

Standards without relevance is not only wrong, it's dangerous. Just like when MCAS scores are used as higher "standards" to make certain politicians look good, rather than improve educational content. This same justification gives those that mastered the code higher technical license classes, since one must learn code to upgrade to higher license class.

Takes some work to get the ticket is fine. These standards should be relevant.

From KB9TMP
>Have a "Hammy" New Year!
Cute alterations of the word "ham" do not endear everyone. Just like regularly in QST when people see the word "ham" in various signs. It's weird.

153. Re: Another Morse Code Opinion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-03 03:05:46 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <icv91vsoa5nrpcll36opnra3b0gi4dslsp@4ax.com>
Source record: 59187

On Thu, 02 Jan 2003 12:12:30 GMT, "Mike H. KC8UBH"
<mhaas@nospam.insight.rr.com> wrote:

>Also - look up "Early Telegraphy" on the 'Net, and take a look at our
>predecesors...when their networks were called in their own day, "The Highway
>of Intelligence". Sound familiar?

Heh, heh! Sounds like nothing new under the sun,

- Mike KB3EIA -

154. Re: "one step closer to extinction" (Was: Re: Followup from K4ZDH)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-03 03:06:43 UTC
From: Captain Liberty <Barrister54@socal.rr.com>
Message-ID: <777R9.64769$B31.14548607@twister.socal.rr.com>
Source record: 59186

```
"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:av1feu11vv@enews3.newsguy.com...
> What about another form of corporate welfare other that corporate
subsidies,
> and grants, what about abatements? If these corporations paid their fair
> share, then the tax burden would be smaller on all of us. For example I
> will pick on the local largest corporation near me, Dow Chemical. If they
> paid even something as small as 1% percent of the value of the property
they
> own in Midland County, MI where the corporation is based, the tax burden
on
> the residences would be alot less..... One percent is not much on thier
> bottom line, but for the average middle class or less person the relief
> would be great.
>
> Obviously this would be in that "ideal" world.... Another spin on the "I
> gotta/had to do it, so do they" attitude.
>

Yep. Don't tax you! Don't tax me! Tax that fellow behind that tree!!
--
Roger J. Buffington
------------------------------
Writer P.J. O'Rourke said: "Politicians are wonderful people as long as they
stay away from things they don't understand, such as working for a living."
```

155. Re: Another Morse Code Opinion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-03 03:20:56 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <8lv91volngfq59f9q019kgji96irqamqgm@4ax.com>
Source record: 59188

On 03 Jan 2003 02:45:56 GMT, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote:

>
>From Mike KB3EIA
>>I'd
>>really rather not hear CB lingo. Its an awful reminder of what the bands
>>*could* degenerate into if we're not careful.

Go find where I said that!

>"Reminder" does not equal band degenerate. Its only because you feel that way.
>You just hate CBers.

I don't hate CB'ers, Vipul. Go find where I said anything of
the sort!

>Lets keep all "lingo" to a minimum.
>
>From Mike KB3EIA
>>I'm not suggesting however that Code will keep that from happening. As long
>>as the standards are high enough where it takes some work to get your
>>ticket - I think we'll be fine.

Go find where I said that, Vipul!

>Standards without relevance is not only wrong, it's dangerous. Just like when
>MCAS scores are used as higher "standards" to make certain politicians look
>good, rather than improve educational content. This same justification gives
>those that mastered the code higher technical license classes, since one must
>learn code to upgrade to higher license class.
>
>Takes some work to get the ticket is fine. These standards should be relevant.
>
>From KB9TMP
>>Have a "Hammy" New Year!
>Cute alterations of the word "ham" do not endear everyone. Just like regularly
>in QST when people see the word "ham" in various signs. It's weird.

How about trying to get your quotes correct please! This isn't
the first time. I don't hate cb'ers, and I don't hate anyone here.
Heck, I like most everyone here, including you, Vipul.

If you are having trouble figuring this out, I'll give you a
hint:

KC8UBH (Mike H.) wrote what you are attributing to me.

- Mike KB3EIA -

156. Re: "one step closer to extinction" (Was: Re: Followup from K4ZDH)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-03 03:42:17 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <gk0a1v0f79qju8og04jljdcr0jhr42ruto@4ax.com>
Source record: 59189

On Thu, 2 Jan 2003 18:43:43 -0600, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote:

>I'll give it a try ... if companies/corporations go down...under...as in
>gone then you have no jobs. If no jobs...no taxes being paid....no money
>being spent...etc.
>
>To simplify.....'trickle down economics'.
>

In an ideal world, I fully support corporations paying NO
taxes whatsoever.

In order for this to work, the money has to go somewhere, such
as shareholders or the like.

So essentially, we (meaning you and me) will need to earn a
good bit of that money that the corporations are saving.

Because WE would have to support a big tax increase for
ourselves. The bills don't go away, and deficit spending only works
for a short while.

- Mike KB3EIA -

157. Re: K1MAN

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-03 03:43:11 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301021943.140ae31b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59190
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

LRod@removethispartpobox.com (LRod) wrote in message
news:<3e14c7b8.122909946@netnews.att.net>...
> On Thu, 02 Jan 2003 23:05:16 GMT, wf3h@ptnospam.com wrote:
>
> >On Thu, 2 Jan 2003 12:34:24 -0500, "QSL" <QRL@qslqrzqrlxxx.net> wrote:
> >
> >> K1MAN has made the FCC and Riley the laughing stock of
> >>the world! T
> >
> >funny...riley got a standing ovation at dayton this year.
> >
> >oh well, morons have a reality all their own.
>
> Dan, W4NTI, whether you like him or not, said it best:
> "you cain't fix stupid."

Its even better when Bruce says it.

158. Re: What country?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-03 03:48:07 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301021948.6e9475b0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59191
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E14B11F.3A62C4FA@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E12FF1C.4E363B24@earthlink.net>...
> >
> > > > Tell us again how a military commander cannot authorize amateur
> > > > operations.
> > >
> > > Let's say you work as a weatherman for an airlift command post. Let's
> > > assume that the commander is a Colonel. You work directly for him.
> > > Would you believe that he is authorized to grant you permission to
> > > operate on the ham bands from your overseas post of assignment? Do you
> > > think it is necessary for such authorization to be in writing? Would
> > > you have nagging doubts about permission issued by such an individual
> > > given that he is not in charge of U.S. forces in the country? It
> > > wouldn't surprise me in the least if your "commander"--you know, the guy
> > > who supposedly told you it was okay for you to spray RF in the ham bands
> > > from Somalia--would respond, "The hell I did!" if quizzed by anyone on
> > > whether he ever gave you the go-ahead.
> >
> > Dave, you are still under the assumption that a military commander
> > cannot authorize amateur operations. Now you wrongly assume that a
> > Colonel cannot be a commander, whereas Steve saw a commander under
> > every pair of butter bars.
> >
> No, I haven't assumed that at all.

I think you have.

I pointed out that someone can be
> directly in charge of you and still not be the commander who can
> authorize amateur radio operation in a country.

A commander has ucmj authority to courts martial and/or non-judicial
punishment. I'm fully aware of what a commander is.

And a commander has the authority to give permission to a subordinate
to operate amateur radio in Somalia, a fact which you said was wrong
wrong wrong.

Apparently you're still missing the point.

It doesn't matter
> much. You didn't get written permission from anyone at all.

>
> > Do I need to start counting cadence so you won't trip over your own
> > bootlaces?
> >
> > Naw, too late. Just dust yourself off and keep going.
>
> You can count all the cadence you like. I'm no longer in the military
> and I'm wearing moccasins.

I can tell. Too much time and distance to discern what a commander is
or is not.

159. Re: What country?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-03 03:52:03 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301021952.421a340f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59192
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E14BA0D.52E24E8F@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E11CAB5.AEDE954C@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E0F282B.4DACAF4D@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E0E7DB8.2728433A@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E0D48F8.E243C02B@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > "K HB" <k hb@arrl.DOTORG> wrote in message news:<kV%O9.1862
> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > The FCC could care less about DXCC
> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > Dave confuses DXCC with FCC. Ditto his minions. You five need a one on
one.
> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > Do you have a single reference of such a comment from me?
> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > Yes.
> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > Then put up or shut up.
> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > You claimed my Somalia operation was illegal based upon ARRL DXCC rules.
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > No, I claimed and still do, that your operation was not acceptable for
> > > > > > > > > DXCC credit. Without supporting documentation, you can never make it
> > > > > > > > > so.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > How do you characterize your use of the term "bootlegging?"
> > > > > >
> > > > > I do not and did not claim that you were a bootlegger based upon
> > > > > violation of DXCC rules. You were a bootlegger because you have no
> > > > > documentation to support your claim that you had permission to

> > > operate. You have no military or UN issued paperwork? Too bad.
> >
> > You did, based upon DXCC rules, claim my operation was illegal. But
> > you have been wrong on so many counts that you really don't recall
> > what you've said anymore.
>
> Google does:
>
> quote From: Dave Heil (k8mn@earthlink.net)
> Subject: Re: ARRL Members -- protest this action to your director
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> Date: 2002-09-12 06:15:32 PST
>
>
> Brian P Burke wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3D7E8A0D.ACC5D04D@earthlink.net...
> > > Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> > So DXCC is the final licensing authority in the world?
> >
> > I guess you're back to that again.
>
> How many times must I tell you before it sinks in:
>
> 1) The DXCC desk (with advice from the DXAC) is the final arbiter on
> what is accepted for DXCC credit.
>
> 2) (a separate issue) You have no proof of permission to operate from
> Somalia at all *punto* unquote
>
> Now, what was it that you were sure I told you?

You claimed that my operation from Somalia was illegal based upon DXCC acceptance/nonacceptance. You continue to amend your statements as I call you to the carpet for each inaccuracy.

You're learning, but only slowly.

160. Re: Wonder?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-03 03:53:41 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <n22a1v8njhr6qukrusmrreaulhp8v063b3@4ax.com>
Source record: 59193

On Thu, 2 Jan 2003 02:17:01 -0500, "KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote:

>If it is okay..... If you have a problem with Kim's (or any other call
>deemed offensive by you) then get off of your freakin' ass and complain to
>the authorizing agency that issued the call in the first place, vanity call
>or not. As far as your post is otherwise concerned, it does not carry any
>weight due to your essentially spineless, anonymous post.
>
>All the whining and bitching here is not gonna change anything....
>
>
>"Voldemort" <Muggle@anon.com> wrote in message
>news:auu8b1$da1$0@pita.alt.net...
>> If it is OK for TIT to have such a call, since she claims to be doing
>such
>> for 'shock' value, then it should also, by her standards, to be OK to have

<a bunch of snippage>

But Gee, Ryan. That would mean ol' Voldemort would have to
give his/her real name!

At least Kim is a known person.

- Mike KB3EIA -

161. Re: ARRL certification program

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-03 04:01:35 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0301022001.501378e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59194

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030101182350.15150.00000967@mb-fe.aol.com>...
> >The ARRL certifiction programs have little or nothing to do with
> >passing license exams, the intent is to provide in-depth education on
> >specific areas of personal interest.
> >
> >w3rv
> >
>
> BS, there just another way for the ARRL to take money from people.

You think they should be free or what??

w3rv

162. Re: County Issuing Radio Licenses

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-03 04:08:16 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301022008.5e38746e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59195

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E14B53A.D07A84F8@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > And you remember english only as a second language. You ought to at
> > least remember the things you say.
>
>
> Just a couple of days ago, you accused me of a faulty memory about what
> I'd written concerning legality of operation vis a vis the DXCC desk. I
> know for a fact that you don't remember everything you've written.
> I surely don't accurately recall each thing I've written over the years.

That is correct.

> I have a reasonably good idea of the essence of the things I've
> written. For anything more detailed, there is Google (as evidence by):
>
> "From: Dave Heil (k8mn@earthlink.net)
> Subject: Re: Pictures Nobody Wants To See
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> Date: 2002-09-02 02:56:23 PST
>
> Brian P Burke wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3D7289D3.4A3F8136@earthlink.net...
> > > Brian P Burke wrote:
> > > >
> > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:3D71A336.B37658AE@earthlink.net...
> > > > > Brian P Burke wrote:
> > > > > I'm sure the gang would have been quite happy to work a legitimate op
> > > > > from Somalia using SSB. They didn't find one in you.
> > > > >
> > > > Certainly I'm legitimate. Why do you say I'm not? I asked permission,
> > > > permission was granted. I operated.
> > > >
> > > Oh, I believe your parents married. Why do I say your operation from
> > > Somalia isn't kosher?--Because you don't have anything which says
> > > permission to operate an amateur radio station was granted. How do you
> > > go about proving that you had permission?
> > >
> > It was granted. Prove it wasn't.
>
> You'll have to prove that you were authorized to operate, Brian. You

> can't do so because, as you've stated, you had only verbal permission.
> Maybe you can dig up your military commander of the time and have him
> issue retroactive permission.
>
> > > > I don't know of
> > > > > any award program which sanctions operations from those not holding a
> > > > > valid license in the country of operation.
> > > > >
> > > > There is no government in Somalia, thus there are no valid Somalia licenses,
> > > > unless you want to consider some UN issued licenses Somalian. You must
> > > > accept the fact that Somalia is a paradox. I operated legally, yet I have
> > > > not provided the ARRL's DXCC desk with anything.
> > >
> > > If your miilitary commander had provided written permission like that
> > > issued by the United Nations, you'd have been operating legally. You
> > > operated on some guy's verbal authorization. You don't have anything to
> > > provide to the DXCC desk.
> >
> > Hmmm, back to the ARRL's DXCC desk. Is the dxcc desk the final authority on
> > legal amateur operations everywhere?
>
> For whether an operation will be accepted for DXCC credit or not? Yes.
> >
> > It would appear that Len is correct. You do view the ARRL as a
> > quasi-governmental entity capable of authorizing amateur operations in
> > foreign countries. Wow.
>
> This is the part where you begin to be the real Brian. You read
> something and draw an incorrect conclusion. The ARRL doesn't authorize
> operations. The ARRL sponsors DXCC. The DXCC desk decides whether an
> operation will be accepted for DXCC purposes. Where there is any
> question of an operation's legitimacy, the desk may request proof of
> licensing along with copies of passport entry or exit stamps and/or
> visas.
>
> <snip>"
>
> It doesn't appear that I said what you attributed to me.

Military members move between countries often without passports,
entry/exit stamps, or visas. Based upon your wisdom, Operation
Restore Hope never happened.

You continue to assume that if the ARRL DXCC doesn't accept an
operation that it is illegal, aka bootlegging, aka Mog Slim.

You've used all three descriptors.

Yet you are not the Somali government, you are not a military
commander, you are not the U.N., you are not a world court, and you
are not the FCC. Yet you declare my operation illegal. You have

unimaginable powers. Who/what are you again?

Because you don't -think- DXCC will accept it.

163. Re: Adding something extra to a CQ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-03 04:15:45 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301022015.163877cc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59196

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E14B2FB.572A774F@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E13CED5.5F323D3C@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
>
> > > > You continued
> > > > > to believe that all the information necessary for permission was
> > > > > contained in a couple of lines of text.
> > > >
> > > > I continue to believe that it was 1,000 better than the information
> > > > you gave.
> > >
> > > So we encounter yet another of your difficulties.
> >
> > Not if we accept that you were simply wrong. I do.
>
> You are an army of one.

No, I aimed higher.

> > > > > Meanwhile, I did have permission from someone authorized to do so,
> > > > > even when you said that a military commander could NOT do so.
> > > >
> > > > Nope. You CLAIM to have had permission from someone just up the chain
> > > > from you.
> > > >
> > > No, I said commander.
> > >
> > > The commander of U.S. forces in Somalia during your stay can't be that
> > > difficult to locate.
> >
> > I briefed him daily. He wasn't hard to find at all.
>
> Great. What does he say about the permission you say he granted you?

He's never given it a seconds thought, I assume. Why?

> > > > You must have assumed that the material on the League's web
> > > > > site meant any officer over you.
> > > >
> > > > No, the material on the ARRL web site was read by me 10 years after my
> > > > tour in Somalia. It essentially state the same thing as the other
> > > > amateur on station told me.

>
> You mean the guy who got it in writing?

Did he?

> > > > You must have assumed that it wasn't
> > > > > important to have such permission in writing.
> > > > >
> > > > That is correct.
> > > >
> > > Well ain't you da fool!
> >
> > Well, yes. But it doesn't mean that I was a bootleger, nor does it mean I'm a liar.
>
> If there is nothing in existence which backs up your claim to have had
> permission, you could be either.

You could be a liar. Please show me something that says you're not.

> > > > > > > To summarize:
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > It is apparent that only you, of all individuals operating from Somalia
> > > > > > > > during that time period, neglected to get permission in writing from
> > > > > > > > someone authorized to grant it. That it never dawned on you that this
> > > > > > > > would be the thing to do, marks you as a rube.
>
> > > > > > > Yes, yes, Dave. You've said that before. But saying it and saying it
> > > > > > > often doesn't make it true, no matter how hard you wish it so.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > No, writing it doesn't make it true.
> > > > > >
> > > > > Hmmm.
> > > > >
> > > > It is true because it is
> > > > > accurate.
> > > > >
> > > > And my statement that I had permission from my commander is accurate.
> > > >
> > > Your proof for the above is?
> > >
> > Didn't you just say that writing it doesn't make it true?
>
> No. Pay attention. I wrote that about the statement I made earlier.

So some things in writing mean that they're true, and other things in
writing could be false?

> > > > Him putting it in writing doesn't make it any truer.
> > > >
> > > We'll never know if your statement was true since he didn't put it in
> > > writing.
> > >

> > Didn't you just say that writing it doesn't make it true?
>
> No. Your oscillator is drifting. I wrote that about my statement, not
> about your statement.

So your statement is true, or is it false? It's so hard to tell.

> > > > Writing it simply points it out again since you don't seem to
> > > > > grasp the implications. Your prior statements on morality and ethics
> > > > > ring hollow in the face of the reality that you had no proof of
> > > > > permission to operate legally and that your operation won't be accepted
> > > > > for DXCC credit.
> > > >
> > > > I don't work people out of band, if that's what you meant.
> > >
> > > I meant what I wrote. Maybe you can have someone explain it to you.
> > >
> > > > > I thought you might be sharper in 2003 than 2002.
> > > >
> > > > Nope, I'm the same.
> > >
> > > So I see.
> >
> > How different will you be in 2003?
>
> I'll still be sharp.

Its still early in the year, but I don't see it that way.

164. Re: Adding something extra to a CQ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-03 04:17:19 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301022017.17a89f6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59197

"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:<586310ECC41B16E4.34546AEBC95B23C6.C4D457470675C945@lp.airnews.net>...
> Still nothing...

Pretty much. But he calls it humor.

Put Dave in a white suit and call him the Good Humor Man.

165. Re: Another Morse Code Opinion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-03 04:20:35 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030102232035.10292.00001284@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 59199

In article <20030102004940.02081.00000093@mb-mk.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>The "10-4" comment is just a way for you to introduce CB into the
>>argument.
>
> And it is that influx of CB-like lingo that has many people concerned,
>ergo VERY relevent, and unfortunately it goes hand-in-hand with the effort to
>dispense with Morse Code testing.

Steve:

I use 10-codes every single day on the job, and I have nothing to do with CB! While doing so, I don't seem to lose my ability to use the Morse code, even I'm not using it at the time! So what does the use of 10-codes ANYWHERE have to do with dispensing with Morse code testing?

BTW all my best to you and Kim! Just don't name anything after me!

73 de Larry, K3LT

166. Re: CCR Issue Revisited

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-03 04:20:35 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030102232035.10292.00001283@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 59200

In article <C663A6F2EA57E3CB.297184971CE7C514.9EAF75F267313972@lp.airnews.net>,
"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>
>Well, absolutely. I don't like "Neighborhood Associations" either. I'll
>speak out of turn, though, and state that I think the CCR issue that the
>ARRL was trying to get through Congress last year deals not only with
>Neighborhood Associations, but deed restrictions as well.
>
>Our dislike of them aside, though: what do you think of the ARRL asking
>congress to pass a bill that would, essentially, render a
>signed-and-agreed-to-contract useless?

Kim:

I think it won't happen, but we an always hope.

> While I disagree wholeheartedly with
>CCRs, and read the deed restrictions on this property before we bought it,
>the question still remains: should I request congress to support my amateur
>radio interest by passing a bill that says I don't have to abide by the
>contract I agreed to? Isn't that the same as someone who relishes antique
>cars being able to get a bunch of like-minded people together and go to
>congress to pass a bill that says they can now have a "junkyard" (in the
>eyes of their neighbors) because they are "special."

That depends. Activities like Amateur are definitely in the public interest,
whereas junkyards in residential areas are not. You have to compare
apples to other apples.

>I don't agree with it. I also don't think it's good publicity to challenge
>contractual agreements because of our interest in amateur radio.

We're just challenging the legal basis upon which these contractual
agreements are based, and creating exceptions for an activity which is
proven to be in the public interest. I see nothing wrong with that.

>If I
>signed a contract, I don't then turn around and "come up with" a way to get
>out of it. The bigger issue, as I see it, would be to challenge the deed
>restriction or neighborhood associations--and even take them to court on our
>own. Does the ARRL feel strongly enough about the CCR issue to allow use of
>ARRL Counsel? I hardly think so.

Don't look now, Kim, but the do and they have!

>This did degrade, the last time around--and I was one of the folks who
>joined in--into an argument about whether Neighborhood Associations and/or
>deed restrictions were a good or bad thing.

And, as usual, you're not making any more sense this time than you
did before.

>It would be nice to see a true
>debate about the true issue. Let's accept that Neighborhood Associations
>and deed restrictions are present and here to stay.

We're not saying we want to do away with them. We just want changes made
which provide "reasonable accommodation" to Amateur Radio operators.

>Yeah, they suck--or
>not; and yeah, they are overbearing--or not. The issue is: should special
>interest groups take issue against a contract they have signed? Was the
>ARRL right to spend so much time on this issue?

The answers are yes and yes. If the ARRL, through it's legislative efforts,
manage to get a universal change made which allows for reasonable
accommodation of Amateur Radio stations in restricted residential areas,
then you are by no means required to take advantage of them personally.
However, the rest of us certainly will! For me, it will mean being able to
spend my own money on my own home and get out of this apartment!
With all the static you've given me over my apartment dweller status in
recent times, I should think you'd be all in favor of this!

73 de Larry, K3LT

167. Re: You have to be kidding!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-03 04:20:36 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030102232036.10292.00001286@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 59198

In article <20030102005120.02081.00000094@mb-mk.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Steve and I's friendship isn't newfound--just FYI. It's about two years
>>old...eh, Steve? Oh, and Larry's jealousy over it isn't new, either...<BEG>
>
> 'Bout right!
>
>73
>
>Steve, K4YZ

Steve/Kim:

You two have my full and complete blessing to be whatever you want to be to each other!

73 de Larry, K3LT

168. Re: Another Morse Code Opinion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-03 04:20:36 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030102232036.10292.00001285@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 59251

In article <eAMQ9.10908$GF.5096557@twister.columbus.rr.com>, "Mike H. KC8UBH" <mhaas@nospam.insight.rr.com> writes:

>By the way - I heard a guy on 2 meters say "10-4" the other day. He caught
>himself and apologized...just wait till you start hearing that on HF!!!
>
>Take care,
>
>Mike H. - KC8UBH

Mike:

To the best of my knowledge, there is nothing illegal or improper about using "10-codes" on VHF/UHF repeaters. The only possible problem would be that 10-codes tend to mean different things in different places, and on ham radio, would not be as universally understood as "Q" signals -- which only have one meaning anywhere they are used. For instance, if I was talking to you on 2-meters, and said I needed you to "10-100," what would you do? How about a "10-21?" Or a "10-10?" These 10-codes mean specific things on my company's radio system, but I've not heard them used much (if at all) anywhere else. However, having said that, certain 10-codes like 10-3, 10-4, 10-7, 10-8, 10-9, 10-19, and 10-36 seem to have pretty consistent meanings. Therefore, I would not question their use on a ham radio repeater. Anyone who would is only playing "radio cop" and would be better off to mind his own business.

Now, as usual, it's time for Kim to chime in with some typically puerile remark.

73 de Larry, K3LT
I'll be 10-7 for the evening.

169. Re: You have to be kidding! I saw it coming.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-03 04:22:23 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301022022.2032842a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59252

NoName <user@computer.net> wrote in message
news:<ii191vofi9n05fc3f2sbbb43f9pdhp8ngd@4ax.com>...
> On Thu, 02 Jan 2003 16:02:57 GMT, "Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL"
> <vlfiscus@mcn.net> wrote:
>
>
> >
> >Yup Gil, You got it. That's what happens when you push for restructuring
> >and dumb down ham radio. I blame the ARRL.
> >
> >73 de KB7ADL
>
> You blame the ARRL because you're an idiot Fiscus.
> Let's discuss the
> code test because that's the real rub with you.
>
> Having several years of bitching the FCC staffers got fed up with the
> controversy WRT Physician Waivers for code speeds greater than
> 5WPM suggested 5WPM for all classes of HF with no waivers.
>
> The ARRL did the best it could with the counter suggestion of 5WPM for
> General and 12WPM for higher classes. Since that would not have
> completely ended the waivers the staffers opted to keep pushing
> for the 5WPM no waiver plan and that is what we have. It is
> not the ARRLs fault they tried but news flash they do not run
> the FCC or any other branch of government.

The ARRL has worked around the regulations with respect to the Morse
Code exams. The so called 5WPM Morse Code exam currently administered
is really a 13-15WPM Farnsworth exam. Slight of hand, shell game,
whatever you want to call it, but its not a 5WPM Morse exam as
required by Part 97.

> If you are so far out in Montana that you just don't get how
> government works let me fill you in. The FCC Commissioners are there
> for a few years, the staffers are there for ever. If you think the
> staffers are not driving the train you are sadly mistaken. You want
> to be annoyed with someone over this non-problem I suggest you
> start with the FCC GSA employees rather than the ARRL.

I liked the way the staffers shut down government under Newt Gingrich.

170. Re: CCR Issue Revisited

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-03 04:41:09 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030102234109.01791.00000167@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 59253

In article <017A02BE546E4CEB.8526366CD8B79EE3.4345195053D2BAD3@lp.airnews.net>, seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030101221317.11569.00000447@mb-fy.aol.com...
>>
>> The main point of the bill being pushed is preemption of deed
>> restrictions, just like TV antennas get.
>>
>> Here's the blurb:
>>
>> "A bill, HR-4720,

(blurb snipped)

>> http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2002/05/14/102/?nc=1

>Around here, I see no homeowner areas with any visible antennas, TV or
>otherwise. Maybe they are low to the ground or something.

Or maybe they are all on cable.

>> The bill would simply require that ham antennas get the same consideration
>> as TV antennas, which have preemption.

>Is this something not a lot of people know about?

Obviously.

>Like I said, I can cruise
>any "new" or "newer" neighborhood here and the only thing I see
>is--MAYBE--satellite dishes in the backyard or up on the roof. TV antennas,
>sure, but is that the kind of antenna we're talking about? I don't see any
>of the yagi-type TV antennas.

Here's the short version:

Back about 1970, various cable companies made sweetheart deals with developers. The developers put "no antenna" clauses in the deed restrictions, and the cable folks wired the developments for cheap, or even free. This was back when cable service was cheap and many cable channels were commercial-free.

After a few years, the no-antenna clauses became part of the boilerplate and were included in almost all new development construction. People in those houses used rabbit ears or cable.

Then along came the "pizza dish" direct broadcast satellite (DBS) folks, with a wireless alternative to cable. Just put the little gray antenna where it can

see the satellite and watch all kinds of great stuff for less than the cost of cable!

Only problem was, much of the potential DBS market was in areas that allowed no outside antennas at all. And the little dishes don't work indoors - they have to have a direct line of sight to the satellite.

After a lengthy legal battle that included the Supremes, it was ruled that the no antenna clauses were unreasonably restrictive, and the FCC preempted them. But the preemption is for broadcast TV reception antennas ONLY - nothing else, not even FM radio!

End result is that a person living in a house with a "no antenna" deed restriction can put up a pizza dish satellite antenna or a VHF/UHF TV yagi antenna or almost any other reasonable antenna IF it is needed for good TV reception. And they don't need to go to court or fight any sort of legal battle to get the preemption.

ARRL and others have tried to get FCC to extend the preemption to ham antennas, arguing the same way the DBS folks did. FCC said they would do the preemption thing if and only if Congress told them to. If HR-4720 is passed, FCC will consider itself "told by Congress" and will extend the preemption to ham antennas. That's why the bill is needed.

Kim wrote:
>> >
>> >While I disagree wholeheartedly with
>> >CCRs, and read the deed restrictions on this property before we bought
>> >it,
>> >the question still remains: should I request congress to support my
>> >amateur
>> >radio interest by passing a bill that says I don't have to abide by the
>> >contract I agreed to?
>>
>> In a word, yes.

>See. I don't think this is an issue for Congress.

FCC does, and they are the ones who are in charge of the preemption.
>
>> >Isn't that the same as someone who relishes antique
>> >cars being able to get a bunch of like-minded people together and go to
>> >congress to pass a bill that says they can now have a "junkyard" (in the
>> >eyes of their neighbors) because they are "special."
>>
>> Nope. Not at all.

>I'm not sure I understand why not.

Because it's not about being "special". It's about reasonable accomodation.
>
>> >I don't agree with it. I also don't think it's good publicity to
>> >challenge

>> >contractual agreements because of our interest in amateur radio. If I
>> >signed a contract, I don't then turn around and "come up with" a way to
>> >get out of it.
>>
>> Contracts are challenged all the time. Look at all the divorces in the US,
>> even
>> though many of the people who get divorced agreed to "until death" when
>> they "signed" the contract.

I recall you saying you got out of a marriage, Kim. Would you have liked it if the court had said: "You made a contractual agreement and now you want to turn around and "come up with" a way to get out of it. No dice - you're stuck with him."?

>> Bankruptcy is similar - creditors often accept less than
>> full value of the money owed them.
>
>Then, let individual homeowners decide to challenge their contract--in civil
>courts or whatever.

Doesn't work that way with deed restrictions.

>I don't have a problem with someone challenging a
>contract. My problem is in taking this issue to Congress, when there are
>probably much more important matters to be debated there.

FCC has told us that the way to challenge these contracts is to get Congress to pass a bill. Because radio is federally regulated, it has to be Congress that does the job.

Restrictive divorce laws kept a lot of folks married against their will until the laws were changed by the state's equivalents of Congress.
>
>> >The bigger issue, as I see it, would be to challenge the deed
>> >restriction or neighborhood associations--and even take them to court on
>> >our own.

And lose.
>>
>> How does one challenge a deed restriction? Sue yourself?
>
>As I understand it, I would have to obtain the agreement of everyone
>affected by the Deed Restrictions that are with this "part and parcel" piece
>of land. I think that is the way to put it. Then, I would have to go to
>the County Courthouse and get a ruling.

Kind of like getting everyone you know to sign a petition so you can get a divorce.

How much chance do you think there is of getting everyone to agree to such a petition? Particularly in an area where the parcel might be 100 or more housing units?
>

>> >Does the ARRL feel strongly enough about the CCR issue to allow use of
>> >ARRL Counsel? I hardly think so.
>>
>> Exactly the opposite is true.

As confirmed by K2ASP
>
>So, there are homeowners/property owners who are challenging this stuff
>outside Congress?

Yep. But deed restrictions are designed to be nearly impossible to challenge
successfully.
>
>> >This did degrade, the last time around--and I was one of the folks who
>> >joined in--into an argument about whether Neighborhood Associations
>>and/or
>> >deed restrictions were a good or bad thing. It would be nice to see a
>true
>> >debate about the true issue. Let's accept that Neighborhood Associations
>> >and deed restrictions are present and here to stay. Yeah, they suck--or
>> >not; and yeah, they are overbearing--or not. The issue is: should
>special
>> >interest groups take issue against a contract they have signed? Was the
>> >ARRL right to spend so much time on this issue?
>> >
>> Answer: YES, on both counts.
>>
>> Here's why:
>>
>> First, buying real estate is not like other purchases. There's no "new"
>> real
>> estate being created - only reused and converted from other uses. The
>>amount of
>> residential real estate on the market at any given time in a particular
>> area is
>> finite and not easily changed. So a person seeking to buy a house often
>> faces
>> extremely limited choices. And as deed restrictions become more pervasive,
>> the
>> percentage of available housing that is unrestricted continues to drop.
>> The
>> pervasiveness of anti-antenna deed restrictions effectively eliminates
>> choice
>> in many areas. End result is that "don't buy a restricted house" is not an
>> option for many people.
>
>I don't agree that market conditions should be a determination of whether
>something is valid for debate in Congress or not.

Why? Real estate has special laws because it is not like other property. Radio
has special laws because of its very nature.

>A person seeking to buy a
>house may want all kinds of other things not amateur related. Let them
>individually take that up with the Neighborhood Association or the
>neighborhood.

In other words, "let those hams stay with their own kind"

>If "don't buy a restricted house" is not an option for many people, they
>join the many others who confront issues like this every day.

One way to confront the issue is to ask Congress for legislation. Are you
saying people should not petition their Government for changes in the law
because YOU don't think they have a legitimate problem?

>> Second, the mere fact that a "contract" was signed doesn't mean it cannot
>> be
>> changed at a later date. Contracts are renegotiated all the time - that's
>> a big
>> part of contract law.

>And, so they can do it outside the Congressional venue.

Not according to the FCC.
>
>> And a valid contract cannot violate a person's civil
>> rights or the law. For example, deed restrictions that prohibit sale of a
>> property to "non-white" people exist - and have been declared null and
>> void by
>> the courts.
>
>But, no time was taken in Congress for this, right?

WRONG.

It took the various Civil Rights Acts and other legislation to make it happen.

It used to be perfectly legal for realtors to not show or sell houses to the
"wrong" people for a neighborhood. "Wrong" as in wrong race, wrong religion,
wrong nationality/ethnicity. It took fair housing laws enacted by Congress -
not the courts - to end that sort of discrimination.

>The courts is where all this stuff needs to happen.

See above.
>
>> Third, what is proposed is not a blanket preemption of all antenna
>> restrictions. Rather, it would require reasonable accomodation. Big
>>difference
>> between a 90 foot tower with multiple beams and a G5RV in the trees, for
>> example. Deed restrictions that prohibit all antennas are unreasonably
>> restrictive.
>
>Why not a ventenna?

You know how big an 80 meter ventenna would be?

>Isn't that what those things are called?

You tell me.

>It's my
>understanding that, for the most part, the "restrictions" of CCRs and
>Neighborhood Associations deal mostly with stuff that can be seen.

Nope. In my experience, no antennas means no antennas, period.

>Low
>antennas and wires, etc. cannot be seen.

They also don't work.

>Well, wait, I am thinking down
>here, where there's a privacy fence in ever housing development. What's up
>there, Jim?
>
It varies all over the place. Some areas are wide open, with no fences or trees
(landscaping must be approved by The Association, doncha know?). In others,
it's more private. But the practical result is that all it takes is one Gladys
Kravitz type to make life heck - and it doesn't have to be a neighbor.

>> And consider why such restrictions were put in the deeds. It's not about
>> interference, because receiving antennas are included. It's not about
>> appearance, because all types of antennas are prohibited, regardless of
>> appearance. The real issue was to effectively force homeowners to sign up
>>for
>> cable!
>>
>
>Well, now that's an issue, then, that I definitely don't think belongs in
>Congress.

Why not? Congress enacts the laws that regulate the cable companies. Do you
think Congress intended for cable ops to have a monopoly?

>Hey, cable companies suck...and they are a growing nusiance.

Maybe where you are. Around here, they are pretty decent - they have to be.

>But, once again, get the neighbors riled, get the public interest going,
>etc. If it's not a big issue for other people, then why should it be a big
>issue in Congress--where time is money and more important bills can be
>debated.

Because Congress is the venue that has the power to do the job.
>
>> Fourth, while many states require disclosure of deed restrictions, the
>> requirement is not universal, nor timely. Often they are not revealed
>> until
>> closing. Of course that's classic caveat emptor, but when real estate
>> sales
>> require termite inspection, radon inspection, seller's disclosure, title

>> search
>> and insurance, escrow and a host of other things, it's not unreasonable
>> for the
>> deed restrictions to be presented up-front. But try and get them!
>
>Tell ya what. I think the average home around here (in a new neighborhood)
>is around $150,000. That's for, as the other folks say, just a house (I
>wouldn't mind at all being in one of those just a houses).

For how much house on how much land? "round here, $150K won't buy a doghouse.

>If I am spending
>money like that, I am in control--no one else.

You may think so, but just try breaking the rules and see what happens.

>I know you think I am being
>simplistic, but I am serious. If I don't get what I want when I am dealing,
>then off to

[expletive deleted]

>with the folks whom I am dealing with. I'd rather keep my
>money and eat steak every night before I go home to my apartment.

??

You must deal with someone in order to have a home. If it's an apartment, you
ust deal with the landlord. If it's a home, you must deal with the real estate
laws and restrictions. That's just reality.
>
>> You mention antique cars. Consider the following scenario:
>>
>> (It's HYPOTHETICAL, folks!)
>>
>> Suppose you went to buy a new car or truck, and found a model you liked at
>> a
>> decent price. You make the deal and all is smiles and handshakes. But when
>> you
>> go to pick up the car, the dealer wants you to sign an "owner's contract"
>> or
>> some such, that requires you to do and not do certain things for the
>> entire
>> time you own the car.
>>
>> You look at the agreement and note that all sorts of things are required,
>> like
>> keeping the car washed, properly maintained by authorized dealers using
>> only
>> approved parts and not performing unauthorized modifications. Failure to
>> comply
>> not only voids the warranty, it may cause you to incur fines and even have
>> the

>> car reposessed by the manufacturer - even after it's paid for and out of
>> warranty! These restrictions are for the life of the car, not just the
>> original owner, and you cannot get out of them except by selling the car.
>> And
>> they have nothing to do with safety or pollution standards - those things
>> are
>> already protected by applicable laws.
>>
>> You ask what this is all about, and the dealer says the car company is
>> concerned about its image being tarnished by owners who don't take care of
>> their cars, hence the restrictions.
>>
>> Now at this point, most folks would storm out of the dealership and take
>> their
>> business elsewhere. But they find most of the other manufacturers have
>> similar
>> rules, and buying a new car without such restrictions limits the choices
>> enormously. Used car? The newer models all have the restrictions, and you
>> don't
>> want the problems of an older car.
>>
>> What to do?
>
>I start taking the old car for repairs, or I decide to learn how to do it
>myself.

Fine - except the reason you are buying a new car is that the old one can't be
fixed.

>I'm telling you, I am the customer, and I am going to have it my
>way or no way at all.

Then in many cases you won't have a car or a home.

>Too many people are letting things *happen* to them,
>and that's why they keep happening and while they'll happen more and more
>frequently. It takes the word, NO.

Which is why people are petitioning Congress to pass HR-4720. They are saying
NO to unreasonable restrictions. They're making things happen and promoting
change of a bad situation. That's a good thing.
>
>> (end hypothetical situation)
>>
>> Not everybody can move to areas where there are no restrictions. Here's a
>> typical example:
>>
>> Young professional couple - he's a doctor, she's an attorney. Both are
>> hams.
>> They move to a new city when he completes his training and gets a new job
>> at a
>> very respected hospital. He needs to live near the hospital, she needs to

>> live
>> near the county seat. They plan to have kids very soon so school quality
>> is a
>> big issue. Yet they find that most of the real estate on the market has
>> unacceptable restrictions. What should they do - give up ham radio?
>>
>Yes.

Well, gee, thanks a lot.

>Or change their situation.

Now you're talking!

>Do not be governed by things that happen
>to you, make your own things happen.

By getting the rules changed.

>If he's a great doctor, then he can make tons of money

WHOA! It's not that simple!

> and she can stay home and school the children, or vice
>versa.

Why can't they have their careers, kids, decent schools and ham radio too? Is
there something wrong with that picture?

>Hold off having kids until they've stashed away tons of money, leave
>the city, retire, and go have kids in some remote area--fast because remote
>is disappearing!

HAW! That's a good one!

73 de Jim, N2EY

Support HR-4720

171. Re: ARRL certification program

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-03 05:01:19 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0301022101.17bd1b95@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59254

vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030101193426.29759.00000321@mb-cv.aol.com>...
> From: Robert Casey wa2ise@ix.netcom.com
> >Without an engineering college degree (BSEE), you'll just
> >be a "technician". They do lab lackey work like soldering
> >wires, ordering parts and such.
>
> Even with a BSEE, you may be some kind of the many forms of "test engineer".
> This may include statistical failures,

Those are legitimate engineering functions. So is sales work by the
way. The three highest paid categories of engineers are sales types,
patent attorneys and MBAs, not designers by a long shot.

> fixturing, soldering, ordering parts,
> maybe some troubleshooting.

Engineers are paid to get the job out the door and do whatever it
takes to make that happen. Been there, done that.

>
> This work may be higher skilled or LOWER skilled than a technician (yet they
> want someone with a BSEE to do the job). Also, it is getting common to append
> the word "engineer" to every low skilled task.

Two of my favorites are "sanitation engineers", the dweebs who pick up
yer trash on Tuesdays and Fridays. The other real gooder is "systems
engineers".

> I am digressing, but it should be noted that it is very common for people with
> BSEEs to do the lackey work.

Been there, done that. Not all engineers who are hams are EEs by the
way. Rumors to the contrary.

> >Now if the above ARRL credentials were worth college
> >credit that you could apply towards a real college degree,
> >then it would be worthwhile.

Will never in this world happen, that's so far past the ARRL mission
it's beyond moot.

>
> There are few such courses now in colleges that cover the relevant material. If
> the quality material is covered at the equivalent hours and equivalent level,
> it should be accredited. Some topics may be only worth 1 credit instead of 3,
> but may be valuable additions.

>
> It would be good to see some design (eg filter design) courses, as well as the
> emergency communications and other courses offered currently.

And courses to cover the other 200 hot buttons . .

>
> >Most colleges will likely want you to take at least half the
> >courses in house though. But you could get the first
> >two years completed via the above.
>
> Colleges have offered credit for off campus courses. The ARRL courses would be
> a real plus. Also, they could have the benefit of being offered regularly,
> while colleges often offer the course every other semester, or even every other
> year.
>
> >Sorry, was thinking of someone wanting to design said equipment.
> >And most companies that do such design work will require college
> >degrees.
> Naturally, design is the most desired work. Few people with BSEEs actually do
> design work.

I don't agree with that. I know a flock of EEs most of whom work for
small to medium size companies or for themselves as
designers/consultants. Every one of 'em does volumes of design work.
Those EES who don't do design work are, for the most part minions in
large corporations or the gummint. 90% of this country's payrolls are
doled out by the owners of small to medium size businesses, you figger
the rest.

> Certifications in the specific area may help you obtain a higher
> level than otherwise.

Not in engineering it doesn't except in very isolated cases. You
either have a BS or you don't. From there you either have an MS or you
don't. One more jump up and you have a PhD or you don't. Somewhere in
the mix you also picked up a PE license or you didn't. The schools
where you picked up yer paper also matter. It's all very digital. The
rest involves identity crises and the eternal hunt for a cheap & quick
ways out.

w3rv

172. Re: What country?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-03 05:38:14 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E1521B7.4FC2C428@earthlink.net>
Source record: 59255
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E14B11F.3A62C4FA@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E12FF1C.4E363B24@earthlink.net>...
> > >
> > > > > Tell us again how a military commander cannot authorize amateur
> > > > > operations.
> > > >
> > > > Let's say you work as a weatherman for an airlift command post. Let's
> > > > assume that the commander is a Colonel. You work directly for him.
> > > > Would you believe that he is authorized to grant you permission to
> > > > operate on the ham bands from your overseas post of assignment? Do you
> > > > think it is necessary for such authorization to be in writing? Would
> > > > you have nagging doubts about permission issued by such an individual
> > > > given that he is not in charge of U.S. forces in the country? It
> > > > wouldn't surprise me in the least if your "commander"--you know, the guy
> > > > who supposedly told you it was okay for you to spray RF in the ham bands
> > > > from Somalia--would respond, "The hell I did!" if quizzed by anyone on
> > > > whether he ever gave you the go-ahead.
> > >
> > > Dave, you are still under the assumption that a military commander
> > > cannot authorize amateur operations. Now you wrongly assume that a
> > > Colonel cannot be a commander, whereas Steve saw a commander under
> > > every pair of butter bars.
> > >
> > No, I haven't assumed that at all.
>
> I think you have.

Then you'd be wrong yet again.

> I pointed out that someone can be
> > directly in charge of you and still not be the commander who can
> > authorize amateur radio operation in a country.
>
> A commander has ucmj authority to courts martial and/or non-judicial
> punishment. I'm fully aware of what a commander is.

> And a commander has the authority to give permission to a subordinate
> to operate amateur radio in Somalia, a fact which you said was wrong

> wrong wrong.

...if one assumes that two lines on the ARRL web page are the sum total
of knowledge and information on the subject.

> Apparently you're still missing the point.

You don't have a point. You have no commander willing to stick his neck
out and say that he gave you permission to operate. You have no
paperwork stating that you had permission to operate.

> > It doesn't matter
> > much. You didn't get written permission from anyone at all.
> >
> > > Do I need to start counting cadence so you won't trip over your own
> > > bootlaces?
> > >
> > > Naw, too late. Just dust yourself off and keep going.
> >
> > You can count all the cadence you like. I'm no longer in the military
> > and I'm wearing moccasins.
>
> I can tell. Too much time and distance to discern what a commander is
> or is not.

I don't need to recognize a commander. I've had proper written
permission every place I've operated. Each operation was credited for
DXCC.

You, on the other hand...

Dave K8MN

173. Re: What country?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-03 05:40:35 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E152255.D8E628AE@earthlink.net>
Source record: 59256
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E14BA0D.52E24E8F@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E11CAB5.AEDE954C@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E0F282B.4DACAF4D@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E0E7DB8.2728433A@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E0D48F8.E243C02B@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > "K HB" <k hb@arrl.DOTORG> wrote in message news:<kV%O9.1862
> > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > The FCC could care less about DXCC
> > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > Dave confuses DXCC with FCC. Ditto his minions. You five need a one
on one.
> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > Do you have a single reference of such a comment from me?
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > Yes.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Then put up or shut up.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > You claimed my Somalia operation was illegal based upon ARRL DXCC rules.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > No, I claimed and still do, that your operation was not acceptable for
> > > > > > > DXCC credit. Without supporting documentation, you can never make it
> > > > > > > so.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > How do you characterize your use of the term "bootlegging?"
> > > > >
```

> > > > I do not and did not claim that you were a bootlegger based upon
> > > > violation of DXCC rules. You were a bootlegger because you have no
> > > > documentation to support your claim that you had permission to
> > > > operate. You have no military or UN issued paperwork? Too bad.
> > >
> > > You did, based upon DXCC rules, claim my operation was illegal. But
> > > you have been wrong on so many counts that you really don't recall
> > > what you've said anymore.
> >
> > Google does:
> >
> > quote From: Dave Heil (k8mn@earthlink.net)
> > Subject: Re: ARRL Members -- protest this action to your director
> > Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> > Date: 2002-09-12 06:15:32 PST
> >
> >
> > Brian P Burke wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3D7E8A0D.ACC5D04D@earthlink.net...
> > > > Brian P Burke wrote:
> >
> > > So DXCC is the final licensing authority in the world?
> > >
> > > I guess you're back to that again.
> >
> > How many times must I tell you before it sinks in:
> >
> > 1) The DXCC desk (with advice from the DXAC) is the final arbiter on
> > what is accepted for DXCC credit.
> >
> > 2) (a separate issue) You have no proof of permission to operate from
> > Somalia at all *punto* unquote
> >
> > Now, what was it that you were sure I told you?
>
> You claimed that my operation from Somalia was illegal based upon DXCC
> acceptance/nonacceptance. You continue to amend your statements as I
> call you to the carpet for each inaccuracy.

Read it again, Brian. That isn't what it says at all.

> You're learning, but only slowly.

Don't just stand there mumbling to yourself, DO something.

Dave K8MN

174. Re: County Issuing Radio Licenses

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-03 05:52:42 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E15251C.AFA4D024@earthlink.net>
Source record: 59257

```
Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E14B53A.D07A84F8@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> >
> > > And you remember english only as a second language. You ought to at
> > > least remember the things you say.
> >
> >
> > Just a couple of days ago, you accused me of a faulty memory about what
> > I'd written concerning legality of operation vis a vis the DXCC desk. I
> > know for a fact that you don't remember everything you've written.
> > I surely don't accurately recall each thing I've written over the years.
>
> That is correct.
>
> > I have a reasonably good idea of the essence of the things I've
> > written. For anything more detailed, there is Google (as evidence by):
> >
> > "From: Dave Heil (k8mn@earthlink.net)
> > Subject: Re: Pictures Nobody Wants To See
> > Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> > Date: 2002-09-02 02:56:23 PST
> >
> > Brian P Burke wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3D7289D3.4A3F8136@earthlink.net...
> > > > Brian P Burke wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > > news:3D71A336.B37658AE@earthlink.net...
> > > > > > Brian P Burke wrote:
> > > > > > I'm sure the gang would have been quite happy to work a legitimate op
> > > > > > from Somalia using SSB. They didn't find one in you.
> > > > > >
> > > > > Certainly I'm legitimate. Why do you say I'm not? I asked permission,
> > > > > permission was granted. I operated.
> > > > >
> > > > Oh, I believe your parents married. Why do I say your operation from
> > > > Somalia isn't kosher?--Because you don't have anything which says
> > > > permission to operate an amateur radio station was granted. How do you
> > > > go about proving that you had permission?
```

> > >
> > > It was granted. Prove it wasn't.
> >
> > You'll have to prove that you were authorized to operate, Brian. You
> > can't do so because, as you've stated, you had only verbal permission.
> > Maybe you can dig up your military commander of the time and have him
> > issue retroactive permission.
> >
> > > > > I don't know of
> > > > > > any award program which sanctions operations from those not holding a
> > > > > > valid license in the country of operation.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > There is no government in Somalia, thus there are no valid Somalia licenses,
> > > > > > unless you want to consider some UN issued licenses Somalian. You must
> > > > > > accept the fact that Somalia is a paradox. I operated legally, yet I have
> > > > > > not provided the ARRL's DXCC desk with anything.
> > > > >
> > > > > If your miilitary commander had provided written permission like that
> > > > > issued by the United Nations, you'd have been operating legally. You
> > > > > operated on some guy's verbal authorization. You don't have anything to
> > > > > provide to the DXCC desk.
> > > >
> > > > Hmmm, back to the ARRL's DXCC desk. Is the dxcc desk the final authority on
> > > > legal amateur operations everywhere?
> > >
> > > For whether an operation will be accepted for DXCC credit or not? Yes.
> > > >
> > > > It would appear that Len is correct. You do view the ARRL as a
> > > > quasi-governmental entity capable of authorizing amateur operations in
> > > > foreign countries. Wow.
> > >
> > > This is the part where you begin to be the real Brian. You read
> > > something and draw an incorrect conclusion. The ARRL doesn't authorize
> > > operations. The ARRL sponsors DXCC. The DXCC desk decides whether an
> > > operation will be accepted for DXCC purposes. Where there is any
> > > question of an operation's legitimacy, the desk may request proof of
> > > licensing along with copies of passport entry or exit stamps and/or
> > > visas.
> > >
> > > <snip>"
> > >
> > > It doesn't appear that I said what you attributed to me.
> >
> > Military members move between countries often without passports,
> > entry/exit stamps, or visas. Based upon your wisdom, Operation
> > Restore Hope never happened.

The DXCC desk is familiar with how military members travel. They'd
understand how you wouldn't necessarily have a visa, entry or exit
stamps or even a passport. They wouldn't understand how you'd have no

written document authorizing you to get on the air from Somalia.

> You continue to assume that if the ARRL DXCC doesn't accept an
> operation that it is illegal, aka bootlegging, aka Mog Slim.

You just can't be that dumb. I've clearly separated the idea of
legality of operation from DXCC acceptance in any number of posts.

> You've used all three descriptors.

Mogadishu Slim can cover both 1) illegality of operation and 2)
non-acceptance by the DXCC desk for credit. I feel comfortable in
calling you "Slim" because you fit in both categories.

> Yet you are not the Somali government, you are not a military
> commander, you are not the U.N., you are not a world court, and you
> are not the FCC. Yet you declare my operation illegal. You have
> unimaginable powers. Who/what are you again?

Let's do it again. I'm a guy who knows you have no paperwork
documenting your operation. It really doesn't require much in the way
of powers.

> Because you don't -think- DXCC will accept it.

I already KNOW the DXCC desk won't accept it without documentation.
There's only one way for you to put that to the test. Have someone
submit one of your QSL cards for T5 credit on his DXCC. Then stand back
and see what happens.
Oddly enough, in all the time which has passed since your supposed
operation, not one single individual has ever submitted a T5/N0IMD card
for DXCC credit.
That is really quite odd.

Dave K8MN

175. Re: Adding something extra to a CQ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-03 05:59:56 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E1526CE.1C4709B1@earthlink.net>
Source record: 59258

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E14B2FB.572A774F@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E13CED5.5F323D3C@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> >
> > > > > You continued
> > > > > > to believe that all the information necessary for permission was
> > > > > > contained in a couple of lines of text.
> > > > >
> > > > > I continue to believe that it was 1,000 better than the information
> > > > > you gave.
> > > >
> > > > So we encounter yet another of your difficulties.
> > >
> > > Not if we accept that you were simply wrong. I do.
> >
> > You are an army of one.
>
> No, I aimed higher.

...and completely missed the target.

> > > > > > Meanwhile, I did have permission from someone authorized to do so,
> > > > > > even when you said that a military commander could NOT do so.
> > > > >
> > > > > Nope. You CLAIM to have had permission from someone just up the chain
> > > > > from you.
> > > >
> > > > No, I said commander.
> > >
> > > The commander of U.S. forces in Somalia during your stay can't be that
> > > difficult to locate.
> >
> > I briefed him daily. He wasn't hard to find at all.
> >
> > Great. What does he say about the permission you say he granted you?
>
> He's never given it a seconds thought, I assume. Why?

He could bring an end to your agony over the issue by simply jotting a
note confirming that he'd authorized you to operate from Somalia.

> > > > > You must have assumed that the material on the League's web
> > > > > > site meant any officer over you.
> > > > >
> > > > > No, the material on the ARRL web site was read by me 10 years after my
> > > > > tour in Somalia. It essentially state the same thing as the other
> > > > > amateur on station told me.
> >
> > You mean the guy who got it in writing?
>
> Did he?

He did.

> > > > > You must have assumed that it wasn't
> > > > > > important to have such permission in writing.
> > > > >
> > > > > That is correct.
> > > >
> > > > Well ain't you da fool!
> > >
> > > Well, yes. But it doesn't mean that I was a bootleger, nor does it mean I'm a liar.
> >
> > If there is nothing in existence which backs up your claim to have had
> > permission, you could be either.
>
> You could be a liar. Please show me something that says you're not.
>
> > > > > > > > To summarize:
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > It is apparent that only you, of all individuals operating from Somalia
> > > > > > > > > during that time period, neglected to get permission in writing from
> > > > > > > > > someone authorized to grant it. That it never dawned on you that this
> > > > > > > > > would be the thing to do, marks you as a rube.
> > >
> > > > > > > > > Yes, yes, Dave. You've said that before. But saying it and saying it
> > > > > > > > > often doesn't make it true, no matter how hard you wish it so.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > No, writing it doesn't make it true.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Hmmm.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > It is true because it is
> > > > > > > > > accurate.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > And my statement that I had permission from my commander is accurate.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Your proof for the above is?
> > > >
> > > > Didn't you just say that writing it doesn't make it true?

> >
> > No. Pay attention. I wrote that about the statement I made earlier.
>
> So some things in writing mean that they're true, and other things in
> writing could be false?

I think you might be getting the hang of it. Yes, the things which are
accurate statements are true. Those which are inaccurate are false.

> > > > > Him putting it in writing doesn't make it any truer.
> > > > >
> > > > > We'll never know if your statement was true since he didn't put it in
> > > > > writing.
> > > >
> > > > Didn't you just say that writing it doesn't make it true?
> > >
> > > No. Your oscillator is drifting. I wrote that about my statement, not
> > > about your statement.
> >
> > So your statement is true, or is it false? It's so hard to tell.

For you, apparently. C'mon, Brian. Study the words. You can do it.

> > > > > > I thought you might be sharper in 2003 than 2002.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Nope, I'm the same.
> > > > >
> > > > > So I see.
> > > >
> > > > How different will you be in 2003?
> > >
> > > I'll still be sharp.
> >
> > Its still early in the year, but I don't see it that way.

Right, 'cuz you're still the same.

Dave K8MN

176. Re: "one step closer to extinction" (Was: Re: Followup from K4ZDH)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-03 06:04:30 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v1a9v9ibgdprbe@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 59259

"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:483495FB945D98F5.06886E62BD332F94.C9FEEE0CEF88F089@lp.airnews.net...
> What I really, really don't get...other than whatever financial experts
> might be able to explain, is why there are "cuts" for companies. C'mon.
> Enough is enough. It cannot be explained to me why it's beneficial to
> provide for corporations so that the working class can be protected and
keep
> jobs.

Because if you don't give them cuts they fly off to Mexico and make it
with lots cheaper labor costs, and you lose the American jobs. Since
NAFTA there hasn't been a good reason for a company not to take
a run for the border. Ask General Motors after they started making
Buicks down in old Mexico. BTW just a little added bit of info, if your
GM car has a 1 at the begining of the VIN number it's US made. The
number 2 is Canada, 3 is Mexico, J is Japan, and K is South Korea.
--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx

>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>
> "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
> news:av1feu11vv@enews3.newsguy.com...
> > What about another form of corporate welfare other that corporate
> subsidies,
> > and grants, what about abatements? If these corporations paid their
fair
> > share, then the tax burden would be smaller on all of us. For example I
> > will pick on the local largest corporation near me, Dow Chemical. If
they
> > paid even something as small as 1% percent of the value of the property
> they
> > own in Midland County, MI where the corporation is based, the tax burden
> on
> > the residences would be alot less..... One percent is not much on thier
> > bottom line, but for the average middle class or less person the relief
> > would be great.
> >
> > Obviously this would be in that "ideal" world.... Another spin on the
"I

> > gotta/had to do it, so do they" attitude.
> >
> > --
> > Ryan, KC8PMX
> > FF/MFR
> > REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
> > "Symbolism is for the simple minded....."
> >
> >
> > "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> >
news:0E16E4F538938A45.D7219D261CB972BE.664E01AFC557E247@lp.airnews.net...
> > > "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
> > > news:auukrf55b2@enews3.newsguy.com...
> > > > Hopefully that also includes corporate welfare too!
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > --
> > > > Ryan, KC8PMX
> > > > FF/MFR
> > > > REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
> > > >
> > > > "Symbolism is for the simple minded....."
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > Excellent point, Ryan. Unfortunately, corporate welfare seems like
"the
> > > thing" these days. Heck, what is up wid dat, anyway? If your
business
> > > can't make it, the govt. just hands over some money, huh? Y'know,
seems
> > > like countries in the rest of the world, and the corporate giants here
> get
> > > all the fringe benefits of our hard earned money.
> > >
> > > Kim W5TIT
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

177. Re: "one step closer to extinction" (Was: Re: Followup from K4ZDH)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-03 06:07:10 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v1aa49f4preb40@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 59260

```
"Captain Liberty" <Barrister54@socal.rr.com> wrote in message
news:777R9.64769$B31.14548607@twister.socal.rr.com...
>
> "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
> news:av1feu11vv@enews3.newsguy.com...
> > What about another form of corporate welfare other that corporate
> subsidies,
> > and grants, what about abatements? If these corporations paid their
fair
> > share, then the tax burden would be smaller on all of us. For example I
> > will pick on the local largest corporation near me, Dow Chemical. If
they
> > paid even something as small as 1% percent of the value of the property
> they
> > own in Midland County, MI where the corporation is based, the tax burden
> on
> > the residences would be alot less..... One percent is not much on thier
> > bottom line, but for the average middle class or less person the relief
> > would be great.
> >
> > Obviously this would be in that "ideal" world.... Another spin on the
"I
> > gotta/had to do it, so do they" attitude.
> >
>
> Yep. Don't tax you! Don't tax me! Tax that fellow behind that tree!!
> --
> Roger J. Buffington
> ------------------------------
> Writer P.J. O'Rourke said: "Politicians are wonderful people as long as
they
> stay away from things they don't understand, such as working for a
living."
>
>

And Bob Hope said that it was so cold in Washington DC that
the politicians had their hands in their own pockets.
--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx
```

178. Re: Another Morse Code Opinion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-03 06:22:26 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v1abac6jt0kv22@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 59261

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030102214556.22983.00000376@mb-mf.aol.com...
<SNIP>
> From KB9TMP
> >Have a "Hammy" New Year!
> Cute alterations of the word "ham" do not endear everyone. Just like
regularly
> in QST when people see the word "ham" in various signs. It's weird.

Are you out to rain on everyone's parade? If you don't like
ham radio the way it is. If you don't like ham radio operators
the way they are. Why are you a ham at all? It seems like you
are trying to change everyone to your version of radio. I started
doing the "Hammy" line because everyone else was saying
Happy New Year, and I thought I'd be a little different. If you
got your way my daughter when she was 2 years old would
have been chastised for saying "Happy Two Ears"!

V why don't you just chill out. You are the ONLY one in
here that has said anything about my little tag line. Even Bruce
who hates everyone and everything didn't say a word about
it, JUST YOU!
--
WW - KB9TMP
I can only please one person per day.
Today is not your day.
Tomorrow is not looking good either.
-- Dilbert

179. Re: Another Morse Code Opinion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-03 06:31:25 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v1abho9uotusf7@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 59262

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030102232036.10292.00001285@mb-ba.aol.com...
> In article <eAMQ9.10908$GF.5096557@twister.columbus.rr.com>, "Mike H.
KC8UBH"
> <mhaas@nospam.insight.rr.com> writes:
>
> >By the way - I heard a guy on 2 meters say "10-4" the other day. He
caught
> >himself and apologized...just wait till you start hearing that on HF!!!
> >
> >Take care,
> >
> >Mike H. - KC8UBH
>
> Mike:
>
> To the best of my knowledge, there is nothing illegal or improper about
using
> "10-codes" on VHF/UHF repeaters. The only possible problem would be that
> 10-codes tend to mean different things in different places, and on ham
radio,
> would not be as universally understood as "Q" signals -- which only have
one
> meaning anywhere they are used. For instance, if I was talking to you on
> 2-meters, and said I needed you to "10-100," what would you do?

Years ago when I did play with CBs I would have walked to the bathroom.
We were in a truckstop one night and one of the guys said he had to go
10-100. The guy who was behind the counter ask real excitedly where the
10-100 was at. Come to find out he was a retired cop and the dept. he
was on used that number for a homicide.

>How about a
> "10-21?" Or a "10-10?" These 10-codes mean specific things on my
company's
> radio system, but I've not heard them used much (if at all) anywhere else.
> However, having said that, certain 10-codes like 10-3, 10-4, 10-7, 10-8,
10-9,
> 10-19, and 10-36 seem to have pretty consistent meanings. Therefore, I
would
> not question their use on a ham radio repeater. Anyone who would is only
> playing "radio cop" and would be better off to mind his own business.
>
> Now, as usual, it's time for Kim to chime in with some typically puerile
> remark.

>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> I'll be 10-7 for the evening.
>

I use 10 codes and Signals around here all the time. But
when your on the fire frequencies or Emergency Management
frequency they expect it, and will tell you about it when you
DON'T use them. 59-605 is 10-42*
*(end of shift)
--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx

180. Re: CCR Issue Revisited

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-03 06:49:52 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v1ackeaekesv7f@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 59263

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.51.0301022047330.7051@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
<SNIP>
> >the question still remains: should I request congress to support my
amateur
> >radio interest by passing a bill that says I don't have to abide by the
> >contract I agreed to? Isn't that the same as someone who relishes
antique
> >cars being able to get a bunch of like-minded people together and go to
> >congress to pass a bill that says they can now have a "junkyard" (in the
> >eyes of their neighbors) because they are "special."
>
> ...But you are "special." You have been granted a federal license to
engage in
> an activity that an unlicensed individual can't (ignoring "third-party"
> transmissions). Under the 10th Amendment, the U.S. Government has
reserved the
> authority to regulate [most] radio to itself - so where do the state and
local
> governments, or the people themselves have the authority to impose any
law,
> rule, regulation, or agreement which infringes upon your federal license?
So,
> it can be argued from the Constitutional point of view that the CC&R's
weren't
> valid for you to begin with - and I think PRB-1 got at that at least with
> regard to the lower government laws, regulations, etc., ...
>

I never thought of it that way. That is like Indiana's scanner
law. It's illegal to carry a scanner in an auto in this state, except
for licensed ham radio operators who are exempt. I think your
onto something there. Since the FCC which is a federal agency
and it gave me the radio license, that makes me exempt from
state or local laws that would infringe on my federal rights
granted by them in issuing my license.
--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx

<SNIP #2>

181. Re: What country?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-03 06:56:01 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.h84csi1.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 59264
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Sun, 29 Dec 2002 10:22:35 +1000, Sivac wrote:

>> The worst mistake the FCC ever made was to discontinue the mandatory
>> use of call area prefixes to indicate the area from which a station is
>> operating.

>This is the best comment of all, I couldn't agree more.

Then you have little knowledge of the really stupid things that the
Five Tubeless Tyres (used to be The Seven Dwarfs) have done in the
field of serious telecommunication.

Of course, most hams have no concept of what the FCC does outside of
ham radio....

Nothing personal, OM....

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

182. Re: Another Morse Code Opinion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-03 08:06:23 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <av49tq8132s@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 59277

Is it a CB arguement? Or is it a relation to public service agencies have been using the 10codes as well as other terminology alot longer that cb'ers....? I slip up from time to time using terminology from my employment in emergency services..... for instance instead of copy or QSL, I have twice used (and quickly corrected) the term 10-3 or "message recieved." Work in a law enforcement capacity as well as a member of a On-call fire department as well as being a ham, sometimes this type of thing does happen.

Ryan KC8PMX

<snippage>
>
> >Irrelavant.
>
> To those who are concerned about the thinning out of the Amateur Radio
> gene pool, it is VERY relevent.
>
> >The "10-4" comment is just a way for you to introduce CB into the
> >argument.
>
> And it is that influx of CB-like lingo that has many people concerned,
> ergo VERY relevent, and unfortunately it goes hand-in-hand with the effort to
> dispense with Morse Code testing.
>
> Steve, K4YZ
>
>
>
>

183. Re: What country?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-03 08:13:47 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <av49ts9132s@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 59278
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3E13689B.8F700404@ix.netcom.com...
> Doug Smith wrote:
>
> >
> > Yikes. I didn't think there was a worse CW call than WB9NME. You've
> > proven me wrong<grin>!
>
> Guess my call WA2ISE would have a CW friendly suffix.
>
> Or you could pound out "whiskey bravo nine november mary echo" in CW.
:-)
>
^^^^^^^^

in morse code that is.

184. Re: You have to be kidding!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-03 08:47:31 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <av49ud1132s@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 59276

Good idere Dan,

Gee, We should probably start cleaning up the mess on HF and actually start using those bands from 10M up to 23cm more before we claim a need for the 5Mhz allocation potential. With over 100Mhz of frequencies from 28.000Mhz-1290Mhz, the usage doesn't justify the amount of frequencies allocated. Maybe things are different where you are at, but around here, things are quiet.....

As far as the HF thing, between the incessant contesting going on as well as some of our "finer" hams making excellent examples of the ham community, (look at some of the BS occuring in R.R.A.M.) I guess that would be another point we need to address.

We definitely need to "clean house" a bit before asking for more...
--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

"Symbolism is for the simple minded....."

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:auvsokgen1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
> How about a discussion of why we 'hams' think we deserve the 5 mhz band?
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>

185. Re: You have to be kidding!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-03 08:53:53 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <av49ud2132s@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 59275

A question (possibly for debate) on yes, morse code, not CW, is why did they chose when they did, the 5, 13 and 20wpm test rates? Why not 4 or 6, 12 or 14, or 19 or 21 respectively, what was so magical about those particular numbers? I can see the 5 and 20 from a mathmatical standpoint, but the 13 I can't see, why did they not go with either 10 or 15 as the middle code test requirement?? Just curious...

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

"Symbolism is for the simple minded....."

>
> How 'bout stirring up the pot on CCRs again?
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

186. Re: Another Morse Code Opinion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-03 13:16:30 UTC
From: "Mike H. KC8UBH" <mhaas@nospam.insight.rr.com>
Message-ID: <O2gR9.14903$GF.6561149@twister.columbus.rr.com>
Source record: 59265

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030102232036.10292.00001285@mb-ba.aol.com...
>
> Mike:
>
> To the best of my knowledge, there is nothing illegal or improper about
using
> "10-codes" on VHF/UHF repeaters. The only possible problem would be that
> 10-codes tend to mean different things in different places, and on ham
radio,
> would not be as universally understood as "Q" signals -- which only have
one
> meaning anywhere they are used. For instance, if I was talking to you on
> 2-meters, and said I needed you to "10-100," what would you do? How about
a
> "10-21?" Or a "10-10?" These 10-codes mean specific things on my
company's
> radio system, but I've not heard them used much (if at all) anywhere else.
> However, having said that, certain 10-codes like 10-3, 10-4, 10-7, 10-8,
10-9,
> 10-19, and 10-36 seem to have pretty consistent meanings. Therefore, I
would
> not question their use on a ham radio repeater. Anyone who would is only
> playing "radio cop" and would be better off to mind his own business.
>
> Now, as usual, it's time for Kim to chime in with some typically puerile
> remark.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> I'll be 10-7 for the evening.
>

Perfectly well aware of all that, Larry. I would find their use
disconcerting if I began hearing them often. I'm hard pressed to believe
that many Hams would appreciate their usage either - if ONLY because of
their negative connotations due to their association with CB.

Yes - 20 years ago I had a CB because it was instant gratification. As I
got older and became less afraid of some good-old-fashioned hard work, I
didn't mind at all doing some learning and taking some tests.

Morse Code is pretty neat and despite what V has to say about it, it is a
pretty lively corpse (as others have noted) that isn't going to "die"
anytime soon - certainly not in my lifetime.

If V wants to work HF as badly as I do - he'll learn...kicking and screaming - but he'll learn!

73
KC8UBH

187. Re: Another Morse Code Opinion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-03 13:53:25 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030103085325.27370.00000446@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 59266

>Subject: Re: Another Morse Code Opinion
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 1/2/03 8:45 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030102214556.22983.00000376@mb-mf.aol.com>

>> THAT was an opinion, Dr Shah.
>The original poster said it was a great experience (for everyone). I said
>it's
>arguable. You said it's an opinion. So, you agree with me.

Ah ah ahhhhh! Don't get caught telling fibs, Vipul! The original poster saud NOTHING about "great experience for everyone"...! THOSE are YOUR words, Sir! Shall I requote his specific comment here for your edification?

QUOTE:

I'm glad I studied it. :) Even if I never use code again after I upgrade, it was a great experience I wouldn't trade for anything.

UNQUOTE

The author SPECIFICALLY STATED "I" three times...Not once did he make ANY inference that it was a "great experience (for everyone)"

>Just because something takes effort, does not mean its relevant to amateur
>radio.

Sure it does. The expenditure of the time, effort and talent make it VERY relevent. Morse Code proficiency are STILL important to Amateur Radio on several levels.

That it is not important to YOU is YOUR opinion.

>>To those who are concerned about the thinning out of the Amateur Radio
>>gene pool, it is VERY relevent.
>
>Gene pool?

Yes, Vipul, "gene pool".

>Except for saying your call sign every 10 min, you can say what you want. Why
>should this person apologize for saying "10-4"?

Because when it starts sounding like a parody of a 1970's era trucker movie, it is time to stop. Better yet to never allow it to stop.

Ironic, isn't it, that you spend sooooooooo much time "dissing" Amateur Radio operators for the use of what you call "codewords", yet you jump to the defense of the use of the yen code on Amateur Radio allocations..?!?!

>>I'd
>>really rather not hear CB lingo. Its an awful reminder of what the bands
>>*could* degenerate into if we're not careful.
>
>"Reminder" does not equal band degenerate. Its only because you feel that
>way.
>You just hate CBers

How do you come to the conclusion that because someone does not want to hear CB-radio type lingo on Amateur Radio that they "hate CBers"..?!?!

I don't like CB lingo on Amateur Radio either, but I don't hate CBers. I USE CB radio from time to time, and on 11 meters I say "10-4" if it's use is in context of the transmission. (No, I do not use "roga-dee", "negatory". "what's the 20?", "good buddy" or other "CB" specific slang)

>Lets keep all "lingo" to a minimum.

Why? Because YOU don't understand it? Have fun tryng to convince the other estimated 10 million CB and Amateur users in the United States, not to mention internationally.

>From KB9TMP
>>Have a "Hammy" New Year!

>Cute alterations of the word "ham" do not endear everyone. Just like
>regularly
>in QST when people see the word "ham" in various signs. It's weird.

His "alteration" of the word "ham" is not what is wierd in this forum, Vipul. Your lack of undersanding of the American use of the English language is.

Steve, K4YZ

188. Re: What country?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-03 13:59:35 UTC
From: Kevin Williams <kwilliams4@wwbcstingnet.net>
Message-ID: <av44vq$fd9$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 59267
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

During my days in professional broadcasting, it never ceased to
amaze me how virtually all ham radio operators believed the
sole function of the FCC was to regulate ham radio. Those of us
who worked professionally in communications, as well as holding
ham tickets, found this amusing!

Kevin Williams

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.h84csi1.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Sun, 29 Dec 2002 10:22:35 +1000, Sivac wrote:
>
> >> The worst mistake the FCC ever made was to discontinue the mandatory
> >> use of call area prefixes to indicate the area from which a station is
> >> operating.
>
> >This is the best comment of all, I couldn't agree more.
>
> Then you have little knowledge of the really stupid things that the
> Five Tubeless Tyres (used to be The Seven Dwarfs) have done in the
> field of serious telecommunication.
>
> Of course, most hams have no concept of what the FCC does outside of
> ham radio....
>
> Nothing personal, OM....
>
> ---
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
> From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
> Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon
>
>

189. Re: Another Morse Code Opinion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-03 14:00:59 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030103090059.27370.00000447@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 59268

>Subject: Re: Another Morse Code Opinion
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
>Date: 1/3/03 7:53 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030103085325.27370.00000446@mb-bk.aol.com>

>>> THAT was an opinion, Dr Shah.
>>The original poster said it was a great experience (for everyone). I said
>>it's
>>arguable. You said it's an opinion. So, you agree with me.
>
> Ah ah ahhhhh! Don't get caught telling fibs, Vipul! The original poster
>saud NOTHING about "great experience for everyone"...! THOSE are YOUR words,
>Sir! Shall I requote his specific comment here for your edification?
>
>QUOTE:
>
>I'm glad I studied it. :) Even if I never use code again after I upgrade, it
>was a great experience I wouldn't trade for anything.
>
>UNQUOTE

Excuse me....FOUR times...Even better...! ! !

Steve, K4YZ

190. Re: ARRL certification program

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-03 14:02:38 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030103090238.02229.00000273@mb-mu.aol.com>
Source record: 59269

>You think they should be free or what??
>
>w3rv

I think the new Ham should at least know the Basic materiaL before he is given
a license.

191. Re: Another Morse Code Opinion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-03 14:09:26 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030103090926.02229.00000274@mb-mu.aol.com>
Source record: 59270

>Even Bruce
>who hates everyone and everything didn't say a word about
>it, JUST YOU!

Well it must have slipped by me. Im in favor of the 10 Codes, anything that will help us get closier to CB is a good thing, bring um on Good Buddy

192. Re: Why hams think we deserve the 5 mhz band (was: You have to be kidding!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-03 14:16:34 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0301030616.25e11e3d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59272

Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns92F6D294E24E0elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...

> If I want to work any DX above 3.8 and below 14.15 MHz, I have to use
> split VFOs, and hope that someone will listen up above 7.15 while I am
> listening below 7.1, and this will get more important again as the
> sunspots go away.

From a dxers perspective working split is a good idea, phone, cw, 40
or anywhere else. Particularly on the low bands the dx is usually weak
and gets buried in the piles when running transceive. So nobody works
the guy and he gives up and goes away. Let me count the times . . You
might notice that most of the expeditions always run split for this
reason. I'm all for the dx having phone privs on freqs below our band
limits. God bless dual VFOs.

There is also a fairness issue involved, the dx is much more likely to
be able to work other dx in those segements without getting hounded
and pounded by the U.S. hordes.

> 5 MHz looks like the best hope right now.

60m for us has been put on hold for now but it's moving forward in
other countries. There are Canadians working Brits on 60m right now
and the Germans are likely to join the party. It's only a matter of
time for us.

>
> Is this a serious enough policy discussion for you? It's still phone ops v
> CW ops, though, or at least someone will turn it into that within the next
> two posts!

If phone was permitted to the lower band edges most of the bitching
would come from the phone ops, not the cw and digital ops. All the cw
& digital ops have to do is engage their narrow filters and there goes
80-90% of the energy in a phone signal and away the beepers go like
the phone signal isn't even there in a large number of instances.
Happens all the time on 40 when it gets down to the beepers vs. the
broadcast stations.

>
> 73 de Alun, N3KIP

w3rv

193. Re: You have to be kidding! I saw it coming.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-03 15:10:01 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <dJhR9.54243$4j5.7332444@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 59271

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0301022022.2032842a@posting.google.com...
> NoName <user@computer.net> wrote in message
news:<ii191vofi9n05fc3f2sbbb43f9pdhp8ngd@4ax.com>...
>
> [snip] ... The ARRL has worked around the regulations with respect to the
Morse
> Code exams. The so called 5WPM Morse Code exam currently administered
> is really a 13-15WPM Farnsworth exam. Slight of hand, shell game,
> whatever you want to call it, but its not a 5WPM Morse exam as
> required by Part 97.
>

If you want to and take the time to arrange it ahead of time with the VEs, you can have a test at the 5wpm character speed rather than the Farnsworth but doing it that way is much harder. The letters come so slowly that there isn't enough space between the letters for the mind to have time to react when you are a beginner. With the Farnsworth type, the examinee has time to think between letters. He/she hears "di dah dah" followed by a space long enough to think "oh yeah, that's a W". On the other hand when it is "diiii daaaah daaaah," he/she doesn't have any time to think before the next letter but must immediately respond "W" so as not to lose the beginning of the next letter. Of course as a person continues to improve, they simply respond and don't have to think about the letters but even that is easier and faster to do via the Farnsworth approach.

Learning and testing using the Farnsworth approach is MUCH easier.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

194. Re: Another Morse Code Opinion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-03 15:38:41 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030103103841.01700.00000131@mb-mm.aol.com>
Source record: 59273

In article <O0WQ9.11755$GF.5510788@twister.columbus.rr.com>, "Mike H. KC8UBH"
<mhaas@nospam.insight.rr.com> writes:

> I might be able to pass the 5WPM,
>but by no means feel I've "learned" Morse Code.

You have learned it at a basic level. Just like other things, there's more to
learn!

>I talked to a guy recently
>who can do 40WPM...in his car...yikes!!!

You could do that, too. He was once a 5 wpm beginner. He just kept learning.

>Also - look up "Early Telegraphy" on the 'Net, and take a look at our
>predecesors...when their networks were called in their own day, "The Highway
>of Intelligence". Sound familiar? These guys (and gals) would go back to
>the office at night, get on the key, and talk to their friends all over the
>US and even across the ocean. I'd love to know what those conversations
>were like 160 years ago!!!

A good book on the subject is "The Victorian Internet", about the development
of the telegraph and its effect on society. If you think radical technological
change is just a 20th-21st century thing, consider that the communications
options available to President Andrew Jackson and Julius Caesar were almost
identical. But by the time Lincoln became president, practically instantaneous
electrical communication across the country and under the sea was commonplace.
>
>> >So what's my opinion?
>> >
>> >I'm glad I studied it. :) Even if I never use code again after I
>> >upgrade,
>> >it was a great experience I wouldn't trade for anything.
>>
>> Yup, me too.

Feels good, huh?

>> >Do I care if they do away with code? Not really - but they damn well
>> >better
>> >make the written test one hell of a lot harder.

Don't hold your breath! Besides the code test changes back in 2000, FCC reduced
the number of tests and the total number of questions. Less written testing as
well as less code testing.

>> > When its as easy to get
>> >your General as it is to get your Tech - HF is going to get really
>> >stinky.

Not on CW!
>>
>> Agreed. The test should be harder. Even then though, it won't
>> necessarily "keep the neighborhood clean" Lots of offenders have been
>> licensed for a long time, before presumed dumbed-down tests were
>> around. The key to keeping things on the up and up is hams who won't
>> tolerate on air abuse, and an enforcement system that backs them up.

Take a look at the FCC enforcement actions, and see how many are for hams using
voice vs. hams using Morse.
>>
>> >By the way - I heard a guy on 2 meters say "10-4" the other day. He
>> >caught
>> >himself and apologized...just wait till you start hearing that on HF!!!
>>
>> We have a fellow who says 10-4 on our repeater, and a few who
>> ask for "handles". All are fine hams.

Yup. "Handle" is actually very old jargon for "first name". CB took it and
redefined it as "nickname used to obscure the identity of its user".
>
>I personally find it disconcerting. The guy really did apologize but I'd
>really rather not hear CB lingo. Its an awful reminder of what the bands
>*could* degenerate into if we're not careful.

Exactly.
>
>I'm not suggesting however that Code will keep that from happening. As long
>as the standards are high enough where it takes some work to get your
>ticket - I think we'll be fine.

Entry standards are only one part of the picture. Enforcement by FCC is
another. Non-tolerance of violations is yet another part.

73 de Jim, N2EY

195. Re: K1MAN

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-03 15:39:38 UTC
From: NoName <user@computer.net>
Message-ID: <phbb1vkurum7v0gsr5llrun18cqf75ogv2@4ax.com>
Source record: 59274
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

On Thu, 02 Jan 2003 23:15:41 GMT, LRod@removethispartpobox.com (LRod)
wrote:

>On Thu, 02 Jan 2003 23:05:16 GMT, wf3h@ptnospam.com wrote:
>
>>On Thu, 2 Jan 2003 12:34:24 -0500, "QSL" <QRL@qslqrzqrlxxx.net> wrote:
>>
>>> K1MAN has made the FCC and Riley the laughing stock of
>>>the world! T
>>
>>funny...riley got a standing ovation at dayton this year.
>>
>>oh well, morons have a reality all their own.
>
>Dan, W4NTI, whether you like him or not, said it best:
>"you cain't fix stupid."

The proper quote is:

"Ignorance can be fixed but stupid is forever."

Dan does put a nice hillbilly tone on it though.

>
>
>LRod
>
>Master Woodbutcher and seasoned termite
>
>Shamelessly whoring my website since 1999
>
>http://www.woodbutcher.net

196. Re: You have to be kidding!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-03 18:34:50 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <eJkR9.54264$4j5.7349497@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 59279

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:av49ud2132s@enews2.newsguy.com...
> A question (possibly for debate) on yes, morse code, not CW, is why did
they
> chose when they did, the 5, 13 and 20wpm test rates? Why not 4 or 6, 12
or
> 14, or 19 or 21 respectively, what was so magical about those particular
> numbers? I can see the 5 and 20 from a mathmatical standpoint, but the 13
I
> can't see, why did they not go with either 10 or 15 as the middle code
test
> requirement?? Just curious...

I'm not really sure but I have seen it mentioned that there is a "barrier" at 10wpm. At this speed, one can still "count" the dots and dashes and relate to a letter. Just above this speed, one must act on reflex. So this may be the reason for not having chose 10wpm as one of the levels. Perhaps 13 is the lowest speed where one must copy on reflex.

Caveat: The above is speculation on my part.

Though in practice, I find that there isn't a significant difference between 13 and 15. However I do notice the difference when it goes above 15.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

197. Re: Another Morse Code Opinion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-03 18:40:55 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <XOkR9.54266$4j5.7350053@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 59280

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030103103841.01700.00000131@mb-mm.aol.com...
> [snip]
> Don't hold your breath! Besides the code test changes back in 2000, FCC
reduced
> the number of tests and the total number of questions. Less written
testing as
> well as less code testing.

Although the examinee answers fewer questions to get a license, the question pools are larger. For example, the new Tech pool covers all the material that used to be covered in the Novice and Tech pools. So one still has to study just as much material as before. The new Extra pool now covers all the material that was in the old Advanced and Extra pools. So again the examinee mus still study just as much as before.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

198. Re: What country?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-03 19:15:06 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301031115.37537be7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59281
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E1521B7.4FC2C428@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:

> > I pointed out that someone can be
> > > directly in charge of you and still not be the commander who can
> > > authorize amateur radio operation in a country.
> >
> > A commander has ucmj authority to courts martial and/or non-judicial
> > punishment. I'm fully aware of what a commander is.
>
> > And a commander has the authority to give permission to a subordinate
> > to operate amateur radio in Somalia, a fact which you said was wrong
> > wrong wrong.
>
> ...if one assumes that two lines on the ARRL web page are the sum total
> of knowledge and information on the subject.

As I've said before, it's 1,000 times more information than you had
when you said that a military commander couldn't authorize any such
thing.

> > Apparently you're still missing the point.
>
> You don't have a point. You have no commander willing to stick his neck
> out and say that he gave you permission to operate. You have no
> paperwork stating that you had permission to operate.

When I operated I had permission. I'm no longer there. My commander
is no longer there. I no longer sign "portable T5."

What more do you want?

> > > It doesn't matter
> > > much. You didn't get written permission from anyone at all.
> > >
> > > > Do I need to start counting cadence so you won't trip over your own
> > > > bootlaces?
> > > >
> > > > Naw, too late. Just dust yourself off and keep going.
> > >
> > > You can count all the cadence you like. I'm no longer in the military
> > > and I'm wearing moccasins.
> >
> > I can tell. Too much time and distance to discern what a commander is
> > or is not.

>
> I don't need to recognize a commander. I've had proper written
> permission every place I've operated. Each operation was credited for
> DXCC.

You were never in a situation where a commander had the authority to authorize amateur operations. You have no experience in such matters. You even went so far as to say that commanders cannot authorize any amateur authorizations.

It was me who has provided you with such an education.

199. Re: What country?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-03 19:20:50 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301031120.8246cc0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59282
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E152255.D8E628AE@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E14BA0D.52E24E8F@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E11CAB5.AEDE954C@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E0F282B.4DACAF4D@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E0E7DB8.2728433A@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E0D48F8.E243C02B@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > "K HB" <k hb@arrl.DOTORG> wrote in message news:<kV%O9.1862
> > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > > The FCC could care less about DXCC
> > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > > Dave confuses DXCC with FCC. Ditto his minions. You five need a one
on one.
> > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > > Do you have a single reference of such a comment from me?
> > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > > Yes.
> > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > > Then put up or shut up.
> > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > > You claimed my Somalia operation was illegal based upon ARRL DXCC rules.
> > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > No, I claimed and still do, that your operation was not acceptable for
> > > > > > > > > > > > DXCC credit. Without supporting documentation, you can never make it
> > > > > > > > > > > > so.
> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > How do you characterize your use of the term "bootlegging?"

> > > > >
> > > > > I do not and did not claim that you were a bootlegger based upon
> > > > > violation of DXCC rules. You were a bootlegger because you have no
> > > > > documentation to support your claim that you had permission to
> > > > > operate. You have no military or UN issued paperwork? Too bad.
> > > > >
> > > > > You did, based upon DXCC rules, claim my operation was illegal. But
> > > > > you have been wrong on so many counts that you really don't recall
> > > > > what you've said anymore.
> > > >
> > > > Google does:
> > > >
> > > > quote From: Dave Heil (k8mn@earthlink.net)
> > > > Subject: Re: ARRL Members -- protest this action to your director
> > > > Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> > > > Date: 2002-09-12 06:15:32 PST
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > Brian P Burke wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > > news:3D7E8A0D.ACC5D04D@earthlink.net...
> > > > > > Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> > > > > So DXCC is the final licensing authority in the world?
> > > > >
> > > > > I guess you're back to that again.
> > > >
> > > > How many times must I tell you before it sinks in:
> > > >
> > > > 1) The DXCC desk (with advice from the DXAC) is the final arbiter on
> > > > what is accepted for DXCC credit.
> > > >
> > > > 2) (a separate issue) You have no proof of permission to operate from
> > > > Somalia at all *punto* unquote
> > > >
> > > > Now, what was it that you were sure I told you?
> > >
> > > You claimed that my operation from Somalia was illegal based upon DXCC
> > > acceptance/nonacceptance. You continue to amend your statements as I
> > > call you to the carpet for each inaccuracy.
>
> Read it again, Brian. That isn't what it says at all.

I see you talking about the DXCC desk again. I don't see you mention
any other "authority."

> > You're learning, but only slowly.
>
> Don't just stand there mumbling to yourself, DO something.

I have no proof that I was authorized to drive equipment up to 5 tons, motorboats up to 27 feet, etc. But I did. And it was legal.

Oh gosh, now what?

Are you going to give me a retroactive no-ops citation?

200. Re: Wonder?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-03 20:08:22 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <v1brejd8kl3d00@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 59283

Here's a scary thought, Kim. Can you imagine if there was a sanity test to get your license renewal? I'd bet half of this newsgroup would loose their ticket! ;) Bush wants to go to war, and all the whining around here is either about CW or your callsign. ..... Well, another year is here and I can't see any difference in this group ;)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.435 / Virus Database: 244 - Release Date: 12/30/02

201. Re: You have to be kidding!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-03 20:11:27 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <v1brkblf1pcr60@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 59284

If you **really** want to see a crazy amateur newsgroup, check out rec.radio.amateur.misc - now **there** is a newsgroup ;) Be sure and wear a flame proof suit.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim

"Gilbert Biro Simon" <testing1234@cfl.rr.com> wrote in message news:u0IQ9.200225$Db4.5618767@twister.tampabay.rr.com...
> I signed on to this page looking for Ham Radio Rules, Regulations, and
> Policies. Now I find out that it is only populated by a bunch of teenagers
> with no minds and no place else to prove it.
>
> I find no technical information, just a bunch of internet wanna-be's
> offering their opinion on everything from Mexican whores to American pigs.
>
> As the hungarians put it Buz Meg to all of you!
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.435 / Virus Database: 244 - Release Date: 12/30/02

202. Re: Another Morse Code Opinion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-03 21:33:12 UTC
From: "Mike H. KC8UBH" <mhaas@nospam.insight.rr.com>
Message-ID: <sknR9.15607$GF.6898825@twister.columbus.rr.com>
Source record: 59285

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030103103841.01700.00000131@mb-mm.aol.com...
> In article <O0WQ9.11755$GF.5510788@twister.columbus.rr.com>, "Mike H.
KC8UBH"
> <mhaas@nospam.insight.rr.com> writes:
>
> > I might be able to pass the 5WPM,
> >but by no means feel I've "learned" Morse Code.
>
> You have learned it at a basic level. Just like other things, there's more
to
> learn!

I find that I'm making noticeable progress about every 4 days or so -
miniscule - but enough that I notice.
>
> >I talked to a guy recently
> >who can do 40WPM...in his car...yikes!!!
>
> You could do that, too. He was once a 5 wpm beginner. He just kept
learning.

Not so sure - I don't think that I'll ever be able to see code in my head
like he does, "like a ticker tape", because I know my memory doesn't work
that way. Example - I can add in my head fine, but give me 3, 2 or 3 digit
numbers to add together and I'll end up forgeting what one of them was.

>
> >Also - look up "Early Telegraphy" on the 'Net, and take a look at our
> >predecesors...when their networks were called in their own day, "The
Highway
> >of Intelligence". Sound familiar? These guys (and gals) would go back
to
> >the office at night, get on the key, and talk to their friends all over
the
> >US and even across the ocean. I'd love to know what those conversations
> >were like 160 years ago!!!
>
> A good book on the subject is "The Victorian Internet", about the
development
> of the telegraph and its effect on society. If you think radical
technological
> change is just a 20th-21st century thing, consider that the communications
> options available to President Andrew Jackson and Julius Caesar were
almost

> identical. But by the time Lincoln became president, practically
instantaneous
> electrical communication across the country and under the sea was
commonplace.
> >

Yup, and we've totally forgotten the AWESOME feat of laying the first trans-atlantic cable. (By the way - how did they overcome resistance in 2000 mi of cable? On land, they had "repeaters" - batteries, basically - every 50 mi or so.)

> >> >So what's my opinion?
> >> >
> >> >I'm glad I studied it. :) Even if I never use code again after I
> >> >upgrade,
> >> >it was a great experience I wouldn't trade for anything.
> >>
> >> Yup, me too.
>
> Feels good, huh?

Yeah. If Vipul just sat down and devoted about 10 minutes a day for a month, I bet he'd change his opinion. BUT - I'm NOT saying I'll actually use it. I want to see what happens in the next week. I take the test on Jan 11 (same across the country I think).

>
> >> >Do I care if they do away with code? Not really - but they damn well
> >> >better
> >> >make the written test one hell of a lot harder.
>
> Don't hold your breath! Besides the code test changes back in 2000, FCC
reduced
> the number of tests and the total number of questions. Less written
testing as
> well as less code testing.
>
> >> > When its as easy to get
> >> >your General as it is to get your Tech - HF is going to get really
> >> >stinky.
>
> Not on CW!

Yeah, well...I guess that goes without saying! ;)

>
> Entry standards are only one part of the picture. Enforcement by FCC is
> another. Non-tolerance of violations is yet another part.

Well...2 meters is certainly full of self-appointed "enforcers" - and most of the time, I think their interpretation of our rules involve a lot of straw grabbing - but I'll save THAT conversation for a different thread.

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

73
KC8UBH, Mike H.

203. Re: ARRL certification program

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-03 23:23:48 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0301031523.17cbe8de@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59286

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030103090238.02229.00000273@mb-mu.aol.com>...
> >You think they should be free or what??
> >
> >w3rv
>
> I think the new Ham should at least know the Basic materiaL before he is given
> a license.

That's obvious. The ARRL certification programs are for certs on
specific narrow subjects like emergency ops, antenna modeling, etc.
which have nothing do do with "basic materials". In fact they're well
beyond the basics. The info is in the ARRL website.

w3rv

204. Re: You have to be kidding! I saw it coming.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-04 00:08:54 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0301031608.4754d284@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59287

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<dJhR9.54243$4j5.7332444@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0301022022.2032842a@posting.google.com...
> > NoName <user@computer.net> wrote in message
> news:<ii191vofi9n05fc3f2sbbb43f9pdhp8ngd@4ax.com>...
> >
> > [snip] ... The ARRL has worked around the regulations with respect to the
> Morse
> > Code exams. The so called 5WPM Morse Code exam currently administered
> > is really a 13-15WPM Farnsworth exam. Slight of hand, shell game,
> > whatever you want to call it, but its not a 5WPM Morse exam as
> > required by Part 97.
> >
>
> If you want to and take the time to arrange it ahead of time with the VEs,
> you can have a test at the 5wpm character speed rather than the Farnsworth
> but doing it that way is much harder. The letters come so slowly that there
> isn't enough space between the letters for the mind to have time to react
> when you are a beginner. With the Farnsworth type, the examinee has time to
> think between letters. He/she hears "di dah dah" followed by a space long
> enough to think "oh yeah, that's a W". On the other hand when it is
> "diiii daaaah daaaah," he/she doesn't have any time to think before the next
> letter but must immediately respond "W" so as not to lose the beginning of
> the next letter. Of course as a person continues to improve, they simply
> respond and don't have to think about the letters but even that is easier
> and faster to do via the Farnsworth approach.
>
> Learning and testing using the Farnsworth approach is MUCH easier.

Amen. Every time something comes up which Brainiac can't do, didn't do
or won't do there's an excuse. Some folk are into contesting, some are
into digital work, some are experimenters, his specialty in the hobby
is excuses published in RRAP.

>
> Dee Flint, N8UZE

w3rv

205. Re: Why hams think we deserve the 5 mhz band (was: You have to be kidding!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-04 00:22:47 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns92F8C50B09522elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 59288

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
news:d22b54c3.0301030616.25e11e3d@posting.google.com:

> Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:<Xns92F6D294E24E0elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>
>
>> If I want to work any DX above 3.8 and below 14.15 MHz, I have to use
>> split VFOs, and hope that someone will listen up above 7.15 while I am
>> listening below 7.1, and this will get more important again as the
>> sunspots go away.
>
> From a dxers perspective working split is a good idea, phone, cw, 40
> or anywhere else.

So you think it's a good idea to use twice the bandwidth!

> Particularly on the low bands the dx is usually weak
> and gets buried in the piles when running transceive. So nobody works
> the guy and he gives up and goes away. Let me count the times . . You
> might notice that most of the expeditions always run split for this
> reason.

Funnily enough, I haven't noticed any such thing. Most DXpeditions seem to
operate without using split, at least on phone. I wouldn't object to them
using split atall, but that's a different issue.

> I'm all for the dx having phone privs on freqs below our band
> limits. God bless dual VFOs.
>
> There is also a fairness issue involved, the dx is much more likely to
> be able to work other dx in those segements without getting hounded
> and pounded by the U.S. hordes.

But on 40 we have no common frequencies!

That's indefensible, and quite different from having a small 'no-US' zone.

>
>> 5 MHz looks like the best hope right now.
>
> 60m for us has been put on hold for now but it's moving forward in
> other countries. There are Canadians working Brits on 60m right now
> and the Germans are likely to join the party. It's only a matter of
> time for us.

>
>>
>> Is this a serious enough policy discussion for you? It's still phone
>> ops v CW ops, though, or at least someone will turn it into that
>> within the next two posts!
>
> If phone was permitted to the lower band edges most of the bitching
> would come from the phone ops, not the cw and digital ops.

Nobody wants phone all the way to the lower band edges - just something more like the rest of the world have. Well, actually in most countries you can operate phone to the lower band edge, but people don't, they follow their bandplans, albeit those are very different from the ARRL's. The Region 1 bandplan allows phone down to 3.63, 7.045, 14.112 and I forget exactly where on 15m (used to be 21.15, but I know it was changed), and their 80 and 40m bands only go up to 3.8 and 7.1.

All I actually asked for was phone from 7.075-7.1, which I really don't think is unreasonable, but I should ask the FCC, not Usenet!

Since you bring it up, most of the bitching now is from DX phone operators who have to put up with the bleeping of US digital and CW ops in their phone subbands, so in that sense you are partly right.

> All the cw
> & digital ops have to do is engage their narrow filters and there goes
> 80-90% of the energy in a phone signal and away the beepers go like
> the phone signal isn't even there in a large number of instances.
> Happens all the time on 40 when it gets down to the beepers vs. the
> broadcast stations.
>
>>
>> 73 de Alun, N3KIP
>
> w3rv
>

206. Re: Thanks GAP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-04 00:31:55 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0301031631.36419aef@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59289
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

"K HB" <k hb@arrl.DOTORG> wrote in message
news:<iV3Q9.4919$9N5.489585@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote
>
> : I have one of those GAPs....I assume your talking about the 45 foot GAP
> : Voyager DX...?? I didn't really like the way it was working on 160. How
> : does yours do Hans?
>
> It's a reasonably good transmitting antenna given its footprint, but noisy
> on receive (the curse of verticals!). To receive I use a horizontal loop

What are the dimensions of your loop, how high is it and how effective
is it on rcv vs. other 160 rcvng antennas you've used?

A year ago when I was recovering from some nasty surgery I stayed at
one of my brothers' places. Four acres of ancient hardwoods. I'd
previously managed to get 475 feet of "random wire" up around 40 feet
and got on 160 for a couple weeks. First time I've ever managed to get
on 160. What a beautiful place to do ham radio. The band that is.

Tnx.

> and during contests string some temporary beverages.
>
> ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ 73, de Hans, K0HB

w3rv

207. Re: Wonder?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-04 00:41:00 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <av5ahl$t2j$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 59290

Maybe everyone is trying to keep their minds off of what a mushroom cloud would look like in the early evenings.

Dan/W4NTI

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message news:v1brejd8kl3d00@corp.supernews.com...
> Here's a scary thought, Kim. Can you imagine if there was a sanity test to
> get your license renewal? I'd bet half of this newsgroup would loose their
> ticket! ;) Bush wants to go to war, and all the whining around here is
> either about CW or your callsign. ..... Well, another year is here and I
> can't see any difference in this group ;)
>
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
> ---
> Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
> Version: 6.0.435 / Virus Database: 244 - Release Date: 12/30/02
>
>

208. Re: K1MAN

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-04 01:12:48 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E163510.70108@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 59296
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

N0VFP 2.0 wrote:
> "Brian" <k3vr@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> news:4bfc7bb.0301020910.35f0e9b3@posting.google.com...
>
>>Interesting reading related to K1MAN's IARN activities world-wide.
>>
>>http://users.adelphia.net/~k3vr/trex.htm
>
>
> Your webpage is liblous fraud. And u are a fraud too......

I thought it pretty well sumed things up about baxterboy.

209. ARRL PROVIDING FCC LICENSE RENEWAL TO NONMEMBERS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-04 02:13:55 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301031813.20c6a139@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59291

Who was it that was so opposed to W5YI charging $5 for license reneals?

From the ARRL Letter, Vol 22, No 01

ARRL PROVIDING FCC LICENSE RENEWAL, ADDRESS CHANGES, MODS TO NONMEMBERS

The ARRL has announced that it's now providing FCC Amateur Radio license renewals, address changes and other license modification services to nonmembers. For a $12 fee, the League will renew a nonmember's Amateur Radio ticket (the license must be within 90 days of expiration), file an application to change address or name or request issuance of a new sequential call sign. The ARRL Volunteer Examiner Coordinator is processing these applications.

"The $12 is in line with our calendar year 2003 exam application fee," said ARRL VEC Manager Bart Jahnke, W9JJ. For several years, the ARRL has been handling renewals, address and name changes and modifications free of charge for members and has directed nonmembers to the FCC's free Internet or hard-copy application options or to other providers of such services.

Jahnke suggests that nonmembers who now choose to employ the League's application handling service also consider adding $27 (based on the current under-65 full term member rate of $39) for a full ARRL membership that includes free application handling and other services--not to mention QST.

Members or nonmembers taking advantage of this service should submit NCVEC Form 605 <http://www.arrl.org/fcc/forms.html> to ARRL VEC, 225 Main St, Newington CT 06111 USA for processing. Nonmembers should make the $12 fee payable to "ARRL." For more information, contact ARRL VEC, vec@arrl.org.

210. Re: What country?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-04 02:23:26 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301031823.3948bfe@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59292
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<av49ts9132s@enews2.newsguy.com>...
> "Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> news:3E13689B.8F700404@ix.netcom.com...
> > Doug Smith wrote:
> >
> > >
> > > Yikes. I didn't think there was a worse CW call than WB9NME. You've
> > > proven me wrong<grin>!
> >
> > Guess my call WA2ISE would have a CW friendly suffix.
> >
> > Or you could pound out "whiskey bravo nine november mary echo" in CW.
> :-)
> >
> ^^^^^^^^
>
> in morse code that is.

Why not? CW is supposed to be a lot of fun, and by first converting
all the Q-signals to longhand, then converting them to phonetic
alphabet, you can make your fun last even longer. With all that fun
practice, you'll be up to 50baud in no time.

211. Re: You have to be kidding! I saw it coming.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-04 02:27:24 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301031827.444802de@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59293

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<dJhR9.54243$4j5.7332444@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0301022022.2032842a@posting.google.com...
> > NoName <user@computer.net> wrote in message
> news:<ii191vofi9n05fc3f2sbbb43f9pdhp8ngd@4ax.com>...
> >
> > [snip] ... The ARRL has worked around the regulations with respect to the
> Morse
> > Code exams. The so called 5WPM Morse Code exam currently administered
> > is really a 13-15WPM Farnsworth exam. Slight of hand, shell game,
> > whatever you want to call it, but its not a 5WPM Morse exam as
> > required by Part 97.
> >
>
> If you want to and take the time to arrange it ahead of time with the VEs,
> you can have a test at the 5wpm character speed rather than the Farnsworth
> but doing it that way is much harder.

Yes, if you know to ask.

The letters come so slowly that there
> isn't enough space between the letters for the mind to have time to react
> when you are a beginner. With the Farnsworth type, the examinee has time to
> think between letters. He/she hears "di dah dah" followed by a space long
> enough to think "oh yeah, that's a W". On the other hand when it is
> "diiii daaaah daaaah," he/she doesn't have any time to think before the next
> letter but must immediately respond "W" so as not to lose the beginning of
> the next letter. Of course as a person continues to improve, they simply
> respond and don't have to think about the letters but even that is easier
> and faster to do via the Farnsworth approach.
>
> Learning and testing using the Farnsworth approach is MUCH easier.

That's what I hear.

Brian

212. Re: Adding something extra to a CQ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-04 02:38:10 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301031838.fa0345a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59294

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E1526CE.1C4709B1@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> > > You are an army of one.
> > >
> > > No, I aimed higher.
> >
> > ...and completely missed the target.

I guess the Air Force didn't have flying machines when you were in.

> > He's never given it a seconds thought, I assume. Why?
> >
> > He could bring an end to your agony over the issue by simply jotting a
> > note confirming that he'd authorized you to operate from Somalia.

Agony? Where did you get that? From the same place you pulled, "a
military commander cannot authorize amateur operations."

> > > > > > You must have assumed that the material on the League's web
> > > > > > > site meant any officer over you.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > No, the material on the ARRL web site was read by me 10 years after my
> > > > > > tour in Somalia. It essentially state the same thing as the other
> > > > > > amateur on station told me.
> > > >
> > > You mean the guy who got it in writing?
> > >
> > Did he?
> >
> > He did.

Who was he?

> > > > > > You must have assumed that it wasn't
> > > > > > > important to have such permission in writing.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > That is correct.
> > > > > >
> > > > > Well ain't you da fool!
> > > > >
> > > > Well, yes. But it doesn't mean that I was a bootleger, nor does it mean I'm a liar.
> > > >
> > > If there is nothing in existence which backs up your claim to have had
> > > permission, you could be either.
> > >
> > You could be a liar. Please show me something that says you're not.

Please show me something that says you're not.

> > > > > > > > > To summarize:
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > It is apparent that only you, of all individuals operating from Somalia
> > > > > > > > > > during that time period, neglected to get permission in writing from
> > > > > > > > > > someone authorized to grant it. That it never dawned on you that this
> > > > > > > > > > would be the thing to do, marks you as a rube.
>
> > > > > > > > > Yes, yes, Dave. You've said that before. But saying it and saying it
> > > > > > > > > often doesn't make it true, no matter how hard you wish it so.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > No, writing it doesn't make it true.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Hmmm.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > It is true because it is
> > > > > > > > > accurate.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > And my statement that I had permission from my commander is accurate.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Your proof for the above is?
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Didn't you just say that writing it doesn't make it true?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > No. Pay attention. I wrote that about the statement I made earlier.
> > >
> > So some things in writing mean that they're true, and other things in
> > writing could be false?
>
> I think you might be getting the hang of it. Yes, the things which are
> accurate statements are true. Those which are inaccurate are false.

You've strayed. How does it relate to being in writing? Must all
things in writing be true? Must all things not in writing be false?

> > > > > > Him putting it in writing doesn't make it any truer.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > We'll never know if your statement was true since he didn't put it in
> > > > > > writing.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Didn't you just say that writing it doesn't make it true?
> > > > >
> > > > > No. Your oscillator is drifting. I wrote that about my statement, not
> > > > about your statement.
> > >
> > So your statement is true, or is it false? It's so hard to tell.
>
> For you, apparently. C'mon, Brian. Study the words. You can do it.

Writing it doesn't make it true.

> > > > > > > I thought you might be sharper in 2003 than 2002.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > > Nope, I'm the same.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > So I see.
> > > > >
> > > > > How different will you be in 2003?
> > >
> > > I'll still be sharp.
> >
> > Its still early in the year, but I don't see it that way.
>
> Right, 'cuz you're still the same.

Like I said, it's early in the year.

213. Re: County Issuing Radio Licenses

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-04 03:01:57 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301031901.25f7dd61@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59295

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E15251C.AFA4D024@earthlink.net>...

> The DXCC desk is familiar with how military members travel. They'd
> understand how you wouldn't necessarily have a visa, entry or exit
> stamps or even a passport.

They are very understanding people. So why did you bring up
passports, entry/exit stamps, and visas?

> They wouldn't understand how you'd have no
> written document authorizing you to get on the air from Somalia.

So where there -is- a formal mechanism in place to track travel from
one location to another and the documentation is lacking, the DXCC
desk forgives the lack of documentation.

But where there is -not- a formal mechanism for operating from a
location without a government, the DXCC desk is a stickler for
documentation.

I see.

> > You continue to assume that if the ARRL DXCC doesn't accept an
> > operation that it is illegal, aka bootlegging, aka Mog Slim.
>
> You just can't be that dumb. I've clearly separated the idea of
> legality of operation from DXCC acceptance in any number of posts.

Only because I've called you on it. It was your first tactic. You've
since changed because your position was untenable. Even the amoeba
moves away from an electrode.

> > You've used all three descriptors.
>
> Mogadishu Slim can cover both 1) illegality of operation and 2)
> non-acceptance by the DXCC desk for credit. I feel comfortable in
> calling you "Slim" because you fit in both categories.

And your documentation is...?

You said:

"...and you have yet to provide any evidence that your operation was
legal, accepted for DXCC credit or that it ever took place at all.

Dave K8MN"

So without any evidence or documentation, you declare me a bootlegger.

You're a helluva guy.

> > Yet you are not the Somali government, you are not a military
> > commander, you are not the U.N., you are not a world court, and you
> > are not the FCC. Yet you declare my operation illegal. You have
> > unimaginable powers. Who/what are you again?
>
> Let's do it again.

Yes, let's do it again. Which of the above are you? The Somali
government, a deployed military commander, a U.N. official, the world
court, the FCC?

I'm a guy who knows you have no paperwork
> documenting your operation. It really doesn't require much in the way
> of powers.

You mean that you have absolutely nothing? Then you call me a
bootlegger without knowing if I even made a transmission?

What a leap of faith you've made.

> > Because you don't -think- DXCC will accept it.
>
> I already KNOW the DXCC desk won't accept it without documentation.
> There's only one way for you to put that to the test. Have someone
> submit one of your QSL cards for T5 credit on his DXCC. Then stand back
> and see what happens.
> Oddly enough, in all the time which has passed since your supposed
> operation, not one single individual has ever submitted a T5/N0IMD card
> for DXCC credit.
> That is really quite odd.

Yes, it is. Perhaps the world's hams aren't all DXers as you would
have us believe.

73, Brian

214. Re: What country?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-04 06:29:44 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E167F50.154C5E13@earthlink.net>
Source record: 59297
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E1521B7.4FC2C428@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
>
> > > I pointed out that someone can be
> > > > directly in charge of you and still not be the commander who can
> > > > authorize amateur radio operation in a country.
> > >
> > > A commander has ucmj authority to courts martial and/or non-judicial
> > > punishment. I'm fully aware of what a commander is.
> >
> > > And a commander has the authority to give permission to a subordinate
> > > to operate amateur radio in Somalia, a fact which you said was wrong
> > > wrong wrong.
> >
> > ...if one assumes that two lines on the ARRL web page are the sum total
> > of knowledge and information on the subject.
>
> As I've said before, it's 1,000 times more information than you had
> when you said that a military commander couldn't authorize any such
> thing.

Did I say that, Brian?

> > > Apparently you're still missing the point.
> >
> > You don't have a point. You have no commander willing to stick his neck
> > out and say that he gave you permission to operate. You have no
> > paperwork stating that you had permission to operate.
>
> When I operated I had permission.

Nobody has any way to confirm that.

> I'm no longer there.

No kidding?

> My commander is no longer there.

It'd probably be easy to hunt him down.

> I no longer sign "portable T5."

I haven't seen any indication that you ever did.

> What more do you want?

...to see you educated.

> > > > It doesn't matter
> > > > much. You didn't get written permission from anyone at all.
> > > >
> > > > > Do I need to start counting cadence so you won't trip over your own
> > > > > bootlaces?
> > > > >
> > > > > Naw, too late. Just dust yourself off and keep going.
> > > >
> > > > You can count all the cadence you like. I'm no longer in the military
> > > > and I'm wearing moccasins.
> > >
> > > I can tell. Too much time and distance to discern what a commander is
> > > or is not.
> >
> > I don't need to recognize a commander. I've had proper written
> > permission every place I've operated. Each operation was credited for
> > DXCC.
>
> You were never in a situation where a commander had the authority to
> authorize amateur operations.

Sure I was, Brian. I was in Vietnam '70-'71.

You have no experience in such matters.

Darn it, you're wrong again.

> You even went so far as to say that commanders cannot authorize any
> amateur authorizations.

Darn--wrong again. Where'd I say that?

> It was me who has provided you with such an education.

Sure you did, Brian--in your mind.

Dave K8MN

215. Re: What country?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-04 06:34:26 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E16806A.F896E3AC@earthlink.net>
Source record: 59298
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E152255.D8E628AE@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E14BA0D.52E24E8F@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E11CAB5.AEDE954C@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E0F282B.4DACAF4D@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E0E7DB8.2728433A@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E0D48F8.E243C02B@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > > "K HB" <k hb@arrl.DOTORG> wrote in message news:<kV%O9.1862
> > > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > The FCC could care less about DXCC
> > > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > Dave confuses DXCC with FCC. Ditto his minions. You five need a
one on one.
> > > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > Do you have a single reference of such a comment from me?
> > > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > Yes.
> > > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > Then put up or shut up.
> > > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > You claimed my Somalia operation was illegal based upon ARRL DXCC rules.
> > > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > No, I claimed and still do, that your operation was not acceptable for
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > DXCC credit. Without supporting documentation, you can never make it
```

> > > > > > > > so.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > How do you characterize your use of the term "bootlegging?"
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > I do not and did not claim that you were a bootlegger based upon
> > > > > > > violation of DXCC rules. You were a bootlegger because you have no
> > > > > > > documentation to support your claim that you had permission to
> > > > > > > operate. You have no military or UN issued paperwork? Too bad.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > You did, based upon DXCC rules, claim my operation was illegal. But
> > > > > > you have been wrong on so many counts that you really don't recall
> > > > > > what you've said anymore.
> > > > >
> > > > > Google does:
> > > > >
> > > > > quote From: Dave Heil (k8mn@earthlink.net)
> > > > > Subject: Re: ARRL Members -- protest this action to your director
> > > > > Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> > > > > Date: 2002-09-12 06:15:32 PST
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > Brian P Burke wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > > > news:3D7E8A0D.ACC5D04D@earthlink.net...
> > > > > > > Brian P Burke wrote:
> >
> > > > > > So DXCC is the final licensing authority in the world?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I guess you're back to that again.
> > > > >
> > > > > How many times must I tell you before it sinks in:
> > > > >
> > > > > 1) The DXCC desk (with advice from the DXAC) is the final arbiter on
> > > > > what is accepted for DXCC credit.
> > > > >
> > > > > 2) (a separate issue) You have no proof of permission to operate from
> > > > > Somalia at all *punto* unquote
> > > > >
> > > > > Now, what was it that you were sure I told you?
> > > >
> > > > You claimed that my operation from Somalia was illegal based upon DXCC
> > > > acceptance/nonacceptance. You continue to amend your statements as I
> > > > call you to the carpet for each inaccuracy.
> >
> > Read it again, Brian. That isn't what it says at all.
>
> I see you talking about the DXCC desk again. I don't see you mention
> any other "authority."

Read it again.

> > > You're learning, but only slowly.
> >
> > Don't just stand there mumbling to yourself, DO something.
>
> I have no proof that I was authorized to drive equipment up to 5 tons,
> motorboats up to 27 feet, etc. But I did. And it was legal.

So you say. What has that to do with amateur radio?

> Oh gosh, now what?

I guess you'll come up with another entertaining tale.

> Are you going to give me a retroactive no-ops citation?

Take it up with the guys at rec.boats.and.large vehicles.support

Dave K8MN

216. Re: Adding something extra to a CQ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-04 06:47:19 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E1683BA.EADEDF6D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 59299

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E1526CE.1C4709B1@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:

> > He could bring an end to your agony over the issue by simply jotting a
> > note confirming that he'd authorized you to operate from Somalia.
>
> Agony? Where did you get that? From the same place you pulled, "a
> military commander cannot authorize amateur operations."

Are you now quoting me?

> > > > > > > You must have assumed that the material on the League's web
> > > > > > > > site meant any officer over you.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > No, the material on the ARRL web site was read by me 10 years after my
> > > > > > > tour in Somalia. It essentially state the same thing as the other
> > > > > > > amateur on station told me.
> > > > >
> > > > You mean the guy who got it in writing?
> > >
> > Did he?
> >
> > He did.
>
> Who was he?

Your memory that short? The same guy you refer to several lines above.
The one who e-mailed the info about his operation. The one who was
spotted numerous times on packet during his operation. That guy.

> > > > > > > You must have assumed that it wasn't
> > > > > > > > important to have such permission in writing.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > That is correct.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Well ain't you da fool!
> > > > >
> > > > Well, yes. But it doesn't mean that I was a bootleger, nor does it mean I'm a
liar.
> > > >
> > > If there is nothing in existence which backs up your claim to have had
> > > permission, you could be either.
> > >

> > > You could be a liar. Please show me something that says you're not.
>
> Please show me something that says you're not.

I have written licensing documents from each place I operated. All my
operations are accepted for DXCC credit. My operations are therefore
not in question.

> > > > > Didn't you just say that writing it doesn't make it true?
> > > > >
> > > > > No. Pay attention. I wrote that about the statement I made earlier.
> > > >
> > > > So some things in writing mean that they're true, and other things in
> > > > writing could be false?
> > >
> > > I think you might be getting the hang of it. Yes, the things which are
> > > accurate statements are true. Those which are inaccurate are false.
> >
> > You've strayed. How does it relate to being in writing? Must all
> > things in writing be true? Must all things not in writing be false?

Wow look at Vipul climb that ladder. He crawled right past you.

> > > > > > > Him putting it in writing doesn't make it any truer.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > We'll never know if your statement was true since he didn't put it in
> > > > > > > writing.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Didn't you just say that writing it doesn't make it true?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > No. Your oscillator is drifting. I wrote that about my statement, not
> > > > > > about your statement.
> > > > >
> > > > > So your statement is true, or is it false? It's so hard to tell.
> > > >
> > > > For you, apparently. C'mon, Brian. Study the words. You can do it.
> >
> > Writing it doesn't make it true.

Get Vipul to give you a hand. Saaaaay! Come to think of it, he could
be a big help in building those germanium diodes for you and the young
lads.

Dave K8MN

217. Re: County Issuing Radio Licenses

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-04 07:02:54 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E168762.5F99D3D5@earthlink.net>
Source record: 59300

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E15251C.AFA4D024@earthlink.net>...
>
> > The DXCC desk is familiar with how military members travel. They'd
> > understand how you wouldn't necessarily have a visa, entry or exit
> > stamps or even a passport.
>
> They are very understanding people. So why did you bring up
> passports, entry/exit stamps, and visas?

As I've already explained, those are among the things which can be used
in support of a claimed operation.

> > They wouldn't understand how you'd have no
> > written document authorizing you to get on the air from Somalia.
>
> So where there -is- a formal mechanism in place to track travel from
> one location to another and the documentation is lacking, the DXCC
> desk forgives the lack of documentation.
>
> But where there is -not- a formal mechanism for operating from a
> location without a government, the DXCC desk is a stickler for
> documentation.
>
> I see.

It is evident that you do not see or understand much of anything.

> > > You continue to assume that if the ARRL DXCC doesn't accept an
> > > operation that it is illegal, aka bootlegging, aka Mog Slim.
> >
> > You just can't be that dumb. I've clearly separated the idea of
> > legality of operation from DXCC acceptance in any number of posts.
>
> Only because I've called you on it. It was your first tactic. You've
> since changed because your position was untenable. Even the amoeba
> moves away from an electrode.

hooooooo-hawwwwwwwww Oh Brian, you're such a cut up! Your tale is
Boooooooogus!

>
> > > You've used all three descriptors.
> >

> > Mogadishu Slim can cover both 1) illegality of operation and 2)
> > non-acceptance by the DXCC desk for credit. I feel comfortable in
> > calling you "Slim" because you fit in both categories.
>
> And your documentation is...?

1) No written authorization to operate from Somalia.
2) No possible acceptance for DXCC credit due to item above.

> You said:
>
> "...and you have yet to provide any evidence that your operation was
> legal, accepted for DXCC credit or that it ever took place at all.
>
> Dave K8MN"
>
> So without any evidence or documentation, you declare me a bootlegger.

That's what bootleggers are, Brian. They're guys without evidence or
documentation.

> You're a helluva guy.
>
> > > Yet you are not the Somali government, you are not a military
> > > commander, you are not the U.N., you are not a world court, and you
> > > are not the FCC. Yet you declare my operation illegal. You have
> > > unimaginable powers. Who/what are you again?
> > >
> > Let's do it again.
>
> Yes, let's do it again. Which of the above are you? The Somali
> government, a deployed military commander, a U.N. official, the world
> court, the FCC?
>
> I'm a guy who knows you have no paperwork
> > documenting your operation. It really doesn't require much in the way
> > of powers.
>
> You mean that you have absolutely nothing? Then you call me a
> bootlegger without knowing if I even made a transmission?

You told us that you made QSOs. You have no proof that you were
authorized to be on the air from Somalia. If you told us that you had
QSOs and you didn't, you move from bootlegger to liar.

> What a leap of faith you've made.

It isn't much of a leap, Brian. Didn't you think anyone would check out
your story?

> > > Because you don't -think- DXCC will accept it.
> > >
> > I already KNOW the DXCC desk won't accept it without documentation.

> > There's only one way for you to put that to the test. Have someone
> > submit one of your QSL cards for T5 credit on his DXCC. Then stand back
> > and see what happens.
> > Oddly enough, in all the time which has passed since your supposed
> > operation, not one single individual has ever submitted a T5/N0IMD card
> > for DXCC credit.
> > That is really quite odd.
>
> Yes, it is. Perhaps the world's hams aren't all DXers as you would
> have us believe.

You keep trying to attribute to me, statements which I've not made. In fact, you are the one who confused the general ham population of the world with the DXers of the world in a couple of earlier posts.

Dave K8MN

218. Re: Wonder?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-04 09:13:24 UTC
From: Thomas Jefferson <Truth@anop.com>
Message-ID: <av68i8$561$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 59301

Yeah...specially if the Sand Niggers were to light off a mushroom cloud over New York and put the World Trade Center on a back burner....
Oh, so sorry...did I offfend somebody's Political Correctness?
OK, no Sand Niggers, OK? I will take that back...just a bunch of Illegal (Undocumented Immigrants) with Dynamite or C-4 in the trunks of their cars hoping to blow up a few hundred innocent citizens.
Come on, you guys...let these illegals in....they don't hurt much, do they?

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message news:av5ahl$t2j$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net...
> Maybe everyone is trying to keep their minds off of what a mushroom cloud
> would look like in the early evenings.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
> news:v1brejd8kl3d00@corp.supernews.com...
> > Here's a scary thought, Kim. Can you imagine if there was a sanity test
> to
> > get your license renewal? I'd bet half of this newsgroup would loose
> their
> > ticket! ;) Bush wants to go to war, and all the whining around here is
> > either about CW or your callsign. ..... Well, another year is here and
I
> > can't see any difference in this group ;)
> >
> >
> > 73 from Rochester, NY
> > Jim
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> > ---
> > Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> > Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
> > Version: 6.0.435 / Virus Database: 244 - Release Date: 12/30/02
> >
> >
>
>

219. Re: Why hams think we deserve the 5 mhz band (was: You have to be kidding!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-04 10:09:47 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0301040209.7634148e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59302

Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns92F8C50B09522elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
> news:d22b54c3.0301030616.25e11e3d@posting.google.com:
>
> > Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:<Xns92F6D294E24E0elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> >
> >
> >> If I want to work any DX above 3.8 and below 14.15 MHz, I have to use
> >> split VFOs, and hope that someone will listen up above 7.15 while I am
> >> listening below 7.1, and this will get more important again as the
> >> sunspots go away.
> >
> > From a dxers perspective working split is a good idea, phone, cw, 40
> > or anywhere else.
>
> So you think it's a good idea to use twice the bandwidth!

Lousy troll. No cigar. If you're so big into "spectrum conservation"
why are you running phone?

>
> > I'm all for the dx having phone privs on freqs below our band
> > limits. God bless dual VFOs.
> >
> > There is also a fairness issue involved, the dx is much more likely to
> > be able to work other dx in those segements without getting hounded
> > and pounded by the U.S. hordes.
>
> But on 40 we have no common frequencies!

So what?? It's just part of the game. You're either a real dxer or yer
not. You either jump the hurdles of you don't. You oughta been there
when phone wasn't permitted by *any* U.S. ops below 7.200. I have no
idea today how many 40m ssb dxcc cards I have from that regime but
I'll bet it's at least pushing 100. And you're all bent outta shape
because you can't yak down to 7.075? Bwaaahaha! Apply for a disabilty
waiver.

> > If phone was permitted to the lower band edges most of the bitching
> > would come from the phone ops, not the cw and digital ops.
>
> Nobody wants phone all the way to the lower band edges

. . . you jest!

>
> All I actually asked for was phone from 7.075-7.1, which I really don't
> think is unreasonable, but I should ask the FCC, not Usenet!

Right on the money. Go ask the FCC for the NPRM. Then (a) put on yer
padded Kevlar suit or (b) yank yer modem.

> Since you bring it up, most of the bitching now is from DX phone operators
> who have to put up with the bleeping of US digital and CW ops in their
> phone subbands, so in that sense you are partly right.

BOINK.

w3rv

220. Re: County Issuing Radio Licenses

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-04 14:24:43 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301040624.3dc9df30@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59303

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E168762.5F99D3D5@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E15251C.AFA4D024@earthlink.net>...
> >
> > > The DXCC desk is familiar with how military members travel. They'd
> > > understand how you wouldn't necessarily have a visa, entry or exit
> > > stamps or even a passport.
> >
> > They are very understanding people. So why did you bring up
> > passports, entry/exit stamps, and visas?
>
> As I've already explained, those are among the things which can be used
> in support of a claimed operation.

David, do you suppose that many people have passports with stamps in
them and visas, who are not amateur radio operators?

> > > They wouldn't understand how you'd have no
> > > written document authorizing you to get on the air from Somalia.
> >
> > So where there -is- a formal mechanism in place to track travel from
> > one location to another and the documentation is lacking, the DXCC
> > desk forgives the lack of documentation.
> >
> > But where there is -not- a formal mechanism for operating from a
> > location without a government, the DXCC desk is a stickler for
> > documentation.
> >
> > I see.
>
> It is evident that you do not see or understand much of anything.

Your brain cage is devoid of logic.

> > > > You continue to assume that if the ARRL DXCC doesn't accept an
> > > > operation that it is illegal, aka bootlegging, aka Mog Slim.
> >
>
> > > You just can't be that dumb. I've clearly separated the idea of
> > > legality of operation from DXCC acceptance in any number of posts.
> >
> > Only because I've called you on it. It was your first tactic. You've
> > since changed because your position was untenable. Even the amoeba

> > moves away from an electrode.
>
> *hooooooo-hawwwwwwwww* Oh Brian, you're such a cut up! Your tale is
> Boooooooogus!

It is true.

> > > > You've used all three descriptors.
> > >
> > > Mogadishu Slim can cover both 1) illegality of operation and 2)
> > > non-acceptance by the DXCC desk for credit. I feel comfortable in
> > > calling you "Slim" because you fit in both categories.
> > >
> > And your documentation is...?
>
> 1) No written authorization to operate from Somalia.
> 2) No possible acceptance for DXCC credit due to item above.

That is not documentation.

> > You said:
> >
> > "...and you have yet to provide any evidence that your operation was
> > legal, accepted for DXCC credit or that it ever took place at all.
> >
> > Dave K8MN"
> >
> > So without any evidence or documentation, you declare me a bootlegger.
>
> That's what bootleggers are, Brian. They're guys without evidence or
> documentation.

But you have no proof of operation. To call me a bootlegger, you have
to have proof that I operated.

> > You're a helluva guy.
> >
> > > > Yet you are not the Somali government, you are not a military
> > > > commander, you are not the U.N., you are not a world court, and you
> > > > are not the FCC. Yet you declare my operation illegal. You have
> > > > unimaginable powers. Who/what are you again?
> > >
> > > Let's do it again.
> >
> > Yes, let's do it again. Which of the above are you? The Somali
> > government, a deployed military commander, a U.N. official, the world
> > court, the FCC?
> >
> > I'm a guy who knows you have no paperwork
> > > documenting your operation. It really doesn't require much in the way
> > > of powers.
> >

> > You mean that you have absolutely nothing? Then you call me a
> > bootlegger without knowing if I even made a transmission?
>
> You told us that you made QSOs. You have no proof that you were
> authorized to be on the air from Somalia. If you told us that you had
> QSOs and you didn't, you move from bootlegger to liar.

I also told you that I had permission to operate. Why do you choose
to believe one thing I say, yet not another?

Brain cage, logic?

> > What a leap of faith you've made.
>
> It isn't much of a leap, Brian. Didn't you think anyone would check out
> your story?

And your findings are?

> > > > Because you don't -think- DXCC will accept it.
> > >
> > > I already KNOW the DXCC desk won't accept it without documentation.
> > > There's only one way for you to put that to the test. Have someone
> > > submit one of your QSL cards for T5 credit on his DXCC. Then stand back
> > > and see what happens.
> > > Oddly enough, in all the time which has passed since your supposed
> > > operation, not one single individual has ever submitted a T5/N0IMD card
> > > for DXCC credit.
> > > That is really quite odd.
> >
> > Yes, it is. Perhaps the world's hams aren't all DXers as you would
> > have us believe.
>
> You keep trying to attribute to me, statements which I've not made. In
> fact, you are the one who confused the general ham population of the
> world with the DXers of the world in a couple of earlier posts.
>
> Dave K8MN

No, I presented them as two distinct populations. You have yet to
show documentation that either one embraces DXCC as the world
standard.

David, you need to come up with something new.

221. Re: Adding something extra to a CQ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-04 14:32:23 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301040632.1c368703@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59304

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E1683BA.EADEDF6D@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E1526CE.1C4709B1@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> >
> > > He could bring an end to your agony over the issue by simply jotting a
> > > note confirming that he'd authorized you to operate from Somalia.
> > >
> > Agony? Where did you get that? From the same place you pulled, "a
> > military commander cannot authorize amateur operations."
> >
> Are you now quoting me?

OK, quote yourself.
>
> > > > > > > > > You must have assumed that the material on the League's web
> > > > > > > > > site meant any officer over you.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > No, the material on the ARRL web site was read by me 10 years after my
> > > > > > > > > tour in Somalia. It essentially state the same thing as the other
> > > > > > > > > amateur on station told me.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > You mean the guy who got it in writing?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Did he?
> > > > >
> > > > > He did.
> > > >
> > > > Who was he?
> >
> Your memory that short? The same guy you refer to several lines above.

Sorry, but you'll have to be more specific. There were a number of
amateurs operating from Somalia during our operations there. I knew
only one other.

> The one who e-mailed the info about his operation. The one who was
> spotted numerous times on packet during his operation. That guy.

Nope. I was gone when that amateur was there.

> > > > > > > > > You must have assumed that it wasn't
> > > > > > > > > important to have such permission in writing.
> > > > > > > > >

> > > > > > > > That is correct.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Well ain't you da fool!
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Well, yes. But it doesn't mean that I was a bootleger, nor does it mean I'm a
liar.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > If there is nothing in existence which backs up your claim to have had
> > > > > > permission, you could be either.
> > > > > >
> > > > > You could be a liar. Please show me something that says you're not.
> > >
> > Please show me something that says you're not.
>
> I have written licensing documents from each place I operated. All my
> operations are accepted for DXCC credit. My operations are therefore
> not in question.

You went to the easy places.

> > > > > > Didn't you just say that writing it doesn't make it true?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > No. Pay attention. I wrote that about the statement I made earlier.
> > > > >
> > > > > So some things in writing mean that they're true, and other things in
> > > > > writing could be false?
> > > >
> > > I think you might be getting the hang of it. Yes, the things which are
> > > accurate statements are true. Those which are inaccurate are false.
> >
> > You've strayed. How does it relate to being in writing? Must all
> > things in writing be true? Must all things not in writing be false?
>
> Wow look at Vipul climb that ladder. He crawled right past you.

And you get lost in your own words.

> > > > > > > > Him putting it in writing doesn't make it any truer.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > We'll never know if your statement was true since he didn't put it in
> > > > > > > > writing.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Didn't you just say that writing it doesn't make it true?
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > No. Your oscillator is drifting. I wrote that about my statement, not
> > > > > > > about your statement.
> > > > > >
> > > > > So your statement is true, or is it false? It's so hard to tell.
> > > >
> > > For you, apparently. C'mon, Brian. Study the words. You can do it.
> > >

> > Writing it doesn't make it true.
>
> Get Vipul to give you a hand. Saaaaay! Come to think of it, he could
> be a big help in building those germanium diodes for you and the young
> lads.

David, please try to stay on topic.

222. Re: Adding something extra to a CQ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-04 16:02:43 UTC
From: Gary Danaher <gdanaher@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <3E1705C9.6080307@attbi.com>
Source record: 59305
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.dx

W 5 T I T currently has 3 cards waiting for he to claim at the buro.
Anyone can access the on line llokup. SAhe just needs to send sase's or
a little cash to the buro at Box 2591, Claremore , OK 74018-2591 to get
them.

Kï¿½HB wrote:

>"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote
>
>: Then, I kept hearing about this "via the Bureau"
>: stuff. Some won't do anything but the Bureau.
>: It sounded like a lot more problem than it's worth.
>
>Actually, "Via the Buro" is the easiest and least expensive (but not the
>fastest) way to QSL. Except for the "new-new" and "new-band" cards I need,
>it's the way I handle all my DX QSL'ing. I just wish we could convince ARRL
>to allow QSLing to the domestic buro also.
>
>ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ 73, de Hans, K0HB
>--
> Help support youth involved in Amateur Radio.
> http://www.mnyarc.org
> http://www.k0bsa.org
>
>
>
>
>
>

223. Re: County Issuing Radio Licenses

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-04 16:42:09 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E170F23.33EB82F7@earthlink.net>
Source record: 59306

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E168762.5F99D3D5@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E15251C.AFA4D024@earthlink.net>...
> > >
> > > > The DXCC desk is familiar with how military members travel. They'd
> > > > understand how you wouldn't necessarily have a visa, entry or exit
> > > > stamps or even a passport.
> > >
> > > They are very understanding people. So why did you bring up
> > > passports, entry/exit stamps, and visas?
> >
> > As I've already explained, those are among the things which can be used
> > in support of a claimed operation.
>
> David, do you suppose that many people have passports with stamps in
> them and visas, who are not amateur radio operators?

I know that there are numerous non-hams with visas and entry/exit stamps
in their passports. I don't know of any of them attempting to prove to
the ARRL's DXCC desk that they were operating an amateur radio station
legally from an exotic spot.

> > > > They wouldn't understand how you'd have no
> > > > written document authorizing you to get on the air from Somalia.
> > >
> > > So where there -is- a formal mechanism in place to track travel from
> > > one location to another and the documentation is lacking, the DXCC
> > > desk forgives the lack of documentation.
> > >
> > > But where there is -not- a formal mechanism for operating from a
> > > location without a government, the DXCC desk is a stickler for
> > > documentation.
> > >
> > > I see.
> >
> > It is evident that you do not see or understand much of anything.
>
> Your brain cage is devoid of logic.

It would take an individual capable of understanding to see the logic.
The brain cage is running low on patience though.

> > > > > You continue to assume that if the ARRL DXCC doesn't accept an
> > > > > operation that it is illegal, aka bootlegging, aka Mog Slim.
> > > >
> > >
> > > > > You just can't be that dumb. I've clearly separated the idea of
> > > > > legality of operation from DXCC acceptance in any number of posts.
> > > >
> > > > Only because I've called you on it. It was your first tactic. You've
> > > > since changed because your position was untenable. Even the amoeba
> > > > moves away from an electrode.
> > >
> > > *hooooooo-hawwwwwwwww* Oh Brian, you're such a cut up! Your tale is
> > > Booooooooogus!
> >
> > It is true.

Come up with a quote or be judged a fabricator.

> > > > > You've used all three descriptors.
> > > > >
> > > > > Mogadishu Slim can cover both 1) illegality of operation and 2)
> > > > > non-acceptance by the DXCC desk for credit. I feel comfortable in
> > > > > calling you "Slim" because you fit in both categories.
> > > >
> > > > And your documentation is...?
> > >
> > > 1) No written authorization to operate from Somalia.
> > > 2) No possible acceptance for DXCC credit due to item above.
> >
> > That is not documentation.

Pretty tough to document what isn't documented.

> > > You said:
> > >
> > > "...and you have yet to provide any evidence that your operation was
> > > legal, accepted for DXCC credit or that it ever took place at all.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN"
> > >
> > > So without any evidence or documentation, you declare me a bootlegger.
> >
> > That's what bootleggers are, Brian. They're guys without evidence or
> > documentation.
>
> But you have no proof of operation. To call me a bootlegger, you have
> to have proof that I operated.

We have your claim. After all, you claimed that you had permission to
operate and that you operated.

> > > You're a helluva guy.
> > >
> > > > > Yet you are not the Somali government, you are not a military
> > > > > commander, you are not the U.N., you are not a world court, and you
> > > > > are not the FCC. Yet you declare my operation illegal. You have
> > > > > unimaginable powers. Who/what are you again?
> > > >
> > > > Let's do it again.
> > >
> > > Yes, let's do it again. Which of the above are you? The Somali
> > > government, a deployed military commander, a U.N. official, the world
> > > court, the FCC?
> > >
> > > I'm a guy who knows you have no paperwork
> > > > documenting your operation. It really doesn't require much in the way
> > > > of powers.
> > >
> > > You mean that you have absolutely nothing? Then you call me a
> > > bootlegger without knowing if I even made a transmission?
> >
> > You told us that you made QSOs. You have no proof that you were
> > authorized to be on the air from Somalia. If you told us that you had
> > QSOs and you didn't, you move from bootlegger to liar.
>
> I also told you that I had permission to operate. Why do you choose
> to believe one thing I say, yet not another?
>
> Brain cage, logic?

Whaddya want to be, Brian? Bootlegger? Liar? Which of your scenarios
is correct? Are you now telling us that you had permission but that
your earlier claims of making QSOs and sending QSL cards from Somalia
were false?

> > > What a leap of faith you've made.
> >
> > It isn't much of a leap, Brian. Didn't you think anyone would check out
> > your story?
>
> And your findings are?

That others operating from Somalia during the same time frame had
written authorization. That the DXCC desk has never had a single
submission for DXCC credit of a T5/N0IMD QSL card in spite of the fact
that you've told us that you made QSOs and sent QSL cards.

> > > > > Because you don't -think- DXCC will accept it.
> > > >
> > > > I already KNOW the DXCC desk won't accept it without documentation.
> > > > There's only one way for you to put that to the test. Have someone
> > > > submit one of your QSL cards for T5 credit on his DXCC. Then stand back
> > > > and see what happens.

> > > > Oddly enough, in all the time which has passed since your supposed
> > > > operation, not one single individual has ever submitted a T5/N0IMD card
> > > > for DXCC credit.
> > > > That is really quite odd.
> > >
> > > Yes, it is. Perhaps the world's hams aren't all DXers as you would
> > > have us believe.
> >
> > You keep trying to attribute to me, statements which I've not made. In
> > fact, you are the one who confused the general ham population of the
> > world with the DXers of the world in a couple of earlier posts--"Perhaps the world's hams aren't all DXers as you would have us believe." In which post would I have you believe this?

> No, I presented them as two distinct populations. You have yet to
> show documentation that either one embraces DXCC as the world
> standard.

Why would a non-DXer embrace any DX awards program as a standard? As to the world's DXers--simply ask a few or ask many. Ask the DXCC desk about the number of non-U.S. hams who have applied for the award. Again, you've attributed to me a statement which I did not make.

> David, you need to come up with something new.

We need to take care of old business before new business is introduced.

Dave K8MN

224. Re: Adding something extra to a CQ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-04 16:52:15 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E171183.EC533EDB@earthlink.net>
Source record: 59307

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E1683BA.EADEDF6D@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E1526CE.1C4709B1@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > > He could bring an end to your agony over the issue by simply jotting a
> > > > note confirming that he'd authorized you to operate from Somalia.
> > > >
> > > Agony? Where did you get that? From the same place you pulled, "a
> > > military commander cannot authorize amateur operations."
> > >
> > Are you now quoting me?
>
> OK, quote yourself.

Your non-answer noted.

> > > > > > > > > You must have assumed that the material on the League's web
> > > > > > > > > site meant any officer over you.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > No, the material on the ARRL web site was read by me 10 years after my
> > > > > > > > > tour in Somalia. It essentially state the same thing as the other
> > > > > > > > > amateur on station told me.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > You mean the guy who got it in writing?
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Did he?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > He did.
> > > > >
> > > > > Who was he?
> > > >
> > > Your memory that short? The same guy you refer to several lines above.
>
> Sorry, but you'll have to be more specific. There were a number of
> amateurs operating from Somalia during our operations there. I knew
> only one other.
>
> > The one who e-mailed the info about his operation. The one who was
> > spotted numerous times on packet during his operation. That guy.

>
> Nope. I was gone when that amateur was there.

Okay. He had written permission.

> > > > > > > > > You must have assumed that it wasn't
> > > > > > > > > > important to have such permission in writing.
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > That is correct.
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > Well ain't you da fool!
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Well, yes. But it doesn't mean that I was a bootleger, nor does it mean I'm a
liar.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > If there is nothing in existence which backs up your claim to have had
> > > > > > > > permission, you could be either.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > You could be a liar. Please show me something that says you're not.
> > > >
> > > Please show me something that says you're not.
> >
> > I have written licensing documents from each place I operated. All my
> > operations are accepted for DXCC credit. My operations are therefore
> > not in question.
>
> You went to the easy places.

You asked for something which says I'm not a liar. I provided it. If
I'd been in your shoes, I'm smart enough to have gotten written
permission. If you'd had it, no one would be laughing up his sleeve at
your claim.

> > > > > > > Didn't you just say that writing it doesn't make it true?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > No. Pay attention. I wrote that about the statement I made earlier.
> > > > >
> > > > > So some things in writing mean that they're true, and other things in
> > > > > writing could be false?
> > > >
> > > I think you might be getting the hang of it. Yes, the things which are
> > > accurate statements are true. Those which are inaccurate are false.
> > >
> > You've strayed. How does it relate to being in writing? Must all
> > things in writing be true? Must all things not in writing be false?
> >
> > Wow look at Vipul climb that ladder. He crawled right past you.
>
> And you get lost in your own words.

Which ones doomed me--"Vipul"?--"ladder"?

> > > > > > > > > > Him putting it in writing doesn't make it any truer.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > We'll never know if your statement was true since he didn't put it in
> > > > > > > > > > writing.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > Didn't you just say that writing it doesn't make it true?
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > No. Your oscillator is drifting. I wrote that about my statement, not
> > > > > > > > > about your statement.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > So your statement is true, or is it false? It's so hard to tell.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > > For you, apparently. C'mon, Brian. Study the words. You can do it.
> > > >
> > > > > Writing it doesn't make it true.
> >
> > Get Vipul to give you a hand. Saaaaay! Come to think of it, he could
> > be a big help in building those germanium diodes for you and the young
> > lads.
>
> David, please try to stay on topic.

You mean about the voracity of your Somalian amateur radio operations
yarn?

Dave K8MN

225. Re: CCR Issue Revisited

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-04 17:10:14 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0301040910.24233647@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59308

"KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com> wrote in message news:<v1ackeaekesv7f@corp.supernews.com>...
> "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
> news:Pine.LNX.4.51.0301022047330.7051@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
> <SNIP>
> > >the question still remains: should I request congress to support my
> amateur
> > >radio interest by passing a bill that says I don't have to abide by the
> > >contract I agreed to? Isn't that the same as someone who relishes
> antique
> > >cars being able to get a bunch of like-minded people together and go to
> > >congress to pass a bill that says they can now have a "junkyard" (in the
> > >eyes of their neighbors) because they are "special."
> >
> > ...But you are "special." You have been granted a federal license to
> engage in
> > an activity that an unlicensed individual can't (ignoring "third-party"
> > transmissions). Under the 10th Amendment, the U.S. Government has
> reserved the
> > authority to regulate [most] radio to itself - so where do the state and
> local
> > governments, or the people themselves have the authority to impose any
> law,
> > rule, regulation, or agreement which infringes upon your federal license?
> So,
> > it can be argued from the Constitutional point of view that the CC&R's
> weren't
> > valid for you to begin with - and I think PRB-1 got at that at least with
> > regard to the lower government laws, regulations, etc., ...
> >
>
> I never thought of it that way. That is like Indiana's scanner
> law. It's illegal to carry a scanner in an auto in this state, except
> for licensed ham radio operators who are exempt. I think your
> onto something there. Since the FCC which is a federal agency
> and it gave me the radio license, that makes me exempt from
> state or local laws that would infringe on my federal rights
> granted by them in issuing my license.

Scanners are receivers, the FCC doesn't regulate the use of receivers.

> --
> '73' From KB9TMP

w3rv

226. Exam credit

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-04 18:20:41 UTC
From: Some One <someone@nowhere.com>
Message-ID: <3e1725f9_4@corp-news.newsgroups.com>
Source record: 59310

I became a novice in June, 1983 and upgraded to Tech in November, 1983. I have my original novice license with an "Interim Amateur Permit", FCC Form 660-B dated November, 1983 attached. I also have my current Tech Plus license effective April, 1997. It's obvious to me that I would get credit for elements 1 and 2 with a current Tech Plus license from 1997. I'm curious if the Interim Amateur Permit will be enough to get credit for element 3. I think it should since 1983 was before the VE program and element 3 was required for both Tech's and General's. I read through part 97.505 be it seems to me that the Interim Amateur Permit falls into a gray area.

Thanks!

227. Re: CCR Issue Revisited

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-04 18:24:37 UTC
From: K�HB <k�hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <FFFR9.12136$134.1381375@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 59309

"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote

:
: Our dislike of them aside, though: what do you think of the ARRL asking
: congress to pass a bill that would, essentially, render a
: signed-and-agreed-to-contract useless?
:

You overstate the case to the point of absurdity. Such a bill would not
make CC&Rs "useless".

The bill would affirm that the US Government has an over-riding interest in
the necessity that federally licensed radio stations be allowed to construct
antennas reasonably adequate to perform the services they are chartered to
perform. Simple PICON stuff.

73, de Hans, K0HB

228. Re: Exam credit

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-04 18:53:19 UTC
From: K�HB <k�hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <z4GR9.12167$134.1385771@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 59311

"Some One" <someone@nowhere.com> wrote in message
news:3e1725f9_4@corp-news.newsgroups.com...

: I read through part 97.505 be it seems to me that the
: Interim Amateur Permit falls into a gray area.

I think you're well covered under 97.505(a)(8).

73, de Hans, K0HB

229. Re: Wonder?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-04 18:56:00 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <5B287D8FE3AB1922.F29E1ED84A39688C.B4B16A6A502D2CE7@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 59312

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:v1brejd8kl3d00@corp.supernews.com...
> Here's a scary thought, Kim. Can you imagine if there was a sanity test
to
> get your license renewal? I'd bet half of this newsgroup would loose
their
> ticket! ;) Bush wants to go to war, and all the whining around here is
> either about CW or your callsign. ..... Well, another year is here and I
> can't see any difference in this group ;)
>
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim
>
>

LOL...yes, that's right. Hey, sanity? I'd lose fer sure...

Kim W5TIT

230. Re: Exam credit

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-04 21:37:18 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <iuIR9.14776$9N5.1401668@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 59314

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote

: Contact the ARRL VEC and ask the question to the experts there. While it
: seems like you would be covered, they are the defining authority.

Nope. The "defining authority" is the FCC. ARRL VEC may be able to give
good advice.... period.

73, de Hans, K0HB

231. Re: Exam credit

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-04 21:41:56 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <EyIR9.54513$4j5.7539201@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 59313

Contact the ARRL VEC and ask the question to the experts there. While it seems like you would be covered, they are the defining authority. Do you have a copy of your Technician license from that period?

Dee Flint, N8UZE

"Some One" <someone@nowhere.com> wrote in message news:3e1725f9_4@corp-news.newsgroups.com...
> I became a novice in June, 1983 and upgraded to Tech in November, 1983. I
> have my original novice license with an "Interim Amateur Permit", FCC Form
> 660-B dated November, 1983 attached. I also have my current Tech Plus
> license effective April, 1997. It's obvious to me that I would get credit
> for elements 1 and 2 with a current Tech Plus license from 1997. I'm
> curious if the Interim Amateur Permit will be enough to get credit for
> element 3. I think it should since 1983 was before the VE program and
> element 3 was required for both Tech's and General's. I read through part
> 97.505 be it seems to me that the Interim Amateur Permit falls into a gray
> area.
>
> Thanks!

232. Re: Exam credit

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-04 22:47:59 UTC
From: Some One <someone@nowhere.com>
Message-ID: <3e17649f$1_4@corp-news.newsgroups.com>
Source record: 59315

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
news:EyIR9.54513$4j5.7539201@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:

> Contact the ARRL VEC and ask the question to the experts there. While
> it seems like you would be covered, they are the defining authority.
> Do you have a copy of your Technician license from that period?
>
> Dee Flint, N8UZE

I don't know if I still have a tech license from then, if I did there
wouldn't be any question in my mind about what exams I would have credit
for. I looked in the obvious place and posted my original message based on
what I had there.

233. Re: CCR Issue Revisited

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-04 23:47:53 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.51.0301042346540.8371@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 59318

On Sat, 4 Jan 2003, Brian Kelly wrote:
>"KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com> wrote in message news:<v1ackeaekesv7f@corp.supernews.com>...
>> "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
>> news:Pine.LNX.4.51.0301022047330.7051@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
>> <SNIP>
>> > >the question still remains: should I request congress to support my
>> amateur
>> > >radio interest by passing a bill that says I don't have to abide by the
>> > >contract I agreed to? Isn't that the same as someone who relishes
>> antique
>> > >cars being able to get a bunch of like-minded people together and go to
>> > >congress to pass a bill that says they can now have a "junkyard" (in the
>> > >eyes of their neighbors) because they are "special."
>> >
>> > ...But you are "special." You have been granted a federal license to
>> engage in
>> > an activity that an unlicensed individual can't (ignoring "third-party"
>> > transmissions). Under the 10th Amendment, the U.S. Government has
>> reserved the
>> > authority to regulate [most] radio to itself - so where do the state and
>> local
>> > governments, or the people themselves have the authority to impose any
>> law,
>> > rule, regulation, or agreement which infringes upon your federal license?
>> So,
>> > it can be argued from the Constitutional point of view that the CC&R's
>> weren't
>> > valid for you to begin with - and I think PRB-1 got at that at least with
>> > regard to the lower government laws, regulations, etc., ...
>> >
>>
>> I never thought of it that way. That is like Indiana's scanner
>> law. It's illegal to carry a scanner in an auto in this state, except
>> for licensed ham radio operators who are exempt. I think your
>> onto something there. Since the FCC which is a federal agency
>> and it gave me the radio license, that makes me exempt from
>> state or local laws that would infringe on my federal rights
>> granted by them in issuing my license.
>
>Scanners are receivers, the FCC doesn't regulate the use of receivers.

Wrong! 47 CFR 15 aka "Part 15" - intentional and unintentional radiators.

The FCC doesn't LICENSE receivers, but there are still regulations. :-)

234. Re: Exam credit

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-04 23:50:11 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.51.0301042348260.8371@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 59319

On Sat, 4 Jan 2003, Some One wrote:
>I became a novice in June, 1983 and upgraded to Tech in November, 1983. I
>have my original novice license with an "Interim Amateur Permit", FCC Form
>660-B dated November, 1983 attached. I also have my current Tech Plus
>license effective April, 1997. It's obvious to me that I would get credit
>for elements 1 and 2 with a current Tech Plus license from 1997. I'm
>curious if the Interim Amateur Permit will be enough to get credit for
>element 3. I think it should since 1983 was before the VE program and
>element 3 was required for both Tech's and General's. I read through part
>97.505 be it seems to me that the Interim Amateur Permit falls into a gray
>area.

No, it is not. It lacks evidence to show that you had an actual license grant
of technician before the magic date in 1987.

235. Re: Exam credit

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-04 23:52:27 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.51.0301042350400.8371@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 59320

On Sat, 4 Jan 2003, KØHB wrote:
>"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote
>
>: Contact the ARRL VEC and ask the question to the experts there. While it
>: seems like you would be covered, they are the defining authority.
>
>Nope. The "defining authority" is the FCC. ARRL VEC may be able to give
>good advice.... period.

However, the ARRL VEC is the defining authority over whether or not an ARRL VE team should accept this "questionable indication" without other proof. Although he can't speak for the other VEC's, aren't the plurality of VE teams under the ARRL VEC?

236. Re: Exam credit

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-05 00:12:07 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <rLKR9.54528$4j5.7553269@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 59316

"K�HB" <k�hb@arrl.DOTORG> wrote in message
news:iuIR9.14776$9N5.1401668@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
>
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote
>
> : Contact the ARRL VEC and ask the question to the experts there. While
it
> : seems like you would be covered, they are the defining authority.
>
> Nope. The "defining authority" is the FCC. ARRL VEC may be able to give
> good advice.... period.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

Well they are defining in the sense that FCC has given them and the other VECs the power to determine if the applicant's documentation meets the requirements of the FCC rules. That's actually what I meant but did not say clearly enough. It will be the VEC who rules on the adequacy of the documentation not the FCC. Although there probably is an appeal mechanism in the system.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

237. Re: Exam credit

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-05 00:14:44 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <UNKR9.54529$4j5.7553719@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 59317

"Some One" <someone@nowhere.com> wrote in message
news:3e17649f$1_4@corp-news.newsgroups.com...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
> news:EyIR9.54513$4j5.7539201@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:
>
> > Contact the ARRL VEC and ask the question to the experts there. While
> > it seems like you would be covered, they are the defining authority.
> > Do you have a copy of your Technician license from that period?
> >
> > Dee Flint, N8UZE
>
> I don't know if I still have a tech license from then, if I did there
> wouldn't be any question in my mind about what exams I would have credit
> for. I looked in the obvious place and posted my original message based
on
> what I had there.

If you have an old call book (pre March of 1987) that shows a listing that
is generally sufficient. Check QRZ. They have a service that can supply
such info I believe. The license or proof of license is the best way. But
otherwise, check with the ARRL or whatever VEC organization that you plan on
going through for the upgrade.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

238. Re: CCR Issue Revisited

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-05 01:24:26 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <7KLR9.6752$yN1.4380@news.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 59322

"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:017A02BE546E4CEB.8526366CD8B79EE3.4345195053D2BAD3@lp.airnews.net...
>
> Around here, I see no homeowner areas with any visible antennas, TV or
> otherwise. Maybe they are low to the ground or something.

I put up both a small directv dish and a yagi TV antenna, as permitted by FCC in 1996. I was the only one in the neighborhood that put up a yagi although several others put up the small directv dishes after I convinced them that the HOA could no longer prevent this. That was right after the telecom law of in 1996 was enacted. Today, I think that most people do not realize that they can put up a yagi tv antenna (the only real decent antenna for analog, which also works fine as a 2m transmitting antenna at 5W ;-)). There were at least 2 complaints over the yagi but the ASSN attorney knew the law very well and they left me alone.
>
>
> Is this something not a lot of people know about? Like I said, I can
cruise
> any "new" or "newer" neighborhood here and the only thing I see
> is--MAYBE--satellite dishes in the backyard or up on the roof. TV
antennas,
> sure, but is that the kind of antenna we're talking about? I don't see
any
> of the yagi-type TV antennas.

I think most of the general public does not know that most ASSNs cannot prohibit tv yagi antennas. And, no one is going to publicize that either. However, for the dish antennas, both DISH and DirecTV have made everyone who asked aware of their rights. If you happened to speak to a knowledgable sales person (not the majority)they would let you know that you can put up a yagi if you want, for local channels, but I think most people just purchase rabbit ears and lived with a terrible signal or sign up with local channels if available. With a Yagi, my analog signal looks much, much better than cable local used to look for local, better than the new satellite local looks today, it is cheaper and I still use it. Also, I can get out-of-market local channels not available via DirecTV, when conditions are right (they usually are).

KR4AJ

239. Re: You have to be kidding!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-05 01:30:12 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <xPLR9.6770$yN1.407@news.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 59323

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:eJkR9.54264$4j5.7349497@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> Though in practice, I find that there isn't a significant difference
> between 13 and 15. However I do notice the difference when it goes above
> 15.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

Aha! A female ham with a normal call sign!

240. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-05 01:32:06 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0301041732.635d2557@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59324

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message news:<20030102073430.21031.00000418@mb-fm.aol.com>...
> Here are the number of unexpired FCC ARS licenses held by individuals on the
> dates listed:
>
> As of May 14, 2000:
>
> Novice - 49,329
> Tech - 205,394
> Tech Plus - 128,860
> General - 112,677
> Advanced - 99,782
> Extra - 78,750
> Total - 674,792
>
>
> As of December 31, 2002:
>
> Novice - 36,074 (decrease of 13,255)
> Tech - 248,395 (increase of 42,401)
> Tech Plus - 73,426 (decrease of 55,434)
> General - 139,859 (increase of 27,182)
> Advanced - 84,330 (decrease of 15,452)
> Extra - 103,276 (increase of 24,526)
> Total - 685,360 (increase of 10,568)
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Heh.

w3rv

241. Re: Adding something extra to a CQ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-05 01:52:02 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301041752.50edb604@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59325

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E171183.EC533EDB@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E1683BA.EADEDF6D@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E1526CE.1C4709B1@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> >
> > > > > > He could bring an end to your agony over the issue by simply jotting a
> > > > > > note confirming that he'd authorized you to operate from Somalia.
> > > > >
> > > > > Agony? Where did you get that? From the same place you pulled, "a
> > > > > military commander cannot authorize amateur operations."
> > > >
> > > > Are you now quoting me?
> > >
> > > OK, quote yourself.
> >
> > Your non-answer noted.

Noted.

> > > > > > > > > You must have assumed that the material on the League's web
> > > > > > > > > site meant any officer over you.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > No, the material on the ARRL web site was read by me 10 years after my
> > > > > > > > > tour in Somalia. It essentially state the same thing as the other
> > > > > > > > > amateur on station told me.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > You mean the guy who got it in writing?
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Did he?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > He did.
> > > > >
> > > > > Who was he?
> > > >
> > > > Your memory that short? The same guy you refer to several lines above.
> > >
> > > Sorry, but you'll have to be more specific. There were a number of
> > > amateurs operating from Somalia during our operations there. I knew
> > > only one other.

> >
> > > The one who e-mailed the info about his operation. The one who was
> > > spotted numerous times on packet during his operation. That guy.
> >
> > Nope. I was gone when that amateur was there.
>
> Okay. He had written permission.

Then life is good.

> > > > > > > > > > You must have assumed that it wasn't
> > > > > > > > > > > important to have such permission in writing.
> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > That is correct.
> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > Well ain't you da fool!
> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > Well, yes. But it doesn't mean that I was a bootleger, nor does it mean I'm
a liar.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > If there is nothing in existence which backs up your claim to have had
> > > > > > > > > permission, you could be either.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > You could be a liar. Please show me something that says you're not.
> > > > > >
> > > > > Please show me something that says you're not.
> > >
> > > I have written licensing documents from each place I operated. All my
> > > operations are accepted for DXCC credit. My operations are therefore
> > > not in question.
> >
> > You went to the easy places.
>
> You asked for something which says I'm not a liar. I provided it. If
> I'd been in your shoes, I'm smart enough to have gotten written
> permission. If you'd had it, no one would be laughing up his sleeve at
> your claim.

You go to the places where the requirements are cut and dried. That
is all. You failed all the questions about operating from a country
without a government.

> > > > > > > > Didn't you just say that writing it doesn't make it true?
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > No. Pay attention. I wrote that about the statement I made earlier.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > So some things in writing mean that they're true, and other things in
> > > > > > > > writing could be false?
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > I think you might be getting the hang of it. Yes, the things which are
> > > > > > > accurate statements are true. Those which are inaccurate are false.

> > > >
> > > > You've strayed. How does it relate to being in writing? Must all
> > > > things in writing be true? Must all things not in writing be false?
> > >
> > > Wow look at Vipul climb that ladder. He crawled right past you.
> >
> > And you get lost in your own words.
>
> Which ones doomed me--"Vipul"?--"ladder"?

Who is Vipul; why is he on a ladder?

> > > > > > > > > > Him putting it in writing doesn't make it any truer.
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > We'll never know if your statement was true since he didn't put it in
> > > > > > > > > > writing.
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > Didn't you just say that writing it doesn't make it true?
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > No. Your oscillator is drifting. I wrote that about my statement, not
> > > > > > > > > about your statement.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > So your statement is true, or is it false? It's so hard to tell.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > For you, apparently. C'mon, Brian. Study the words. You can do it.
> > > >
> > > > Writing it doesn't make it true.
> > >
> > > Get Vipul to give you a hand. Saaaaay! Come to think of it, he could
> > > be a big help in building those germanium diodes for you and the young
> > > lads.
> >
> > David, please try to stay on topic.
>
> You mean about the voracity of your Somalian amateur radio operations
> yarn?
>
> Dave K8MN

Yarn? I thought you had proof?

242. Re: Exam credit

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-05 02:19:03 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <rCMR9.54544$4j5.7567487@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 59321

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.51.0301042350400.8371@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
On Sat, 4 Jan 2003, K�HB wrote:
>"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote
>>
>>: Contact the ARRL VEC and ask the question to the experts there. While
it
>>: seems like you would be covered, they are the defining authority.
>>
>>Nope. The "defining authority" is the FCC. ARRL VEC may be able to give
>>good advice.... period.
>
>However, the ARRL VEC is the defining authority over whether or not an ARRL
VE
>team should accept this "questionable indication" without other proof.
>Although he can't speak for the other VEC's, aren't the plurality of VE
teams
>under the ARRL VEC?

I don't know if ARRL is the plurality or not. W5YI is quite prominent and
widespread also.

However, I expect that they will interpret things about the same way.

Dee D Flint (YL), N8UZE

243. Re: County Issuing Radio Licenses

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-05 02:19:14 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301041819.5e8237ac@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59326

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E170F23.33EB82F7@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E168762.5F99D3D5@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E15251C.AFA4D024@earthlink.net>...
> > > >
> > > > > The DXCC desk is familiar with how military members travel. They'd
> > > > > understand how you wouldn't necessarily have a visa, entry or exit
> > > > > stamps or even a passport.
> > > >
> > > > They are very understanding people. So why did you bring up
> > > > passports, entry/exit stamps, and visas?
> > >
> > > As I've already explained, those are among the things which can be used
> > > in support of a claimed operation.
> >
> > David, do you suppose that many people have passports with stamps in
> > them and visas, who are not amateur radio operators?
>
> I know that there are numerous non-hams with visas and entry/exit stamps
> in their passports. I don't know of any of them attempting to prove to
> the ARRL's DXCC desk that they were operating an amateur radio station
> legally from an exotic spot.

Yet you trot it out as something DXCC accepts.

> > > > > They wouldn't understand how you'd have no
> > > > > written document authorizing you to get on the air from Somalia.
> > > >
> > > > So where there -is- a formal mechanism in place to track travel from
> > > > one location to another and the documentation is lacking, the DXCC
> > > > desk forgives the lack of documentation.
> > > >
> > > > But where there is -not- a formal mechanism for operating from a
> > > > location without a government, the DXCC desk is a stickler for
> > > > documentation.
> > > >
> > > > I see.
> > >
> > > It is evident that you do not see or understand much of anything.
> >

> > Your brain cage is devoid of logic.
>
> It would take an individual capable of understanding to see the logic.
> The brain cage is running low on patience though.

Then what happens?

> > > > > > You continue to assume that if the ARRL DXCC doesn't accept an
> > > > > > operation that it is illegal, aka bootlegging, aka Mog Slim.
> > > > >
>
> > > > > > You just can't be that dumb. I've clearly separated the idea of
> > > > > > legality of operation from DXCC acceptance in any number of posts.
> > > > >
> > > > > Only because I've called you on it. It was your first tactic. You've
> > > > > since changed because your position was untenable. Even the amoeba
> > > > > moves away from an electrode.
> > > >
> > > *hoooooooo-hawwwwwwwww* Oh Brian, you're such a cut up! Your tale is
> > > Boooooooogus!
> > >
> > It is true.
>
> Come up with a quote or be judged a fabricator.

David, I've already been judged. I choose not to jump through your
hoops.

> > > > > > You've used all three descriptors.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Mogadishu Slim can cover both 1) illegality of operation and 2)
> > > > > > non-acceptance by the DXCC desk for credit. I feel comfortable in
> > > > > > calling you "Slim" because you fit in both categories.
> > > > >
> > > > > And your documentation is...?
> > > >
> > > 1) No written authorization to operate from Somalia.
> > > 2) No possible acceptance for DXCC credit due to item above.
> > >
> > That is not documentation.
>
> Pretty tough to document what isn't documented.

You can't document that I operated from Somalia, then you declare me a
bootlegger. Logic, David, logic.

> > > > You said:
> > > >
> > > > "...and you have yet to provide any evidence that your operation was
> > > > legal, accepted for DXCC credit or that it ever took place at all.
> > > >
> > > > Dave K8MN"

> > > >
> > > > So without any evidence or documentation, you declare me a bootlegger.
> > >
> > > That's what bootleggers are, Brian. They're guys without evidence or
> > > documentation.
> >
> > But you have no proof of operation. To call me a bootlegger, you have
> > to have proof that I operated.
>
> We have your claim. After all, you claimed that you had permission to
> operate and that you operated.

Lemme see, you believe me when I say I operated. You don't believe me
when I say that I had permission.

Logic, David, logic.

> > > > You're a helluva guy.
> > > >
> > > > > > Yet you are not the Somali government, you are not a military
> > > > > > commander, you are not the U.N., you are not a world court, and you
> > > > > > are not the FCC. Yet you declare my operation illegal. You have
> > > > > > unimaginable powers. Who/what are you again?
> > > > >
> > > > > Let's do it again.
> > > >
> > > > Yes, let's do it again. Which of the above are you? The Somali
> > > > government, a deployed military commander, a U.N. official, the world
> > > > court, the FCC?
> > > >
> > > > I'm a guy who knows you have no paperwork
> > > > > documenting your operation. It really doesn't require much in the way
> > > > > of powers.
> > > >
> > > > You mean that you have absolutely nothing? Then you call me a
> > > > bootlegger without knowing if I even made a transmission?
> > >
> > > You told us that you made QSOs. You have no proof that you were
> > > authorized to be on the air from Somalia. If you told us that you had
> > > QSOs and you didn't, you move from bootlegger to liar.
> >
> > I also told you that I had permission to operate. Why do you choose
> > to believe one thing I say, yet not another?
> >
> > Brain cage, logic?
>
> Whaddya want to be, Brian? Bootlegger? Liar? Which of your scenarios
> is correct? Are you now telling us that you had permission but that
> your earlier claims of making QSOs and sending QSL cards from Somalia
> were false?

It's clear to me that you believe what you want.

But for your beliefs to carry any weight, you need to say you are from
the Somali government, you are my deployed military commander, you are
a U.N. official serving in Somalia, you are from the world court, or
you are an agent of the FCC.

Which one are you?

> > > > What a leap of faith you've made.
> > >
> > > It isn't much of a leap, Brian. Didn't you think anyone would check out
> > > your story?
> > >
> > And your findings are?
>
> That others operating from Somalia during the same time frame had
> written authorization. That the DXCC desk has never had a single
> submission for DXCC credit of a T5/N0IMD QSL card in spite of the fact
> that you've told us that you made QSOs and sent QSL cards.

OK.

> > > > > > Because you don't -think- DXCC will accept it.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I already KNOW the DXCC desk won't accept it without documentation.
> > > > > > There's only one way for you to put that to the test. Have someone
> > > > > > submit one of your QSL cards for T5 credit on his DXCC. Then stand back
> > > > > > and see what happens.
> > > > > > Oddly enough, in all the time which has passed since your supposed
> > > > > > operation, not one single individual has ever submitted a T5/N0IMD card
> > > > > > for DXCC credit.
> > > > > > That is really quite odd.
> > > > >
> > > > > Yes, it is. Perhaps the world's hams aren't all DXers as you would
> > > > > have us believe.
> > > >
> > > > You keep trying to attribute to me, statements which I've not made. In
> > > > fact, you are the one who confused the general ham population of the
> > > > world with the DXers of the world in a couple of earlier posts--"Perhaps the world's
hams aren't all DXers as you would have us believe." In which post would I have you believe
this?
>
> > No, I presented them as two distinct populations. You have yet to
> > show documentation that either one embraces DXCC as the world
> > standard.
>
> Why would a non-DXer embrace any DX awards program as a standard? As to
> the world's DXers--simply ask a few or ask many. Ask the DXCC desk
> about the number of non-U.S. hams who have applied for the award.
> Again, you've attributed to me a statement which I did not make.

David, OK, I'll grant you that we won't consider the amateurs worldwide that don't engage in DX activities.

Now, the number of amateurs that have applied for DXCC is what percentage of the number of amateurs engaging in DX activities? Again I ask, of all the worlds amateurs that engage in DX activities, how many have filed for DXCC?

We need to quantify in some way your claims of one world DX standard.

I would think that "Worked All Continents" is a more popular DX award than DXCC.

> > David, you need to come up with something new.
>
> We need to take care of old business before new business is introduced.

I thought you took care of it? Didn't I hear your gavel hit the bench?

244. Re: What country?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-05 02:21:26 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301041821.2506656a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59327
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E16806A.F896E3AC@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E152255.D8E628AE@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E14BA0D.52E24E8F@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E11CAB5.AEDE954C@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E0F282B.4DACAF4D@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E0E7DB8.2728433A@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E0D48F8.E243C02B@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > "K HB" <k hb@arrl.DOTORG> wrote in message news:<kV%O9.1862
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > > The FCC could care less about DXCC
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > > Dave confuses DXCC with FCC. Ditto his minions. You five need a
one on one.
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > > Do you have a single reference of such a comment from me?
> > > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > Yes.
> > > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > Then put up or shut up.
> > > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > You claimed my Somalia operation was illegal based upon ARRL DXCC
rules.
> > > > > > > > > > > > > >

> > > > > > > > > No, I claimed and still do, that your operation was not acceptable for
> > > > > > > > > DXCC credit. Without supporting documentation, you can never make it
> > > > > > > > > so.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > How do you characterize your use of the term "bootlegging?"
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > I do not and did not claim that you were a bootlegger based upon
> > > > > > > > > violation of DXCC rules. You were a bootlegger because you have no
> > > > > > > > > documentation to support your claim that you had permission to
> > > > > > > > > operate. You have no military or UN issued paperwork? Too bad.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > You did, based upon DXCC rules, claim my operation was illegal. But
> > > > > > > > you have been wrong on so many counts that you really don't recall
> > > > > > > > what you've said anymore.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Google does:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > quote From: Dave Heil (k8mn@earthlink.net)
> > > > > > > Subject: Re: ARRL Members -- protest this action to your director
> > > > > > > Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> > > > > > > Date: 2002-09-12 06:15:32 PST
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Brian P Burke wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > > > > > news:3D7E8A0D.ACC5D04D@earthlink.net...
> > > > > > > > > Brian P Burke wrote:
>
> > > > > > > > So DXCC is the final licensing authority in the world?
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > I guess you're back to that again.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > How many times must I tell you before it sinks in:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > 1) The DXCC desk (with advice from the DXAC) is the final arbiter on
> > > > > > > what is accepted for DXCC credit.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > 2) (a separate issue) You have no proof of permission to operate from
> > > > > > > Somalia at all *punto* unquote
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Now, what was it that you were sure I told you?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > You claimed that my operation from Somalia was illegal based upon DXCC
> > > > > > acceptance/nonacceptance. You continue to amend your statements as I
> > > > > > call you to the carpet for each inaccuracy.
> > > > >
> > > > > Read it again, Brian. That isn't what it says at all.
> > >
> > > I see you talking about the DXCC desk again. I don't see you mention

> > any other "authority."
>
> Read it again.

No.

245. Re: What country?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-05 02:28:57 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301041828.3281188@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59328
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E167F50.154C5E13@earthlink.net>...

> > I no longer sign "portable T5."
>
> I haven't seen any indication that you ever did.

Yet, without any indication, you declare people bootleggers.

> > You were never in a situation where a commander had the authority to
> > authorize amateur operations.
>
> Sure I was, Brian. I was in Vietnam '70-'71.

Sure you weren't. Don't you remember what you said? You've already
said here that amateur operations weren't permitted.

> You have no experience in such matters.
>
> Darn it, you're wrong again.

Nope. Don't you remember what you said? Every country that you've
operated from had a government that you petitioned for amateur
operations.

> > You even went so far as to say that commanders cannot authorize any
> > amateur authorizations.
>
> Darn--wrong again. Where'd I say that?

You're David Heil, K8MN, Right?

> > It was me who has provided you with such an education.
>
> Sure you did, Brian--in your mind.

Don't you remember what you said? It's all here David.

246. Re: What country?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-05 03:07:07 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301041907.3e03ae99@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59329
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E167F50.154C5E13@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:

> > You were never in a situation where a commander had the authority to
> > authorize amateur operations.
>
> Sure I was, Brian. I was in Vietnam '70-'71.
>
> You have no experience in such matters.
>
> Darn it, you're wrong again.

I am not wrong. You said you couldn't operate in Vietnam. Maybe too much happy smoke or maybe you just bootlegged. Probably hear a different story tomorrow anyway.

Here's the quote:

"There was no amateur radio operation permitted by the military in Vietnam. I know of two legal stations, both operated by American civilians during my time in country. My military commander did not have the authority to permit me to operate on the ham bands. I don't have any written permission either."

247. Re: What country?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-05 03:20:16 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <pr8f1v8s38vh6s4m0virpk4msmr4bqisd7@4ax.com>
Source record: 59330
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Sat, 04 Jan 2003 06:34:26 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Brian wrote:
>>
>> Dave Heil wrote
>> > Brian wrote:
>> > >
>> > > Dave Heil wrote
>> > > > Brian wrote:
>> > > > >
>> > > > > Dave Heil wrote
>> > > > > > Brian wrote:
>> > > > > > >
>> > > > > > > Dave Heil wrote
>> > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
>> > > > > > > > >
>> > > > > > > > > Dave Heil wrote
>> > > > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
>> > > > > > > > > > >
>> > > > > > > > > > > Dave Heil wrote
>> > > > > > > > > > > > Brian wrote:

And on and on and on and on.....

With all due respect guys are you going to take over EVERY
thread here with who said who said what and who can do what where?

Your rrap bar room brawl might be better confined to one
thread. PSE K.

- Mike KB3EIA -

248. Re: Adding something extra to a CQ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-05 03:21:50 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <t49f1v0nnkrj8v2amem5ohhb5qh2tmmqob@4ax.com>
Source record: 59331

On Sat, 04 Jan 2003 16:52:15 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Brian wrote:
>>
>> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E1683BA.EADEDF6D@earthlink.net>...
>> > Brian wrote:
>> > >
>> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E1526CE.1C4709B1@earthlink.net>...
>> > > > Brian wrote:

And on and on and on and on........

With all due respect guys are you going to take over EVERY
thread here with who said who said what and who can do what where?

Your rrap bar room brawl might be better confined to one
thread. PSE K.

- Mike KB3EIA -

249. Re: County Issuing Radio Licenses

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-05 03:22:41 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <c79f1vg5ovj0aqgb8u8kb9fq1hgnd45c5k@4ax.com>
Source record: 59332

On 4 Jan 2003 06:24:43 -0800, brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:

>Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E168762.5F99D3D5@earthlink.net>...
>> Brian wrote:
>> >
>> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E15251C.AFA4D024@earthlink.net>...

And on and on and on and on........

With all due respect guys are you going to take over EVERY
thread here with who said who said what and who can do what where?

Your rrap bar room brawl might be better confined to one
thread. PSE K.

- Mike KB3EIA -

250. Re: Ham Running For Office - Orange County, California

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-05 04:58:49 UTC
From: "William A. Wetzel" <n6rky@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <dYOR9.15890$9N5.1463144@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 59333

Ryan,

You have an excellent point there. If amateur radio enthusiasts voted independently as you had suggested, the voice would be unified and heard all the way to Washington. Many interest groups do just that. Why not amateur radio as well? Something to think about :)

Best Wishes,
& Thank you for your support!
--
William A. Wetzel
http://home.earthlink.net/~n6rky
http://www.qsl.net/n6rky
mailto:n6rky@earthlink.net
mailto:n6rky@qsl.net

KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:aupff85adl@enews2.newsguy.com...
>
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> news:cuvyxnansvbet.h7rb50w.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> > On Thu, 26 Dec 2002 04:15:32 -0500, KC8PMX wrote:
> >
> > >Anyone who votes democrat or republican is nuts.... It is
> > >a no-win situation on either side of that political coin. Look at this
> last
> > >presidential election, neither partie's candidate was worth a damn,
> except
> > >for being a puppet on a string for their respective parties.
> >
> > "None of the above" was not an option.
>
> There were other candidates other that the Big 2 parties...
>
>
> >
> > >"Vote Independant; Think For Yourself, Not What People Want You To
> Think"
> >
> > The last "independents" in Presidemtial elections were Ross Perot
> > and Ralph Nader, both of whom were scarier than the Demo-Rep
> > candidates.
>
>
> Maybe I should have cleared that one up a bit.... Independant meaning any

> party other than the republican and democrat parties.
>
>
> >
> > The first and last independent that I voted for was John Anderson in
> > 1980, because neither Carter nor Reagan were acceptable.
> >
> > None of the above were hams....
> >
> > ---
> > 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
> Maybe that would be the ultimate goal for the ARRL? After all, aren't
these
> the people (any elected officials that is) that we are going to look to
for
> defense, and support? Me thinks they would understand the hobby better if
> they knew more about it if they were licensed also. I would almost join
the
> ARRL just to get a motion made to get that to happen.... :)
>
>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF/MFR
> REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
>
> "Symbolism is for the simple minded....."
>
>
>
>
>
>

251. Re: You have to be kidding! I saw it coming.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-05 05:28:45 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3E17C28C.56B2BDF3@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 59334

Brian wrote:

>
> I liked the way the staffers shut down government under Newt Gingrich.

"She turned me into a NEWT.... Well, I got better...."
from "Monty Python and the Holy Grail"

252. Re: You have to be kidding! I saw it coming.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-05 05:30:42 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3E17C301.F9B559F3@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 59335

>
> > Learning and testing using the Farnsworth approach is MUCH easier.
>
> That's what I hear.
>
>

Well, it's just a communist plot. Oh, wait, cold war's over.... :-)

253. Re: ARRL PROVIDING FCC LICENSE RENEWAL TO NONMEMBERS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-05 05:35:13 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3E17C411.B84EC2B0@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 59336

Brian wrote:

> Who was it that was so opposed to W5YI charging $5 for license reneals?
>
> From the ARRL Letter, Vol 22, No 01
> ----------------------------------
>
> ARRL PROVIDING FCC LICENSE RENEWAL, ADDRESS CHANGES, MODS TO NONMEMBERS
>
> The ARRL has announced that it's now providing FCC Amateur Radio license
> renewals, address changes and other license modification services to
> nonmembers. For a $12 fee, the League will renew a nonmember's Amateur
> Radio ticket

IIRC, you can do it for free via the Internet at a web page at the FCC.
Yes?

254. Re: Another Morse Code Opinion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-05 05:37:27 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3E17C497.7DB5526B@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 59337

KC8PMX wrote:

> Is it a CB arguement? Or is it a relation to public service agencies have
> been using the 10codes as well as other terminology alot longer that
> cb'ers....? I slip up from time to time using terminology from my
> employment in emergency services..... for instance instead of copy or QSL,
> I have twice used (and quickly corrected) the term 10-3 or "message
> recieved." Work in a law enforcement capacity as well as a member of a
> On-call fire department as well as being a ham, sometimes this type of thing
> does happen.
>

For added fun, use 10 codes when operating CW. Especially if you
QSO Larry.

:-)

255. Re: Another Morse Code Opinion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-05 05:52:44 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3E17C82C.2F992654@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 59338

"Mike H. KC8UBH" wrote:

>
> Do I care if they do away with code? Not really - but they damn well better
> make the written test one hell of a lot harder. When its as easy to get
> your General as it is to get your Tech - HF is going to get really stinky.

When the FCC did the reconstruction reconsiderations, they pointed out
that there was no detectable dedragration of HF in the first year after
reconstruction went into effect. No additional idiots on 14313

256. Re: County Issuing Radio Licenses

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-05 06:43:55 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E17D416.E64C6CA@earthlink.net>
Source record: 59339

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E170F23.33EB82F7@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E168762.5F99D3D5@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E15251C.AFA4D024@earthlink.net>...
> > > > >
> > > > > > The DXCC desk is familiar with how military members travel. They'd
> > > > > > understand how you wouldn't necessarily have a visa, entry or exit
> > > > > > stamps or even a passport.
> > > > >
> > > > > They are very understanding people. So why did you bring up
> > > > > passports, entry/exit stamps, and visas?
> > > >
> > > > As I've already explained, those are among the things which can be used
> > > > in support of a claimed operation.
> > >
> > > David, do you suppose that many people have passports with stamps in
> > > them and visas, who are not amateur radio operators?
> >
> > I know that there are numerous non-hams with visas and entry/exit stamps
> > in their passports. I don't know of any of them attempting to prove to
> > the ARRL's DXCC desk that they were operating an amateur radio station
> > legally from an exotic spot.
>
> Yet you trot it out as something DXCC accepts.

...that's because they are among things which the DXCC desk can and does
look at in evaluating whether an operation will be accepted for DXCC.

> > > > > > They wouldn't understand how you'd have no
> > > > > > written document authorizing you to get on the air from Somalia.
> > > > >
> > > > > So where there -is- a formal mechanism in place to track travel from
> > > > > one location to another and the documentation is lacking, the DXCC
> > > > > desk forgives the lack of documentation.
> > > >
> > > > But where there is -not- a formal mechanism for operating from a
> > > > location without a government, the DXCC desk is a stickler for

> > > > > documentation.
> > > > >
> > > > > I see.
> > > > >
> > > > It is evident that you do not see or understand much of anything.
> > > >
> > > Your brain cage is devoid of logic.
> > >
> > It would take an individual capable of understanding to see the logic.
> > The brain cage is running low on patience though.
> >
> Then what happens?

Stick around.

> > > > > > > You continue to assume that if the ARRL DXCC doesn't accept an
> > > > > > > operation that it is illegal, aka bootlegging, aka Mog Slim.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > You just can't be that dumb. I've clearly separated the idea of
> > > > > > > legality of operation from DXCC acceptance in any number of posts.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > Only because I've called you on it. It was your first tactic. You've
> > > > > > since changed because your position was untenable. Even the amoeba
> > > > > > moves away from an electrode.
> > > > > >
> > > > > *hooooooo-hawwwwwwwww* Oh Brian, you're such a cut up! Your tale is
> > > > > Booooooooogus!
> > > > >
> > > > It is true.
> > > >
> > > Come up with a quote or be judged a fabricator.
> > >
> > David, I've already been judged. I choose not to jump through your
> > hoops.

Jump through my hoops? You've attributed something to me which I didn't
write.
Have I attributed anything to you which you haven't written?

> > > > > > > You've used all three descriptors.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Mogadishu Slim can cover both 1) illegality of operation and 2)
> > > > > > > non-acceptance by the DXCC desk for credit. I feel comfortable in
> > > > > > > calling you "Slim" because you fit in both categories.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > And your documentation is...?
> > > > > >
> > > > > 1) No written authorization to operate from Somalia.
> > > > > 2) No possible acceptance for DXCC credit due to item above.
> > > > >

> > > That is not documentation.
> >
> > Pretty tough to document what isn't documented.
>
> You can't document that I operated from Somalia, then you declare me a
> bootlegger. Logic, David, logic.

We aren't dealing with x + y. Your dilemma is x or y.

> > > > > You said:
> > > > >
> > > > > "...and you have yet to provide any evidence that your operation was
> > > > > legal, accepted for DXCC credit or that it ever took place at all.
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave K8MN"
> > > > >
> > > > > So without any evidence or documentation, you declare me a bootlegger.
> > > >
> > > > That's what bootleggers are, Brian. They're guys without evidence or
> > > > documentation.
> > >
> > > But you have no proof of operation. To call me a bootlegger, you have
> > > to have proof that I operated.
> >
> > We have your claim. After all, you claimed that you had permission to
> > operate and that you operated.
>
> Lemme see, you believe me when I say I operated. You don't believe me
> when I say that I had permission.
>
> Logic, David, logic.

x or y, Brian.

> > > > > You're a helluva guy.
> > > > >
> > > > > > > Yet you are not the Somali government, you are not a military
> > > > > > > commander, you are not the U.N., you are not a world court, and you
> > > > > > > are not the FCC. Yet you declare my operation illegal. You have
> > > > > > > unimaginable powers. Who/what are you again?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Let's do it again.
> > > > >
> > > > > Yes, let's do it again. Which of the above are you? The Somali
> > > > > government, a deployed military commander, a U.N. official, the world
> > > > > court, the FCC?
> > > > >
> > > > > I'm a guy who knows you have no paperwork
> > > > > > documenting your operation. It really doesn't require much in the way
> > > > > > of powers.
> > > > >

> > > > > You mean that you have absolutely nothing? Then you call me a
> > > > > bootlegger without knowing if I even made a transmission?
> > > > >
> > > > > You told us that you made QSOs. You have no proof that you were
> > > > > authorized to be on the air from Somalia. If you told us that you had
> > > > > QSOs and you didn't, you move from bootlegger to liar.
> > > >
> > > > I also told you that I had permission to operate. Why do you choose
> > > > to believe one thing I say, yet not another?
> > > >
> > > > Brain cage, logic?
> > >
> > Whaddya want to be, Brian? Bootlegger? Liar? Which of your scenarios
> > is correct? Are you now telling us that you had permission but that
> > your earlier claims of making QSOs and sending QSL cards from Somalia
> > were false?
>
> It's clear to me that you believe what you want.

My belief can change depending upon what your story is on this
particular day.
You could clear up some of these issues by being more forthcoming and
answering a few questions. For example: What equipment and antennas
were used? What bands and modes did you use in making your contacts from
Somalia?
Which countries and continents did you work? How were the QSLs delivered
or handled? After all, you did tell us that you operated from Somalia
and that QSLs were exchanged. These should be easy for you.

> But for your beliefs to carry any weight, you need to say you are from
> the Somali government, you are my deployed military commander, you are
> a U.N. official serving in Somalia, you are from the world court, or
> you are an agent of the FCC.

Where does it say that my views don't carry any weight unless I meet
your criteria?

> Which one are you?

> > > > > What a leap of faith you've made.
> > > > >
> > > > > It isn't much of a leap, Brian. Didn't you think anyone would check out
> > > > > your story?
> > > >
> > > > And your findings are?
> > >
> > That others operating from Somalia during the same time frame had
> > written authorization. That the DXCC desk has never had a single
> > submission for DXCC credit of a T5/N0IMD QSL card in spite of the fact
> > that you've told us that you made QSOs and sent QSL cards.
>
> OK.

>
> > > > > > > Because you don't -think- DXCC will accept it.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > I already KNOW the DXCC desk won't accept it without documentation.
> > > > > > > There's only one way for you to put that to the test. Have someone
> > > > > > > submit one of your QSL cards for T5 credit on his DXCC. Then stand back
> > > > > > > and see what happens.
> > > > > > > Oddly enough, in all the time which has passed since your supposed
> > > > > > > operation, not one single individual has ever submitted a T5/N0IMD card
> > > > > > > for DXCC credit.
> > > > > > > That is really quite odd.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Yes, it is. Perhaps the world's hams aren't all DXers as you would
> > > > > > > have us believe.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > You keep trying to attribute to me, statements which I've not made. In
> > > > > > fact, you are the one who confused the general ham population of the
> > > > > > world with the DXers of the world in a couple of earlier posts--"Perhaps the
world's hams aren't all DXers as you would have us believe." In which post would I have you
believe this?
> > >
> > > No, I presented them as two distinct populations. You have yet to
> > > show documentation that either one embraces DXCC as the world
> > > standard.
> > >
> > Why would a non-DXer embrace any DX awards program as a standard? As to
> > the world's DXers--simply ask a few or ask many. Ask the DXCC desk
> > about the number of non-U.S. hams who have applied for the award.
> > Again, you've attributed to me a statement which I did not make.
>
> David, OK, I'll grant you that we won't consider the amateurs
> worldwide that don't engage in DX activities.

That's awfully big of you since it appeared that you had no option but
to rope in your silly rhetoric.

> Now, the number of amateurs that have applied for DXCC is what
> percentage of the number of amateurs engaging in DX activities? Again
> I ask, of all the worlds amateurs that engage in DX activities, how
> many have filed for DXCC?

Again I answer: Ask the folks at the DXCC desk. If I told you, "12,323"
how would you be equipped to confirm my response without knowing how
many non-U.S. DXers are currently active?

> We need to quantify in some way your claims of one world DX standard.

Ask other DXers? Know any?

> I would think that "Worked All Continents" is a more popular DX award
> than DXCC.

More popular? Do you really believe that DXers consider WAC a standard?
Only among neophytes could that be possible. You keep coming up with
new ways to affirm my statement that you are not a DXer.

> > > David, you need to come up with something new.
> >
> > We need to take care of old business before new business is introduced.
>
> I thought you took care of it? Didn't I hear your gavel hit the
> bench?

No, that was your credibility hitting a new low.

Dave K8MN

257. Re: What country?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-05 06:46:14 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E17D4B2.C307E519@earthlink.net>
Source record: 59340
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E16806A.F896E3AC@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E152255.D8E628AE@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:

> > > > > > > So DXCC is the final licensing authority in the world?
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > I guess you're back to that again.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > How many times must I tell you before it sinks in:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > 1) The DXCC desk (with advice from the DXAC) is the final arbiter on
> > > > > > > what is accepted for DXCC credit.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > 2) (a separate issue) You have no proof of permission to operate from
> > > > > > > Somalia at all *punto* unquote
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Now, what was it that you were sure I told you?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > You claimed that my operation from Somalia was illegal based upon DXCC
> > > > > > acceptance/nonacceptance. You continue to amend your statements as I
> > > > > > call you to the carpet for each inaccuracy.
> > > > >
> > > > > Read it again, Brian. That isn't what it says at all.
> > > >
> > > > I see you talking about the DXCC desk again. I don't see you mention
> > > > any other "authority."
> > >
> > > Read it again.
> >
> > No.

I'd be embarrassed too if I were you.

Dave K8MN
```

258. Re: What country?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-05 06:53:43 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E17D664.E2E17CF8@earthlink.net>
Source record: 59341
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E167F50.154C5E13@earthlink.net>...
>
> > > I no longer sign "portable T5."
> >
> > I haven't seen any indication that you ever did.
>
> Yet, without any indication, you declare people bootleggers.

No, it is assuredly with indication. You are without any indication
that you ever had permission to operate from T5.

> > > You were never in a situation where a commander had the authority to
> > > authorize amateur operations.
> >
> > Sure I was, Brian. I was in Vietnam '70-'71.
>
> Sure you weren't. Don't you remember what you said? You've already
> said here that amateur operations weren't permitted.

My commander had the authority. His decision was that I couldn't
operate.
Don Riebhoff was operating legally right across town at the same time I
was in country. He used to run phone patches for Ambassador Bunker.

> > You have no experience in such matters.
> >
> > Darn it, you're wrong again.
>
> Nope. Don't you remember what you said? Every country that you've
> operated from had a government that you petitioned for amateur
> operations.

I did no petitioning, Brian. I made application. Vietnam had a
government. I still couldn't operate.

> > > You even went so far as to say that commanders cannot authorize any
> > > amateur authorizations.
> >
> > Darn--wrong again. Where'd I say that?
>
> You're David Heil, K8MN, Right?

Who I am was already known. Where did I say what you've attributed to me?

> > > It was me who has provided you with such an education.
> >
> > Sure you did, Brian--in your mind.
>
> Don't you remember what you said? It's all here David.

Come up with it.

Dave K8MN

259. Re: What country?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-05 07:00:48 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E17D85A.8A3BE787@earthlink.net>
Source record: 59342
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E167F50.154C5E13@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
>
> > > You were never in a situation where a commander had the authority to
> > > authorize amateur operations.
> >
> > Sure I was, Brian. I was in Vietnam '70-'71.
> >
> > You have no experience in such matters.
> >
> > Darn it, you're wrong again.
>
> I am not wrong. You said you couldn't operate in Vietnam. Maybe too
> much happy smoke or maybe you just bootlegged. Probably hear a
> different story tomorrow anyway.
>
> Here's the quote:
>
> "There was no amateur radio operation permitted by the military in
> Vietnam. I know of two legal stations, both operated by American
> civilians during my time in country. My military commander did not
> have the authority to permit me to operate on the ham bands. I don't
> have any written permission either."

And I had no written permission and did no operating in the ham bands.
My commander advised that he could not grant permission. I was in the
military and had to accept his word. Yet Don Riebhoff, a civilian,
operated legally right across town from me.

So I broke no regs, no laws, did no bootlegging, had no QSOs. Now, back
to your situation...

Dave K8MN

260. Re: Why hams think we deserve the 5 mhz band (was: You have to be kidding!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-05 07:07:10 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns92FA157C9F25Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 59343

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
news:d22b54c3.0301040209.7634148e@posting.google.com:

> Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:<Xns92F8C50B09522elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
>> news:d22b54c3.0301030616.25e11e3d@posting.google.com:
>>
>> > Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>> > news:<Xns92F6D294E24E0elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> >
>> >
>> >> If I want to work any DX above 3.8 and below 14.15 MHz, I have to
>> >> use split VFOs, and hope that someone will listen up above 7.15
>> >> while I am listening below 7.1, and this will get more important
>> >> again as the sunspots go away.
>> >
>> > From a dxers perspective working split is a good idea, phone, cw, 40
>> > or anywhere else.
>>
>> So you think it's a good idea to use twice the bandwidth!
>
>
> Lousy troll. No cigar. If you're so big into "spectrum conservation"
> why are you running phone?
>

No-one has ever called me a troll before.

>
>>
>> > I'm all for the dx having phone privs on freqs below our band
>> > limits. God bless dual VFOs.
>> >
>> > There is also a fairness issue involved, the dx is much more likely
>> > to be able to work other dx in those segements without getting
>> > hounded and pounded by the U.S. hordes.
>>
>> But on 40 we have no common frequencies!
>
> So what?? It's just part of the game. You're either a real dxer or yer
> not. You either jump the hurdles of you don't. You oughta been there
> when phone wasn't permitted by *any* U.S. ops below 7.200. I have no
> idea today how many 40m ssb dxcc cards I have from that regime but

> I'll bet it's at least pushing 100. And you're all bent outta shape
> because you can't yak down to 7.075? Bwaaahaha! Apply for a disabilty
> waiver.
>

So you don't want any improvements? What an odd attitude.

>> > If phone was permitted to the lower band edges most of the bitching
>> > would come from the phone ops, not the cw and digital ops.
>>
>> Nobody wants phone all the way to the lower band edges
>
> . . . you jest!
>
>>
>> All I actually asked for was phone from 7.075-7.1, which I really
>> don't think is unreasonable, but I should ask the FCC, not Usenet!
>
> Right on the money. Go ask the FCC for the NPRM. Then (a) put on yer
> padded Kevlar suit or (b) yank yer modem.
>

I probably will do it.

>
>> Since you bring it up, most of the bitching now is from DX phone
>> operators who have to put up with the bleeping of US digital and CW
>> ops in their phone subbands, so in that sense you are partly right.
>
>
>
> BOINK.
>

What language is that?

>
> w3rv
>

261. Re: ARRL PROVIDING FCC LICENSE RENEWAL TO NONMEMBERS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-05 14:16:45 UTC
From: Steve Fleckenstein <spfleck@citlink.net>
Message-ID: <v1gfif64cpjk86@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 59344

```
| IIRC, you can do it for free via the Internet at a web page at the FCC.
| Yes?
|

Yes, However passing an Amateur radio exam does not guarantee that you will
be able to navigate the FCC web site.
```

262. Re: Exam credit

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-05 14:23:51 UTC
From: NoName <user@computer.net>
Message-ID: <rkfg1vgkrd3vgnouenruriahf721lf9vrn@4ax.com>
Source record: 59346

On Sat, 04 Jan 2003 23:52:27 GMT, "D. Stussy"
<kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote:

>On Sat, 4 Jan 2003, Kï¿½HB wrote:
>>"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote
>>
>>: Contact the ARRL VEC and ask the question to the experts there. While it
>>: seems like you would be covered, they are the defining authority.
>>
>>Nope. The "defining authority" is the FCC. ARRL VEC may be able to give
>>good advice.... period.
>
>However, the ARRL VEC is the defining authority over whether or not an ARRL VE
>team should accept this "questionable indication" without other proof.
>Although he can't speak for the other VEC's, aren't the plurality of VE teams
>under the ARRL VEC?

I don't think the W5YI VEC or the Alaska VEC or any of the other VECs
answer to the ARRL.

263. Re: Why hams think we deserve the 5 mhz band (was: You have to be kidding!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-05 14:39:23 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0301050639.6233f47e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59345

Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns92FA157C9F25Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...

> >> > From a dxers perspective working split is a good idea, phone, cw, 40
> >> > or anywhere else.
> >>
> >> So you think it's a good idea to use twice the bandwidth!
> > >
> > >
> > > Lousy troll. No cigar. If you're so big into "spectrum conservation"
> > > why are you running phone?
> > >
> >
> > No-one has ever called me a troll before.

Ya can't be a virgin forever in this NG. Welcome to The Group.

Ya didn't answer the question.

> > > idea today how many 40m ssb dxcc cards I have from that regime but
> > > I'll bet it's at least pushing 100. And you're all bent outta shape
> > > because you can't yak down to 7.075? Bwaaahaha! Apply for a disabilty
> > > waiver.
> > >
> >
> > So you don't want any improvements? What an odd attitude.

I never even intimated any such thing. I've been hoping for the ITU
40M "harmonization" maneuver for years. In tbe best of all possible
worlds the DX would get privs all the way up to 7.300. That would
solve the problem. All extending U.S. phone privs down to 7.075 would
do is cause problems on top of problems.

> >> Since you bring it up, most of the bitching now is from DX phone
> >> operators who have to put up with the bleeping of US digital and CW
> >> ops in their phone subbands, so in that sense you are partly right.
> > >
> > > BOINK.
> > >
> >
> > What language is that?

CW.

>
> >
> > > w3rv
> >

264. Re: ARRL PROVIDING FCC LICENSE RENEWAL TO NONMEMBERS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-05 14:48:46 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0301050648.5fc91342@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59347

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:<3E17C411.B84EC2B0@ix.netcom.com>...

>> > The ARRL has announced that it's now providing FCC Amateur Radio
license
> > renewals, address changes and other license modification services to
> > nonmembers. For a $12 fee, the League will renew a nonmember's Amateur
> > Radio ticket
>
> IIRC, you can do it for free via the Internet at a web page at the FCC.
> Yes?

Yes. And it's a pain in the butt. Another side of it being that there
are a very large number of hams out here who don't have computers
and/or connections to the Net. The League will make a few bucks on it,
no biggie.

w3rv

265. Re: What country?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-05 14:54:59 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301050654.58dd3db4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59348
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E17D85A.8A3BE787@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E167F50.154C5E13@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
>
> > > > You were never in a situation where a commander had the authority to
> > > > authorize amateur operations.
> > >
> > > Sure I was, Brian. I was in Vietnam '70-'71.
> > >
> > > You have no experience in such matters.
> > >
> > > Darn it, you're wrong again.
> >
> > I am not wrong. You said you couldn't operate in Vietnam. Maybe too
> > much happy smoke or maybe you just bootlegged. Probably hear a
> > different story tomorrow anyway.
> >
> > Here's the quote:
> >
> > "There was no amateur radio operation permitted by the military in
> > Vietnam. I know of two legal stations, both operated by American
> > civilians during my time in country. My military commander did not
> > have the authority to permit me to operate on the ham bands. I don't
> > have any written permission either."
>
> And I had no written permission and did no operating in the ham bands.
> My commander advised that he could not grant permission. I was in the
> military and had to accept his word. Yet Don Riebhoff, a civilian,
> operated legally right across town from me.
>
> So I broke no regs, no laws, did no bootlegging, had no QSOs. Now, back
> to your situation...
>
> Dave K8MN

So, 1) you were not in a situation where your commander had the
authority to authorize amateur operations, and 2) you have no
experience in such matters.

You accepted your commander's word.

266. Re: What country?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-05 15:09:48 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301050709.64649eed@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59349
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E17D664.E2E17CF8@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E167F50.154C5E13@earthlink.net>...
> >
> > > > I no longer sign "portable T5."
> > >
> > > I haven't seen any indication that you ever did.
> >
> > Yet, without any indication, you declare people bootleggers.
>
> No, it is assuredly with indication. You are without any indication
> that you ever had permission to operate from T5.

David, what do you have?

> > > > You were never in a situation where a commander had the authority to
> > > > authorize amateur operations.
> > >
> > > Sure I was, Brian. I was in Vietnam '70-'71.
> >
> > Sure you weren't. Don't you remember what you said? You've already
> > said here that amateur operations weren't permitted.
>
> My commander had the authority. His decision was that I couldn't
> operate.

No, Cecil, he didn't. Your commander had no decision to make, had no
authority to rescind a standing rule. He simply told you what the
rule was. The rule was, you said, ~no military pers can operate
amateur radio in Vietnam."

> Don Riebhoff was operating legally right across town at the same time I
> was in country. He used to run phone patches for Ambassador Bunker.

I can see the deep scarring that has caused. Must be why you found a
new career in the State Department.

> > > You have no experience in such matters.
> > >
> > > Darn it, you're wrong again.
> >
> > Nope. Don't you remember what you said? Every country that you've
> > operated from had a government that you petitioned for amateur

> > operations.
>
> I did no petitioning, Brian. I made application. Vietnam had a
> government. I still couldn't operate.

You made application. We learn something new every day. Which form
did you use?

> > > > You even went so far as to say that commanders cannot authorize any
> > > > amateur authorizations.
> > >
> > > Darn--wrong again. Where'd I say that?
> >
> > You're David Heil, K8MN, Right?
>
> Who I am was already known. Where did I say what you've attributed to
> me?

Its just that you say different things on different days and cannot
remember contradicting statements. I just wondered who you were
yesterday. Who will you be tomorrow?

> > > > It was me who has provided you with such an education.
> > >
> > > Sure you did, Brian--in your mind.
> >
> > Don't you remember what you said? It's all here David.
>
> Come up with it.

I did.

267. Re: What country?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-05 15:12:44 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301050712.c57fb18@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59350
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E17D4B2.C307E519@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E16806A.F896E3AC@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E152255.D8E628AE@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> >
> > > > > > > > > > > > So DXCC is the final licensing authority in the world?
> > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > I guess you're back to that again.
> > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > How many times must I tell you before it sinks in:
> > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > 1) The DXCC desk (with advice from the DXAC) is the final arbiter on
> > > > > > > > > > > > what is accepted for DXCC credit.
> > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > 2) (a separate issue) You have no proof of permission to operate from
> > > > > > > > > > > > Somalia at all *punto* unquote
> > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > Now, what was it that you were sure I told you?
> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > You claimed that my operation from Somalia was illegal based upon DXCC
> > > > > > > > > > > acceptance/nonacceptance. You continue to amend your statements as I
> > > > > > > > > > > call you to the carpet for each inaccuracy.
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > Read it again, Brian. That isn't what it says at all.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > I see you talking about the DXCC desk again. I don't see you mention
> > > > > > > > any other "authority."
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Read it again.
> > > >
> > > > No.
> >
> > I'd be embarrassed too if I were you.

David, there is no "authority" listed in the above document, other
than the DXCC. Reading it again won't make it magically appear. You
go be embarassed.

268. Re: County Issuing Radio Licenses

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-05 15:41:22 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301050741.32cc0e9a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59351

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E17D416.E64C6CA@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E170F23.33EB82F7@earthlink.net>...

> > > Come up with a quote or be judged a fabricator.
> >
> > David, I've already been judged. I choose not to jump through your
> > hoops.
>
> Jump through my hoops? You've attributed something to me which I didn't
> write.

You write so many things, David. You remember so little of what
you've written.

> Have I attributed anything to you which you haven't written?

Yes, you've said I didn't have permission.

> > > > > > > Mogadishu Slim can cover both 1) illegality of operation and 2)
> > > > > > > non-acceptance by the DXCC desk for credit. I feel comfortable in
> > > > > > > calling you "Slim" because you fit in both categories.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > And your documentation is...?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > 1) No written authorization to operate from Somalia.
> > > > > > 2) No possible acceptance for DXCC credit due to item above.
> > > > >
> > > > That is not documentation.
> > >
> > > Pretty tough to document what isn't documented.
> >
> > You can't document that I operated from Somalia, then you declare me a
> > bootlegger. Logic, David, logic.
>
> We aren't dealing with x + y. Your dilemma is x or y.

David, I'm quite comfortable with x and y. But you need to show me
documentation of x before you declare z.

> > Lemme see, you believe me when I say I operated. You don't believe me
> > when I say that I had permission.
> >
> > Logic, David, logic.

>
> x or y, Brian.

Z, David. Choose to believe it, or choose not to believe it.

> > > Whaddya want to be, Brian? Bootlegger? Liar? Which of your scenarios
> > > is correct? Are you now telling us that you had permission but that
> > > your earlier claims of making QSOs and sending QSL cards from Somalia
> > > were false?
> >
> > It's clear to me that you believe what you want.
>
> My belief can change depending upon what your story is on this
> particular day.

You and Ed made up your minds a long time ago. My "story" hasn't
changed.

> You could clear up some of these issues by being more forthcoming and
> answering a few questions. For example: What equipment and antennas
> were used? What bands and modes did you use in making your contacts from
> Somalia?
> Which countries and continents did you work? How were the QSLs delivered
> or handled? After all, you did tell us that you operated from Somalia
> and that QSLs were exchanged. These should be easy for you.

For what purpose? You choose to believe this, but reject that.

> > But for your beliefs to carry any weight, you need to say you are from
> > the Somali government, you are my deployed military commander, you are
> > a U.N. official serving in Somalia, you are from the world court, or
> > you are an agent of the FCC.
>
> Where does it say that my views don't carry any weight unless I meet
> your criteria?

To make your label of bootlegger valid. Show me your badge.

> > Now, the number of amateurs that have applied for DXCC is what
> > percentage of the number of amateurs engaging in DX activities? Again
> > I ask, of all the worlds amateurs that engage in DX activities, how
> > many have filed for DXCC?
>
> Again I answer: Ask the folks at the DXCC desk. If I told you, "12,323"
> how would you be equipped to confirm my response without knowing how
> many non-U.S. DXers are currently active?

You're the one who has stated that DXCC is the universal standard.
You need to back it up somehow. I'm just trying to help you think it
through.

OK, you've stated that 12,323 have applied for DXCC. Now how many
amateurs have worked DX?

> > We need to quantify in some way your claims of one world DX standard.
>
> Ask other DXers? Know any?

I asked you. Have you stepped down from being the World's Greatest
DXer?

> > I would think that "Worked All Continents" is a more popular DX award
> > than DXCC.
>
> More popular? Do you really believe that DXers consider WAC a standard?
> Only among neophytes could that be possible. You keep coming up with
> new ways to affirm my statement that you are not a DXer.

Now David, do you really believe that one amateur station can declare
all continents as local contacts? I don't. Thus working other
continents must be considered DX. Unless you've rewritten the rules
or forgotten what they are.

And by "more popular" I mean that it is probable that more DXers have
applied for WAC than DXCC. Do you disagree with this also?

> > > > David, you need to come up with something new.
> > >
> > > We need to take care of old business before new business is introduced.
> >
> > I thought you took care of it? Didn't I hear your gavel hit the
> > bench?
>
> No, that was your credibility hitting a new low.

Then you've already judged.

269. Re: County Issuing Radio Licenses

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-05 15:44:06 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301050744.56c1f596@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59352

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<c79f1vg5ovj0aqgb8u8kb9fq1hgnd45c5k@4ax.com>...
> On 4 Jan 2003 06:24:43 -0800, brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:
>
> >Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E168762.5F99D3D5@earthlink.net>...
> >> Brian wrote:
> >> >
> >> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E15251C.AFA4D024@earthlink.net>...
>
> And on and on and on and on........
>
>
>
> With all due respect guys are you going to take over EVERY
> thread here with who said who said what and who can do what where?
>
> Your rrap bar room brawl might be better confined to one
> thread. PSE K.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Mike, please show a little consideration for the Worlds Greatest
Woodchopping DXer. He's not quite finished grinding his axe.

Brian

270. Re: Another Morse Code Opinion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-05 15:51:18 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301050751.399dc7e0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59353

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:<3E17C82C.2F992654@ix.netcom.com>...
> "Mike H. KC8UBH" wrote:
>
> >
> > Do I care if they do away with code? Not really - but they damn well better
> > make the written test one hell of a lot harder. When its as easy to get
> > your General as it is to get your Tech - HF is going to get really stinky.
>
> When the FCC did the reconstruction reconsiderations, they pointed out
> that there was no detectable dedragration of HF in the first year after
> reconstruction went into effect. No additional idiots on 14313

Exactly. All the idiots were there before restructuring, indicating
that the old ways left a lot to be desired, didn't do what the OT's
said it did (keep out the riff-raff).

And FWIW, the General and Technician were the same written exam prior
to May 1987. Why shouldn't it take the same level of "ease?"

Finally, my comments prior to restructuring, about restructuring, were
this:

What I fear most about restructuring is a lack of enforcement; and
what I fear most about maintaining the status quo is a lack of
enforcement. Lack of enforcement is more detrimental to all of
amateur radio than any change in the rules.

271. Re: ARRL PROVIDING FCC LICENSE RENEWAL TO NONMEMBERS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-05 16:01:45 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301050801.5ff5d421@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59354

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:<3E17C411.B84EC2B0@ix.netcom.com>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > Who was it that was so opposed to W5YI charging $5 for license reneals?
> >
> > From the ARRL Letter, Vol 22, No 01
> > ----------
> >
> > ARRL PROVIDING FCC LICENSE RENEWAL, ADDRESS CHANGES, MODS TO NONMEMBERS
> >
> > The ARRL has announced that it's now providing FCC Amateur Radio license
> > renewals, address changes and other license modification services to
> > nonmembers. For a $12 fee, the League will renew a nonmember's Amateur
> > Radio ticket
>
> IIRC, you can do it for free via the Internet at a web page at the FCC.
> Yes?

Yes. If you can get through all 30 pages of it.

Mike was so upset about W5YI gold digging for $5. Now its up to $12
at the ARRL.

Now the questions.

How is license renewal and address modification related to examining?

How is it that a VEC can become the middleman for license renewal or
address modification, and charge a fee equal to the examination fee,
which already includes sending in a form or electronic form?

If the ARRL or W5YI can send in simple Form 605v, why do you and me
have to fill out the long form?

If the FCC were able to claim $12 per exam and $12 filing fee for
license renewal, perhaps it would have kept the FCC working for
amateur radio.

272. Re: What country?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-05 16:01:59 UTC
From: Gr&#65533;mw&#65533;tch th&#65533; &#65533;nfl&#65533;pp&#65533;bl&#65533; <Gr&#65533;mw&#65533;tch@NOSPAM.THANKS.IM.FULL.lycos.co.de>
Message-ID: <XFYR9.16445$9N5.1531376@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 59355
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3E17D4B2.C307E519@earthlink.net...

> I'd be embarrassed too if I were you.

I'd be embarrassed if I were either of you! What an incredible clutter of
unuseful drivel!

Beware! The Celestial rrap/rradx Emperor may banish you both to the Big
Grumpy Place and you will have to perform square dances with Steve Robenson
and Len Anderson.

BGO

273. Re: You have to be kidding! I saw it coming.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-05 16:04:16 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301050804.4decf13d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59356

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:<3E17C301.F9B559F3@ix.netcom.com>...
> >
> > > Learning and testing using the Farnsworth approach is MUCH easier.
> >
> > That's what I hear.
>
> Well, it's just a communist plot. Oh, wait, cold war's over.... :-)

So is Morse examining. ;))

274. Re: You have to be kidding! I saw it coming.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-05 16:07:54 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301050807.17d2680e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59357

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0301031608.4754d284@posting.google.com>...

> Amen. Every time something comes up which Brainiac can't do, didn't do
> or won't do there's an excuse. Some folk are into contesting, some are
> into digital work, some are experimenters, his specialty in the hobby
> is excuses published in RRAP.
>
> w3rv

I did it. So what are you bitching about now?

Go put on your surplus field jacket or p-coat or whatever and march
around the neighborhood. Show everyone your "military background."
They'll be impressed.

275. Re: ARRL PROVIDING FCC LICENSE RENEWAL TO NONMEMBERS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-05 17:07:15 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <7DZR9.16537$9N5.1537469@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 59358

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote

:
: Mike was so upset about W5YI gold digging for $5. Now its up to $12
: at the ARRL.
:

It's free if you're a member of ARRL.

You didn't make an issue when W5YI was charging for the service. Why is it an issue when ARRL VEC charges for the service?

Sort of like the old joke.... "Would you go to bed with me for $1,000,000?" "Yes!" "OK, would you go to bed with me for $2.00?" "What kind of girl do you think I am?" "We've already established that ... now we're dickering over your price."

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

276. Re: Exam credit

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-05 18:24:36 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <EL_R9.54636$4j5.7664244@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 59359

"NoName" <user@computer.net> wrote in message
news:rkfg1vgkrd3vgnouenruriahf721lf9vrn@4ax.com...
> On Sat, 04 Jan 2003 23:52:27 GMT, "D. Stussy"
> <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote:
>
> >However, the ARRL VEC is the defining authority over whether or not an
ARRL VE
> >team should accept this "questionable indication" without other proof.
> >Although he can't speak for the other VEC's, aren't the plurality of VE
teams
> >under the ARRL VEC?
>
> I don't think the W5YI VEC or the Alaska VEC or any of the other VECs
> answer to the ARRL.
>

You are confusing VEs with VECs. It is probable that the plurality of VEs do indeed belong to either the ARRL or the W5YI (or even both). It would be a true statement that W5YI VEC and Alaska VEC do not answer to the ARRL VEC. Though it is quite possible that the larger VEC organizations (ARRL and W5YI) have more influence than the smaller ones.

The VEs (volunteer examiners) are the ones who physically administer the tests.

The VECs (Volunteer Examiner Coordinators) are the organizations that are allowed to be the coordinating bodies for the examination process. The various VECs meet and set up the question pools, agree on the interpretation of the rules (i.e. what constitutes acceptable documentation for proof of previous licensing), process the exams sent to them by the VE teams, etc. The VECs work together to establish the overall procedures so one will almost certainly require the same documentation as another.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

277. Re: Another Morse Code Opinion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-05 18:26:52 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <MN_R9.54637$4j5.7664441@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 59360

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0301050751.399dc7e0@posting.google.com...
> Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:<3E17C82C.2F992654@ix.netcom.com>...
> And FWIW, the General and Technician were the same written exam prior
> to May 1987. Why shouldn't it take the same level of "ease?"

However then we had the Novice as an introductory license. Now the Tech
fills that role.

>
> Finally, my comments prior to restructuring, about restructuring, were
> this:
>
> What I fear most about restructuring is a lack of enforcement; and
> what I fear most about maintaining the status quo is a lack of
> enforcement. Lack of enforcement is more detrimental to all of
> amateur radio than any change in the rules.

I agree that this is a key issue.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

278. Re: What country?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-05 18:49:55 UTC
From: peter@strg-alt-entf.org
Message-ID: <av9uoj$dbjad$1@ID-31.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 59361
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In rec.radio.amateur.dx Lloyd B <Lloyd@no.spammmmm> wrote:
> Sigh. I turn off my news filters for just a moment, and look what sneaks
> through them: A post violating the RFC for acceptable header format.

Err, did you say RfC as in IETF?

> If it satisfies the regular expression
>
> From: [^a-zA-Z0-9@<>." _()-]
>
> then it isn't a valid header, it is probably from a spammer, and it is
> killed.

Valid header as in "Invalid From:" or "nonexistent Reply-To:"

Please chose a place of your convenience and take some time to die, oaf.

Peter Lemken
DF5JT
Berlin

--
Je suis Marxiste, tendance Groucho.

279. Re: IARN AND THE INTERNATIONAL RED CROSS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-05 19:23:17 UTC
From: ole bignose <fcarters32@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3e188642@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 59362
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"N0VFP 2.0" <brother_lloyd_99@yahoo.com.spma> wrote in message
news:3e17e261$1_8@server....
> Call 1-800-262-9543. International caller should
> telephone 207 495 2215. Your views will be aired over the fabulous
> international K1MAN amateur radio bulletin service unedited.

I considered calling in once, however embarassment
at the very thought of my voice being reproduced over
"Boy Broadcaster's" horribly distorted and overmodulated
audio feed prevented us.

How sad. I've heard Pirate Radio stations on 6.950 with better audio.

280. K1MAN BROADCASTING???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-05 19:24:59 UTC
From: "Mike H. KC8UBH" <mhaas@nospam.insight.rr.com>
Message-ID: <fE%R9.18330$GF.8979122@twister.columbus.rr.com>
Source record: 59363

Ok - I don't get it.

I'm listening to this guy on 14.275, here at 1923z.

I'm sure its been covered - but humor me.

This is clearly a BROADCAST to the public, not a QSO or any other legal HAM activity.

Uhm...how come this guy is still on the air???

Is it me, or am I just being naive in thinking that the FCC can actually enforce OUR laws?

KC8UBH.

281. Re: K1MAN BROADCASTING???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-05 19:29:28 UTC
From: "Mike H. KC8UBH" <mhaas@nospam.insight.rr.com>
Message-ID: <sI%R9.18337$GF.8982995@twister.columbus.rr.com>
Source record: 59364

Oh great...this guy might sue me because I'm mentioning this???

Fer cryin' out loud...

"Mike H. KC8UBH" <mhaas@nospam.insight.rr.com> wrote in message
news:fE%R9.18330$GF.8979122@twister.columbus.rr.com...
> Ok - I don't get it.
>
> I'm listening to this guy on 14.275, here at 1923z.
>
> I'm sure its been covered - but humor me.
>
> This is clearly a BROADCAST to the public, not a QSO or any other legal
HAM
> activity.
>
> Uhm...how come this guy is still on the air???
>
> Is it me, or am I just being naive in thinking that the FCC can actually
> enforce OUR laws?
>
> KC8UBH.
>
>

282. Re: K1MAN BROADCASTING???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-05 19:48:42 UTC
From: "Mike H. KC8UBH" <mhaas@nospam.insight.rr.com>
Message-ID: <u_%R9.18357$GF.8999618@twister.columbus.rr.com>
Source record: 59365

I've read further....I AM incredibly naive.

KC8UBH - Shaking head...
"Mike H. KC8UBH" <mhaas@nospam.insight.rr.com> wrote in message
news:sI%R9.18337$GF.8982995@twister.columbus.rr.com...
> Oh great...this guy might sue me because I'm mentioning this???
>
> Fer cryin' out loud...
>
> "Mike H. KC8UBH" <mhaas@nospam.insight.rr.com> wrote in message
> news:fE%R9.18330$GF.8979122@twister.columbus.rr.com...
> > Ok - I don't get it.
> >
> > I'm listening to this guy on 14.275, here at 1923z.
> >
> > I'm sure its been covered - but humor me.
> >
> > This is clearly a BROADCAST to the public, not a QSO or any other legal
> HAM
> > activity.
> >
> > Uhm...how come this guy is still on the air???
> >
> > Is it me, or am I just being naive in thinking that the FCC can actually
> > enforce OUR laws?
> >
> > KC8UBH.
> >
> >
>
>

283. Re: IARN AND THE INTERNATIONAL RED CROSS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-05 20:33:07 UTC
From: signalchaser <williamsmith208@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <v1h5ka7a9g8ef@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 59366
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Agreed. The 6950/6955 group does have good audio in a lot of cases. Some of the programs are quite professional sounding.

"ole bignose" <fcarters32@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:3e188642@snipnews.snip.net...
>
> "N0VFP 2.0" <brother_lloyd_99@yahoo.com.spma> wrote in message
> news:3e17e261$1_8@server....
> > Call 1-800-262-9543. International caller should
> > telephone 207 495 2215. Your views will be aired over the fabulous
> > international K1MAN amateur radio bulletin service unedited.
>
> I considered calling in once, however embarassment
> at the very thought of my voice being reproduced over
> "Boy Broadcaster's" horribly distorted and overmodulated
> audio feed prevented us.
>
> How sad. I've heard Pirate Radio stations on 6.950 with better audio.
>
>
>

284. Re: What country?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-05 22:55:37 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E18B7E8.827D9933@earthlink.net>
Source record: 59367
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E17D85A.8A3BE787@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E167F50.154C5E13@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> >
> > > > > > You were never in a situation where a commander had the authority to
> > > > > > authorize amateur operations.
> > > > >
> > > > > Sure I was, Brian. I was in Vietnam '70-'71.
> > > > >
> > > > > You have no experience in such matters.
> > > > >
> > > > > Darn it, you're wrong again.
> > > >
> > > > I am not wrong. You said you couldn't operate in Vietnam. Maybe too
> > > > much happy smoke or maybe you just bootlegged. Probably hear a
> > > > different story tomorrow anyway.
> > > >
> > > > Here's the quote:
> > > >
> > > > "There was no amateur radio operation permitted by the military in
> > > > Vietnam. I know of two legal stations, both operated by American
> > > > civilians during my time in country. My military commander did not
> > > > have the authority to permit me to operate on the ham bands. I don't
> > > > have any written permission either."
> > >
> > > And I had no written permission and did no operating in the ham bands.
> > > My commander advised that he could not grant permission. I was in the
> > > military and had to accept his word. Yet Don Riebhoff, a civilian,
> > > operated legally right across town from me.
> > >
> > > So I broke no regs, no laws, did no bootlegging, had no QSOs. Now, back
> > > to your situation...
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
>
> So, 1) you were not in a situation where your commander had the
> authority to authorize amateur operations, and 2) you have no
```

> experience in such matters.

Have it your way.

> You accepted your commander's word.

Did I have a choice? Doesn't matter, does it? I did not break laws or regs, did no bootlegging, had no QSOs.

Now, back to your scenario.

Care to answer the questions I posed?

Dave K8MN

285. Re: What country?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-05 23:04:17 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E18BA3B.16D3D5A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 59368
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E17D664.E2E17CF8@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E167F50.154C5E13@earthlink.net>...
> > >
> > > > > I no longer sign "portable T5."
> > > >
> > > > I haven't seen any indication that you ever did.
> > >
> > > Yet, without any indication, you declare people bootleggers.
> >
> > No, it is assuredly with indication. You are without any indication
> > that you ever had permission to operate from T5.
>
> David, what do you have?

You on the ropes.

> > > > > You were never in a situation where a commander had the authority to
> > > > > authorize amateur operations.
> > > >
> > > > Sure I was, Brian. I was in Vietnam '70-'71.
> > >
> > > Sure you weren't. Don't you remember what you said? You've already
> > > said here that amateur operations weren't permitted.
> >
> > My commander had the authority. His decision was that I couldn't
> > operate.
>
> No, Cecil, he didn't. Your commander had no decision to make, had no
> authority to rescind a standing rule. He simply told you what the
> rule was. The rule was, you said, ~no military pers can operate
> amateur radio in Vietnam."

> > Don Riebhoff was operating legally right across town at the same time I
> > was in country. He used to run phone patches for Ambassador Bunker.
>
> I can see the deep scarring that has caused. Must be why you found a
> new career in the State Department.

You think so? You believe that my bringing up your supposed operation
from T5 is out of my deep seated need to run phone patches?

> > > > You have no experience in such matters.
> > > >
> > > > Darn it, you're wrong again.
> > >
> > > Nope. Don't you remember what you said? Every country that you've
> > > operated from had a government that you petitioned for amateur
> > > operations.
> >
> > I did no petitioning, Brian. I made application. Vietnam had a
> > government. I still couldn't operate.
>
> You made application. We learn something new every day. Which form
> did you use?

If it was on a form, it might be difficult to recall thirty-two years
after the fact. I didn't use a form; I used a letter.

> > > > > You even went so far as to say that commanders cannot authorize any
> > > > > amateur authorizations.
> > > > >
> > > > > Darn--wrong again. Where'd I say that?
> > > >
> > > > You're David Heil, K8MN, Right?
> > >
> > > Who I am was already known. Where did I say what you've attributed to
> > > me?
> >
> > Its just that you say different things on different days and cannot
> > remember contradicting statements. I just wondered who you were
> > yesterday. Who will you be tomorrow?

Where is the contradiction, Brian?

> > > > > It was me who has provided you with such an education.
> > > > >
> > > > > Sure you did, Brian--in your mind.
> > > >
> > > > Don't you remember what you said? It's all here David.
> > >
> > > Come up with it.
> >
> > I did.

Where is it, Brian? Did the dog eat your homework?

Dave K8MN

286. Re: Why hams think we deserve the 5 mhz band (was: You have to be kidding!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-05 23:23:36 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns92FABB0899B4Celektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 59369

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
news:d22b54c3.0301050639.6233f47e@posting.google.com:

> Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:<Xns92FA157C9F25Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>
>> >> > From a dxers perspective working split is a good idea, phone, cw,
>> >> > 40 or anywhere else.
>> >>
>> >> So you think it's a good idea to use twice the bandwidth!
>> >
>> >
>> > Lousy troll. No cigar. If you're so big into "spectrum conservation"
>> > why are you running phone?
>> >
>>
>> No-one has ever called me a troll before.
>
> Ya can't be a virgin forever in this NG. Welcome to The Group.

You think it's being a troll just because I don't agree with you?

>
> Ya didn't answer the question.

Partly because I was insulted, and partly because I doubt if you really
want an answer. However, I use phone because I prefer it.

>
>> > idea today how many 40m ssb dxcc cards I have from that regime but
>> > I'll bet it's at least pushing 100. And you're all bent outta shape
>> > because you can't yak down to 7.075? Bwaaahaha! Apply for a
>> > disabilty waiver.
>> >
>>
>> So you don't want any improvements? What an odd attitude.
>
> I never even intimated any such thing. I've been hoping for the ITU
> 40M "harmonization" maneuver for years. In tbe best of all possible
> worlds the DX would get privs all the way up to 7.300. That would
> solve the problem.

It would, but it will never happen. Do you really beleive that the rest of
the world will all change to solve a US internal problem? I don't.

> All extending U.S. phone privs down to 7.075 would
> do is cause problems on top of problems.

Not atall. It would solve the problem at the point where it exists, i.e. inside the US. Some people here would lose by it, but that's nothing compared with the numbers of people who would be disturbed by moving the whole band down 100 kHz. I know that's not what you just proposed, but that's even more laughable, suggesting moving the BC stations out entirely. As the kids nowadays would say, that's just sooo not going to happen. You call me a troll, but you're living in a dream world. Snap out of it.

>
>> >> Since you bring it up, most of the bitching now is from DX phone
>> >> operators who have to put up with the bleeping of US digital and CW
>> >> ops in their phone subbands, so in that sense you are partly right.
>> >
>> > BOINK.
>> >
>>
>> What language is that?
>
> CW.

That's odd. I thought it used dits and dahs.

>
>>
>> >
>> > w3rv
>> >
>

287. Re: What country?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-06 00:53:11 UTC
From: peter@strg-alt-entf.org
Message-ID: <avak1n$dg45r$1@ID-31.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 59370
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In rec.radio.amateur.dx Lloyd B <Lloyd@no.spammmmm> wrote:
> On 5 Jan 2003 18:49:55 GMT, Peter Lemken <peter@strg-alt-entf.org> wrote:
>> In rec.radio.amateur.dx Lloyd B <Lloyd@no.spammmmm> wrote:
>> > Sigh. I turn off my news filters for just a moment, and look what sneaks
>> > through them: A post violating the RFC for acceptable header format.
>>
>> Err, did you say RfC as in IETF?
>>
>
> Nope.
>
> And if you don't understand the meaning of RFC, then you aren't
> qualified to comment.
>
> To the rest of you: See RFC-1036, "Standard for Interchange of USENET
> Messages"

The same. See 5.2

Sheeesh.

Peter Lemken
DF5JT
Berlin

--
Je suis Marxiste, tendance Groucho.

288. Re: Why hams think we deserve the 5 mhz band (was: You have to be kidding!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-06 02:52:30 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3E18EF6E.110864DC@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 59371

Alun Palmer wrote:

>
> Nobody wants phone all the way to the lower band edges - just something
> more like the rest of the world have. Well, actually in most countries you
> can operate phone to the lower band edge, but people don't, they follow
> their bandplans, albeit those are very different from the ARRL's. The
> Region 1 bandplan allows phone down to 3.63, 7.045, 14.112 and I forget
> exactly where on 15m (used to be 21.15, but I know it was changed), and
> their 80 and 40m bands only go up to 3.8 and 7.1.
>
> All I actually asked for was phone from 7.075-7.1, which I really don't
> think is unreasonable, but I should ask the FCC, not Usenet!

Maybe we should have phone on the bottom end of that band, and put
CW and digital on the top end. CW should be less bothered by the
international broadcasters than phone is.

289. Re: Why hams think we deserve the 5 mhz band (was: You have to be kidding!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-06 03:43:01 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301051943.71ca2e80@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59372

Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns92FABB0899B4Celektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
> news:d22b54c3.0301050639.6233f47e@posting.google.com:
>
> > Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:<Xns92FA157C9F25Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> >
> >> >> > From a dxers perspective working split is a good idea, phone, cw,
> >> >> > 40 or anywhere else.
> >> >>
> >> >> So you think it's a good idea to use twice the bandwidth!
> >> >
> >> > Lousy troll. No cigar. If you're so big into "spectrum conservation"
> >> > why are you running phone?
> >>
> >> No-one has ever called me a troll before.
> >
> > Ya can't be a virgin forever in this NG. Welcome to The Group.
>
> You think it's being a troll just because I don't agree with you?

Oh Geez, Alun, just back up and apologize. Then agree with him.
Although he doesn't sound like one, he's an engineer. Of some kind.
And he has military background. Yes, -real- military background. I'm
not kidding.

And don't forget to say good things about the Morse Code, or "troll"
and "virgin" will be the least of the names he'll call you.

Good luck to you now, and welcome to the group.

Brian

290. Re: What country?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-06 04:01:20 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301052001.1b6064c1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59373
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E18BA3B.16D3D5A@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E17D664.E2E17CF8@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E167F50.154C5E13@earthlink.net>...
> > > >
> > > > > > I no longer sign "portable T5."
> > > > >
> > > > > I haven't seen any indication that you ever did.
> > > >
> > > > Yet, without any indication, you declare people bootleggers.
> > >
> > > No, it is assuredly with indication. You are without any indication
> > > that you ever had permission to operate from T5.
> >
> > David, what do you have?
>
> You on the ropes.

Ropes and Ladders? Whatever are you talking about?

Did you scale the walls of the former American Embassy in Mog and see
me operating?

> > > > > > You were never in a situation where a commander had the authority to
> > > > > > authorize amateur operations.
> > > > >
> > > > > Sure I was, Brian. I was in Vietnam '70-'71.
> > > >
> > > > Sure you weren't. Don't you remember what you said? You've already
> > > > said here that amateur operations weren't permitted.
> > >
> > > My commander had the authority. His decision was that I couldn't
> > > operate.
> >
> > No, Cecil, he didn't. Your commander had no decision to make, had no
> > authority to rescind a standing rule. He simply told you what the
> > rule was. The rule was, you said, ~no military pers can operate
> > amateur radio in Vietnam."
>

> > > Don Riebhoff was operating legally right across town at the same time I
> > > was in country. He used to run phone patches for Ambassador Bunker.
> >
> > I can see the deep scarring that has caused. Must be why you found a
> > new career in the State Department.
>
> You think so? You believe that my bringing up your supposed operation
> from T5 is out of my deep seated need to run phone patches?

No, I didn't say that. I said that seeing another being allowed to
operate in Vietnam and you denied operation in Vietnam has caused deep
scarring.

All that happened before you ever heard of me.

> > > > > You have no experience in such matters.
> > > > >
> > > > > Darn it, you're wrong again.
> > > >
> > > > Nope. Don't you remember what you said? Every country that you've
> > > > operated from had a government that you petitioned for amateur
> > > > operations.
> > >
> > > I did no petitioning, Brian. I made application. Vietnam had a
> > > government. I still couldn't operate.
> >
> > You made application. We learn something new every day. Which form
> > did you use?
>
> If it was on a form, it might be difficult to recall thirty-two years
> after the fact. I didn't use a form; I used a letter.

You said that military personnel weren't allowed to operate in
Vietnam, but civilians were.

If you were a military person, why did you apply?

Who did you make your application to?

> > > > > > You even went so far as to say that commanders cannot authorize any
> > > > > > amateur authorizations.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Darn--wrong again. Where'd I say that?
> > > > >
> > > > > You're David Heil, K8MN, Right?
> > > >
> > > > Who I am was already known. Where did I say what you've attributed to
> > > > me?
> > >
> > > Its just that you say different things on different days and cannot
> > > remember contradicting statements. I just wondered who you were
> > > yesterday. Who will you be tomorrow?

>
> Where is the contradiction, Brian?

Its in your posts.

> > > > > > It was me who has provided you with such an education.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Sure you did, Brian--in your mind.
> > > > > >
> > > > > Don't you remember what you said? It's all here David.
> > > > >
> > > > Come up with it.
> > >
> > I did.
>
> Where is it, Brian? Did the dog eat your homework?

I posted it.

291. Re: What country?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-06 04:07:24 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301052007.6e4f0f71@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59374
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E18B7E8.827D9933@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E17D85A.8A3BE787@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E167F50.154C5E13@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
>
> > > > > > You were never in a situation where a commander had the authority to
> > > > > > authorize amateur operations.
> > > > >
> > > > > Sure I was, Brian. I was in Vietnam '70-'71.
> > > > >
> > > > > You have no experience in such matters.
> > > > >
> > > > > Darn it, you're wrong again.
> > > >
> > > > I am not wrong. You said you couldn't operate in Vietnam. Maybe too
> > > > much happy smoke or maybe you just bootlegged. Probably hear a
> > > > different story tomorrow anyway.
> > > >
> > > > Here's the quote:
> > > >
> > > > "There was no amateur radio operation permitted by the military in
> > > > Vietnam. I know of two legal stations, both operated by American
> > > > civilians during my time in country. My military commander did not
> > > > have the authority to permit me to operate on the ham bands. I don't
> > > > have any written permission either."
> > >
> > > And I had no written permission and did no operating in the ham bands.
> > > My commander advised that he could not grant permission. I was in the
> > > military and had to accept his word. Yet Don Riebhoff, a civilian,
> > > operated legally right across town from me.
> > >
> > > So I broke no regs, no laws, did no bootlegging, had no QSOs. Now, back
> > > to your situation...
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > So, 1) you were not in a situation where your commander had the

> > authority to authorize amateur operations, and 2) you have no
> > experience in such matters.
>
> Have it your way.

It's not "my way." Perhaps if the government of Vietnam had allowed
you to operate amateur radio there you wouldn't be so emotionally
scarred.

But look on the bright side. You saw a civilian state department pers
who was allowed to operate amateur radio and you made a career out of
it.

> > You accepted your commander's word.
>
> Did I have a choice? Doesn't matter, does it? I did not break laws or
> regs, did no bootlegging, had no QSOs.
>
> Now, back to your scenario.
>
> Care to answer the questions I posed?

I accepted my commander's word also.

292. Re: Another Morse Code Opinion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-06 04:10:20 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301052010.255361cc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59375

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<MN_R9.54637$4j5.7664441@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0301050751.399dc7e0@posting.google.com...
> > Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> news:<3E17C82C.2F992654@ix.netcom.com>...
> > And FWIW, the General and Technician were the same written exam prior
> > to May 1987. Why shouldn't it take the same level of "ease?"
>
> However then we had the Novice as an introductory license. Now the Tech
> fills that role.

Just barely. The mateiral is much too complex for a beginners
license. The Novice license, pre-87 enhancement, was about right for
beginners.

> > Finally, my comments prior to restructuring, about restructuring, were
> > this:
> >
> > What I fear most about restructuring is a lack of enforcement; and
> > what I fear most about maintaining the status quo is a lack of
> > enforcement. Lack of enforcement is more detrimental to all of
> > amateur radio than any change in the rules.
>
> I agree that this is a key issue.
>
>
> Dee Flint, N8UZE

And the FCC didn't do much enforcement for over 20 years. Now we have
known frequencies to avoid.

293. Re: What country?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-06 04:14:01 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E19028C.70729064@earthlink.net>
Source record: 59376
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E17D4B2.C307E519@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E16806A.F896E3AC@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E152255.D8E628AE@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Brian wrote:
> >
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > So DXCC is the final licensing authority in the world?
> > > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > I guess you're back to that again.
> > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > > How many times must I tell you before it sinks in:
> > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > > 1) The DXCC desk (with advice from the DXAC) is the final arbiter on
> > > > > > > > > > > > > what is accepted for DXCC credit.
> > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > > 2) (a separate issue) You have no proof of permission to operate from
> > > > > > > > > > > > > Somalia at all *punto* unquote
> > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > Now, what was it that you were sure I told you?
> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > You claimed that my operation from Somalia was illegal based upon DXCC
> > > > > > > > > > > acceptance/nonacceptance. You continue to amend your statements as I
> > > > > > > > > > > call you to the carpet for each inaccuracy.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Read it again, Brian. That isn't what it says at all.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > I see you talking about the DXCC desk again. I don't see you mention
> > > > > > > > any other "authority."
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Read it again.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > No.
> > > > >
> > > > > I'd be embarrassed too if I were you.
> > > >
```

> David, there is no "authority" listed in the above document, other
> than the DXCC. Reading it again won't make it magically appear. You
> go be embarassed.

The statement only looks complex at first, Brian. It isn't. You've apparently read the item marked "1)". If you'll look at the item marked "2) (a separate issue)", you might find the key. That issue covers your lack of documentation.
There is no documentation of licensing for your supposed operation by any licensing authority whatsoever anywhere on the planet. In other words, anyone who questions whether you were authorized to operate is told to take your word for it. That doesn't wash anywhere.

Dave K8MN

294. Re: ARRL PROVIDING FCC LICENSE RENEWAL TO NONMEMBERS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-06 04:18:54 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301052018.54ad9260@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59377

"K HB" <k hb@arrl.DOTORG> wrote in message
news:<7DZR9.16537$9N5.1537469@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote
>
> :
> : Mike was so upset about W5YI gold digging for $5. Now its up to $12
> : at the ARRL.
> :
>
> It's free if you're a member of ARRL.

Yes, its free to me.

> You didn't make an issue when W5YI was charging for the service.

Mike did.

Why is it
> an issue when ARRL VEC charges for the service?

Why does an entire exam session, to members and non-members alike,
including the electronic filing, cost $12 in reimbursable expenses,
and an electronic filing all by itself also cost $12?

Where is the body of rules by which a VEC can establish and charge for
non-examining services?

> Sort of like the old joke.... "Would you go to bed with me for $1,000,000?"
> "Yes!" "OK, would you go to bed with me for $2.00?" "What kind of girl do
> you think I am?" "We've already established that ... now we're dickering
> over your price."

Hans, are you saying that the ARRL is pimping their VE's?

295. Re: County Issuing Radio Licenses

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-06 04:34:28 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E190757.D372EB9D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 59378

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E17D416.E64C6CA@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E170F23.33EB82F7@earthlink.net>...
>
> > > > Come up with a quote or be judged a fabricator.
> > >
> > > David, I've already been judged. I choose not to jump through your
> > > hoops.
> >
> > Jump through my hoops? You've attributed something to me which I didn't
> > write.
>
> You write so many things, David. You remember so little of what
> you've written.

I've asked about a specific item. Apparently you can't remember that
one.

> > Have I attributed anything to you which you haven't written?
>
> Yes, you've said I didn't have permission.

Impossible, Brian. I would have had to have written that YOU said, "I
didn't have permission to operate from Somalia". I've not done that.

> > > > > > > > Mogadishu Slim can cover both 1) illegality of operation and 2)
> > > > > > > > non-acceptance by the DXCC desk for credit. I feel comfortable in
> > > > > > > > calling you "Slim" because you fit in both categories.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > And your documentation is...?
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > 1) No written authorization to operate from Somalia.
> > > > > > > 2) No possible acceptance for DXCC credit due to item above.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > That is not documentation.
> > > > >
> > > > > Pretty tough to document what isn't documented.
> > >
> > > You can't document that I operated from Somalia, then you declare me a
> > > bootlegger. Logic, David, logic.
> >

> > We aren't dealing with x + y. Your dilemma is x or y.
>
> David, I'm quite comfortable with x and y. But you need to show me
> documentation of x before you declare z.

I need to show YOU documentation? Balderdash! You are the one without
documentation for your supposed operation.

> > > Lemme see, you believe me when I say I operated. You don't believe me
> > > when I say that I had permission.
> > >
> > > Logic, David, logic.
> >
> > x or y, Brian.
>
> Z, David. Choose to believe it, or choose not to believe it.

Uuuuhhhhh....believe which one, Brian--that you are a bootlegger or that
you never made a contact?

> > > > Whaddya want to be, Brian? Bootlegger? Liar? Which of your scenarios
> > > > is correct? Are you now telling us that you had permission but that
> > > > your earlier claims of making QSOs and sending QSL cards from Somalia
> > > > were false?
> > >
> > > It's clear to me that you believe what you want.
> >
> > My belief can change depending upon what your story is on this
> > particular day.
>
> You and Ed made up your minds a long time ago. My "story" hasn't
> changed.
>
> > You could clear up some of these issues by being more forthcoming and
> > answering a few questions. For example: What equipment and antennas
> > were used? What bands and modes did you use in making your contacts from
> > Somalia?
> > Which countries and continents did you work? How were the QSLs delivered
> > or handled? After all, you did tell us that you operated from Somalia
> > and that QSLs were exchanged. These should be easy for you.
>
> For what purpose? You choose to believe this, but reject that.

...for the purpose of being forthright and to keep yourself from looking
disingenuous.

> > > But for your beliefs to carry any weight, you need to say you are from
> > > the Somali government, you are my deployed military commander, you are
> > > a U.N. official serving in Somalia, you are from the world court, or
> > > you are an agent of the FCC.
> >
> > Where does it say that my views don't carry any weight unless I meet

> > your criteria?
>
> To make your label of bootlegger valid. Show me your badge.

Badges? We don't need no steenking badges! Either you didn't operate (though you've told us previously that you did and that you exchanged QSL cards) or you operated and you don't hold and never held written permission to do so.

> > > Now, the number of amateurs that have applied for DXCC is what
> > > percentage of the number of amateurs engaging in DX activities? Again
> > > I ask, of all the worlds amateurs that engage in DX activities, how
> > > many have filed for DXCC?
> >
> > Again I answer: Ask the folks at the DXCC desk. If I told you, "12,323"
> > how would you be equipped to confirm my response without knowing how
> > many non-U.S. DXers are currently active?
>
> You're the one who has stated that DXCC is the universal standard.
> You need to back it up somehow. I'm just trying to help you think it
> through.

I've thought it through and given you good advice once again.

> OK, you've stated that 12,323 have applied for DXCC. Now how many
> amateurs have worked DX?

You're incapable of reading the simplest sentence and correctly interpreting it. I did not say that 12,323 have applied for DXCC. I have explained that you'd be well served to ask the DXCC desk.

> > > We need to quantify in some way your claims of one world DX standard.
> >
> > Ask other DXers? Know any?
>
> I asked you. Have you stepped down from being the World's Greatest
> DXer?

There you go again. I've never made such a claim for myself and have denied it several times. Please come up with a single instance where I've used the term in reference to myself.

You asked me and I gave you some leads. I've given you leads previously but you've not used them.

> > > I would think that "Worked All Continents" is a more popular DX award
> > > than DXCC.
> >
> > More popular? Do you really believe that DXers consider WAC a standard?
> > Only among neophytes could that be possible. You keep coming up with
> > new ways to affirm my statement that you are not a DXer.
>
> Now David, do you really believe that one amateur station can declare

> all continents as local contacts? I don't. Thus working other
> continents must be considered DX. Unless you've rewritten the rules
> or forgotten what they are.

So you have it in your head that six QSOs constitutes a better world
standard of DXing than the challenges of obtaining DXCC, 5BDXCC, 6m DXCC
or 160m DXCC?
Do you have any idea how stupid that makes you look?

> And by "more popular" I mean that it is probable that more DXers have
> applied for WAC than DXCC. Do you disagree with this also?

Try to stick with me, Brian. We weren't speaking of "popular". We were
speaking of a world standard.

> > > > > David, you need to come up with something new.
> > > > >
> > > > > We need to take care of old business before new business is introduced.
> > > >
> > > > I thought you took care of it? Didn't I hear your gavel hit the
> > > > bench?
> > >
> > > No, that was your credibility hitting a new low.
> >
> Then you've already judged.

Judged again, Brian. Judged again. You're pretty much of a dolt.

Dave K8MN

296. Re: What country?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-06 04:37:03 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.h89qqh7.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 59379
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Fri, 3 Jan 2003 08:59:35 -0500, Kevin Williams wrote:

> During my days in professional broadcasting, it never ceased to
>amaze me how virtually all ham radio operators believed the
>sole function of the FCC was to regulate ham radio. Those of us
>who worked professionally in communications, as well as holding
>ham tickets, found this amusing!

While I was attached to the FCC Field Enforcement Office in San Francisco, I got an emergency assignment to attend a local meeting of a telephone industry rate and accounting practices committee that by charter required an FCC representative - the regular member having taken sick suddenly.

There I was, with a group of high-powered interstate telephone accounting professionals...who were amazed to find out that the FCC regulated radio communications and had field enforcement agents to do so.

I apparently knew more about their end of the business than they knew about mine.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

297. Re: What country?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-06 04:38:59 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E190867.D0698697@earthlink.net>
Source record: 59380

"Grï¿½mwï¿½tch thï¿½ ï¿½nflï¿½ppï¿½blï¿½" wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3E17D4B2.C307E519@earthlink.net...
>
> > I'd be embarrassed too if I were you.
>
> I'd be embarrassed if I were either of you! What an incredible clutter of
> unuseful drivel!
>
> Beware! The Celestial rrap/rradx Emperor may banish you both to the Big
> Grumpy Place and you will have to perform square dances with Steve Robenson
> and Len Anderson.
>
> BGO

...and you, the unidentified type worried that he might be subject to
ridicule if his name/call should come out--what makes you read any of
it?

Dave K8MN

298. Re: What country?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-06 04:53:34 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E190BD1.5876E073@earthlink.net>
Source record: 59381
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E18BA3B.16D3D5A@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E17D664.E2E17CF8@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E167F50.154C5E13@earthlink.net>...
>
> > > > Don Riebhoff was operating legally right across town at the same time I
> > > > was in country. He used to run phone patches for Ambassador Bunker.
> > > >
> > > I can see the deep scarring that has caused. Must be why you found a
> > > new career in the State Department.
> > >
> > You think so? You believe that my bringing up your supposed operation
> > from T5 is out of my deep seated need to run phone patches?
>
> No, I didn't say that. I said that seeing another being allowed to
> operate in Vietnam and you denied operation in Vietnam has caused deep
> scarring.

I didn't see him operate. He died in a car wreck in Spain in the '80s.
I didn't. I knew him and liked him.

> All that happened before you ever heard of me.

What of it?

> > > > > > You have no experience in such matters.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Darn it, you're wrong again.
> > > > >
> > > > > Nope. Don't you remember what you said? Every country that you've
> > > > > operated from had a government that you petitioned for amateur
> > > > > operations.
> > > >
> > > > I did no petitioning, Brian. I made application. Vietnam had a
> > > > government. I still couldn't operate.
> > >
> > > You made application. We learn something new every day. Which form
```

> > > did you use?
> >
> > If it was on a form, it might be difficult to recall thirty-two years
> > after the fact. I didn't use a form; I used a letter.
>
> You said that military personnel weren't allowed to operate in
> Vietnam, but civilians were.

No, I didn't say "civilians were". A couple of civilians were
successful in obtaining licenses. Don Riebhoff was one. Chester XV5AC
was another.

> If you were a military person, why did you apply?

..because I wanted a license.

> Who did you make your application to?

...General Herron, my commander.

> > > > > > > You even went so far as to say that commanders cannot authorize any
> > > > > > > amateur authorizations.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Darn--wrong again. Where'd I say that?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > You're David Heil, K8MN, Right?
> > > > >
> > > > > Who I am was already known. Where did I say what you've attributed to
> > > > > me?
> > > >
> > > > Its just that you say different things on different days and cannot
> > > > remember contradicting statements. I just wondered who you were
> > > > yesterday. Who will you be tomorrow?
> > >
> > > Where is the contradiction, Brian?
> >
> > Its in your posts.

Where, Brian? You seem a little skimpy on detail.

> > > > > > > It was me who has provided you with such an education.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Sure you did, Brian--in your mind.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Don't you remember what you said? It's all here David.
> > > > >
> > > > > Come up with it.
> > > >
> > > > I did.
> > >
> > > Where is it, Brian? Did the dog eat your homework?
> >
> > I posted it.

THAT was the contradiction you came up with? THAT?

I don't know how you manage but you look more foolish each time.

Dave K8MN

299. Re: What country?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-06 04:58:45 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E190D08.AD6B60AC@earthlink.net>
Source record: 59382
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E18B7E8.827D9933@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E17D85A.8A3BE787@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E167F50.154C5E13@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > >

> > Have it your way.
>
> It's not "my way." Perhaps if the government of Vietnam had allowed
> you to operate amateur radio there you wouldn't be so emotionally
> scarred.

Apparently not so scarred as to begin bootlegging while claiming that I
had official permission to operate.

> But look on the bright side. You saw a civilian state department pers
> who was allowed to operate amateur radio and you made a career out of
> it.

I didn't see anyone else operate. I didn't state the op worked for the
"state department" (the words are capitalized, Brian) and I didn't go to
work for the Department of State for about fourteen years afterward. I
was so scarred that I played music and sold electronic components. Hate
to spoil a peachy theory.

> > > You accepted your commander's word.
> >
> > Did I have a choice? Doesn't matter, does it? I did not break laws or
> > regs, did no bootlegging, had no QSOs.
> >
> > Now, back to your scenario.
> >
> > Care to answer the questions I posed?
>
> I accepted my commander's word also.
```

So you say. Care to answer any of the questions I posed?

Dave K8MN

300. Re: Why hams think we deserve the 5 mhz band (was: You have to be kidding!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-06 05:02:00 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns92FB4403C63elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 59383

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in
news:f45722ac.0301051943.71ca2e80@posting.google.com:

> Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:<Xns92FABB0899B4Celektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
>> news:d22b54c3.0301050639.6233f47e@posting.google.com:
>>
>> > Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>> > news:<Xns92FA157C9F25Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> >
>> >> > From a dxers perspective working split is a good idea, phone,
>> >> > cw, 40 or anywhere else.
>> >>
>> >> So you think it's a good idea to use twice the bandwidth!
>> >
>> > Lousy troll. No cigar. If you're so big into "spectrum
>> > conservation" why are you running phone?
>> >
>> No-one has ever called me a troll before.
>> >
>> > Ya can't be a virgin forever in this NG. Welcome to The Group.
>>
>> You think it's being a troll just because I don't agree with you?
>
> Oh Geez, Alun, just back up and apologize. Then agree with him.
> Although he doesn't sound like one, he's an engineer. Of some kind.
> And he has military background. Yes, -real- military background. I'm
> not kidding.
>
> And don't forget to say good things about the Morse Code, or "troll"
> and "virgin" will be the least of the names he'll call you.
>
> Good luck to you now, and welcome to the group.
>
> Brian
>

Firstly, I didn't say anything that I have to apologise for. All I said
was working split uses twice as much bandwidth.

Secondly, I'm an engineer too. So what? What does that have to do with the
thread?

What's the relevance of his military background to anything? Are you trying to say he's dangerous?

Good things about the code? Yeah, I'm sure it's the greatest thing since sliced bread. Can't stand it myself, of course ... but why do we have to open that can of worms?

73 de Alun, N3KIP

301. Re: ARRL PROVIDING FCC LICENSE RENEWAL TO NONMEMBERS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-06 05:04:23 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.h89s1q8.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 59384

On 5 Jan 2003 20:18:54 -0800, Brian wrote:

>Where is the body of rules by which a VEC can establish and charge for
>non-examining services?

Don't want to pay? Do it yourself, as hams had done from time
immemorial. Don't have 'net access? Call the FCC and get a paper
application sent to you.

And it's being done by an ARRL staffer in his or her paid employee
capacity, not as a VE/VEC.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

302. Re: ARRL PROVIDING FCC LICENSE RENEWAL TO NONMEMBERS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-06 05:07:40 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <wa8S9.18003$9N5.1663555@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 59385

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote

: Where is the body of rules by which a VEC can establish and charge for
: non-examining services?

I have no idea. You'll need to ask W5YI and N1VXY.

: Hans, are you saying that the ARRL is pimping their VE's?

No. Are you?

73, de Hans, K0HB

303. Re: Why hams think we deserve the 5 mhz band (was: You have to be kidding!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-06 05:14:03 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns92FB24EAEED6elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 59386

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in
news:3E18EF6E.110864DC@ix.netcom.com:

> Alun Palmer wrote:
>
>>
>> Nobody wants phone all the way to the lower band edges - just
>> something more like the rest of the world have. Well, actually in most
>> countries you can operate phone to the lower band edge, but people
>> don't, they follow their bandplans, albeit those are very different
>> from the ARRL's. The Region 1 bandplan allows phone down to 3.63,
>> 7.045, 14.112 and I forget exactly where on 15m (used to be 21.15, but
>> I know it was changed), and their 80 and 40m bands only go up to 3.8
>> and 7.1.
>>
>> All I actually asked for was phone from 7.075-7.1, which I really
>> don't think is unreasonable, but I should ask the FCC, not Usenet!
>
> Maybe we should have phone on the bottom end of that band, and put
> CW and digital on the top end. CW should be less bothered by the
> international broadcasters than phone is.
>
>

I have to admit that there is logic in that, but it would be nice to get
some phone spectrum where everyone else has it. The rest of the world has
at least 7.045-7.1 as a phone allocation, so a slice anywhere in that part
of the band would fix the problem. I suggested 7.075-7.1 only because that
section is phone in places where radio is controlled by the FCC but that
are outside Region 2 (that is to say basically outside North and South
America), so it would be the smallest change to Part 97 that would work.
Even a slightly smaller chunk anywhere between 7.045 and 7.1 would work
too, but would involve more rule writing.

304. Re: Why hams think we deserve the 5 mhz band (was: You have to be kidding!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-06 05:25:15 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <%q8S9.18027$9N5.1666370@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 59387

"Alun Palmer" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote

: I have to admit that there is logic in that, but it would be nice to get
: some phone spectrum where everyone else has it. The rest of the world has
: at least 7.045-7.1 as a phone allocation, so a slice anywhere in that part
: of the band would fix the problem.

It would fix one (perceived) problem, but would open another much bigger problem. Amateurs outside ITU Region II have -ONLY- 100KHz of spectrum on 40M in which they must squeeze all their modes. Putting a voice allocation there for Region II american amateurs would make an already crowded situation much, much worse.

The real solution is a worldwide harmonization of the 40M allocation and separation from the SWBC folks, which hopefully makes the agenda at the coming WRC.

&#65533;&#65533;&#65533; 73, de Hans, K0HB
--
Help support youth involved in Amateur Radio.
http://www.mnyarc.org
http://www.k0bsa.org

305. Re: ARRL PROVIDING FCC LICENSE RENEWAL TO NONMEMBERS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-06 12:24:35 UTC
From: Steve Fleckenstein <spfleck@citlink.net>
Message-ID: <v1itc4d8a9f9b3@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 59388

If you guys are so upset over the $12..

Why doesn't some one who has already renewed using the FCC web process write down how they did it and post it here for all to enjoy rather than acting like crusty old farts ?

306. Re: Why hams think we deserve the 5 mhz band (was: You have to be kidding!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-06 13:45:11 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301060545.26f97db4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59389

```
Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns92FB4403C63elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in
> news:f45722ac.0301051943.71ca2e80@posting.google.com:
>
> > Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:<Xns92FABB0899B4Celektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> >> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
> >> news:d22b54c3.0301050639.6233f47e@posting.google.com:
> >>
> >> > Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> >> > news:<Xns92FA157C9F25Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> >> >
> >> >> > From a dxers perspective working split is a good idea, phone,
> >> >> > cw, 40 or anywhere else.
> >> >>
> >> >> So you think it's a good idea to use twice the bandwidth!
> >> >
> >> > Lousy troll. No cigar. If you're so big into "spectrum
> >> > conservation" why are you running phone?
> >>
> >> No-one has ever called me a troll before.
> >
> > Ya can't be a virgin forever in this NG. Welcome to The Group.
> >
> >> You think it's being a troll just because I don't agree with you?
> >
> > Oh Geez, Alun, just back up and apologize. Then agree with him.
> > Although he doesn't sound like one, he's an engineer. Of some kind.
> > And he has military background. Yes, -real- military background. I'm
> > not kidding.
> >
> > And don't forget to say good things about the Morse Code, or "troll"
> > and "virgin" will be the least of the names he'll call you.
> >
> > Good luck to you now, and welcome to the group.
> >
> > Brian
> >
>
> Firstly, I didn't say anything that I have to apologise for. All I said
> was working split uses twice as much bandwidth.
```

And it usually takes even more than that where the calling amateurs
might be 10khz or more wide.

> Secondly, I'm an engineer too. So what? What does that have to do with the
> thread?

Nothing. But he's brought it up sooo many times here.

> What's the relevance of his military background to anything? Are you
> trying to say he's dangerous?

He's not dangerous, just loud.

> Good things about the code? Yeah, I'm sure it's the greatest thing since
> sliced bread. Can't stand it myself, of course ... but why do we have to
> open that can of worms?
>
> 73 de Alun, N3KIP

No, no. But that's what most everything here boils down to. Might as
well get it out of the way so they can decide which side to put you
on.
Kind of like a young man named Val. He came on here saying all the
right things about Morse code. He was their little darling. Said he
was going to take the code test.

There are four basic truths here:

You took the code exam and you like code: you're OK.
You took the code exam and you don't like the code: you're an idiot.
You never learned the code but want to: you're OK.
You never learned the code and don't want to: you're an idiot.

Kind of like a young man named Val. He came on here saying all the
right things about Morse code. He was their little darling. Said he
was going to take the code test.

For the record, I don't support code testing as a separate pass/fail
HF exam.

73, Brian

307. Re: ARRL PROVIDING FCC LICENSE RENEWAL TO NONMEMBERS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-06 13:50:39 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301060550.54c6c66f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59390

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.h89s1q8.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> On 5 Jan 2003 20:18:54 -0800, Brian wrote:
>
> >Where is the body of rules by which a VEC can establish and charge for
> >non-examining services?
>
> Don't want to pay? Do it yourself, as hams had done from time
> immemorial. Don't have 'net access? Call the FCC and get a paper
> application sent to you.
>
> And it's being done by an ARRL staffer in his or her paid employee
> capacity, not as a VE/VEC.

Yes and no. They've got Bart doing it. They also advertise it as
something which falls under their VEC. I'm just curious where this
body of rules are that authorizes VEC's to circumvent the FCC
application and renewal process where it is not associated with an
exam, and for the VEC to collect $12 along the way.

Brian

308. Re: ARRL PROVIDING FCC LICENSE RENEWAL TO NONMEMBERS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-06 13:54:21 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301060554.2ab4063e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59391

"K HB" <k hb@arrl.DOTORG> wrote in message
news:<wa8S9.18003$9N5.1663555@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote
>
>
> : Where is the body of rules by which a VEC can establish and charge for
> : non-examining services?
>
> I have no idea. You'll need to ask W5YI and N1VXY.

You're an Extra. VEC ops are part of (used to be most of) the exam
for Extra. I've looked at Part 97 and don't see anything about this.
Must be more unwritten rules like Farnsworth at 13/15wpm = Morse at
5wpm.

> : Hans, are you saying that the ARRL is pimping their VE's?
>
> No. Are you?

You're the one who established the kind of girl that the ARRL was,
metaphorically. Why did you do that?

309. Re: Why hams think we deserve the 5 mhz band (was: You have to be kidding!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-06 15:15:22 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0301060715.33efe8a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59392

```
Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns92FABB0899B4Celektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
> news:d22b54c3.0301050639.6233f47e@posting.google.com:
>
> > Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:<Xns92FA157C9F25Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> >
> >> >> > From a dxers perspective working split is a good idea, phone, cw,
> >> >> > 40 or anywhere else.
> >> >>
> >> >> So you think it's a good idea to use twice the bandwidth!
> >> >
> >> >
> >> > Lousy troll. No cigar. If you're so big into "spectrum conservation"
> >> > why are you running phone?
> >> >
> >>
> >> No-one has ever called me a troll before.
> >
> > Ya can't be a virgin forever in this NG. Welcome to The Group.
>
> You think it's being a troll just because I don't agree with you?

No, it's because anybody who runs ssb on HF and also bleats about
spectrum conservation is either trolling or is a nitwit.

> > Ya didn't answer the question.
>
> Partly because I was insulted,

Pore abused, sensitive thing. See above WRT to RRAP virgins. Which YOU
sure as hell ain't.

> and partly because I doubt if you really
> want an answer. However, I use phone because I prefer it.

We all have the option of shooting ourselves in the foot if that's
what we prefer.

> > I never even intimated any such thing. I've been hoping for the ITU
> > 40M "harmonization" maneuver for years. In tbe best of all possible
> > worlds the DX would get privs all the way up to 7.300. That would
> > solve the problem.
>
```

> It would, but it will never happen. Do you really beleive that the rest of
> the world will all change to solve a US internal problem? I don't.

We'll see about the "never happen" thing. Personally I don't have a
problem with 40 just the way it is, I could care less when push come
to shove. Just because you can't yak down to 7.075 does not make your
problem any kind of "internal U.S. problem".

> > All extending U.S. phone privs down to 7.075 would
> > do is cause problems on top of problems.
>
> Not atall. It would solve the problem at the point where it exists, i.e.
> inside the US.

Horespucky, you already conceded that the DX running ssb below 7.100
is bitching about the CW and digital comms in that space. We don't
have that problem. Why create the problem in the U.S.? Just because
you don't happen to like to work split? Spare me the tears.

> Some people here would lose by it, but that's nothing
> compared with the numbers of people who would be disturbed by moving the
> whole band down 100 kHz.

Blather. Let 'em eat cake. The 15M band jumped out of the gloom from
nowhere in the late 40s when nobody had radios built for the band.
Then came the three WARC bands in the late 70s for which "there were
no radios". Today there are ham ops on 60m for which "there are no
radios". And you think moving 40 down a lousy 100 is some kind of huge
deal? I doubt that there is an HF xcvr out there which can't be very
easily "snipped". If that would "disturb" some refer back to my
comment about cake.

> I know that's not what you just proposed, but
> that's even more laughable, suggesting moving the BC stations out
> entirely.

Have you ever tuned 6.900-7.000?

> As the kids nowadays would say, that's just sooo not going to
> happen. You call me a troll, but you're living in a dream world. Snap out
> of it.

Snap out of what Alun? I could give a rat's patooie less actually,
I've been working the DX "tranceive" on 40 since back when I rode my
dinosaur downtown to take the tests.

> >> What language is that?
> >
> > CW.
>
> That's odd. I thought it used dits and dahs.

Your lack of linguistic agility is not my problem. You keep having
problems I don't have. Odd.

>
> >
> >>
> >> >
> >> > w3rv
> >> >
> >

310. Re: Why hams think we deserve the 5 mhz band (was: You have to be kidding!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-06 15:27:00 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0301060727.6737a274@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59393

"K HB" <k hb@arrl.DOTORG> wrote in message
news:<%q8S9.18027$9N5.1666370@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>...
> "Alun Palmer" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote
>
> : I have to admit that there is logic in that, but it would be nice to get
> : some phone spectrum where everyone else has it. The rest of the world has
> : at least 7.045-7.1 as a phone allocation, so a slice anywhere in that part
> : of the band would fix the problem.
>
> It would fix one (perceived) problem, but would open another much bigger
> problem. Amateurs outside ITU Region II have -ONLY- 100KHz of spectrum on
> 40M in which they must squeeze all their modes. Putting a voice allocation
> there for Region II american amateurs would make an already crowded
> situation much, much worse.

Probably to the point where working ssb dx would become close to
impossible. He doesn't get it. But then again maybe he does, eh?

> The real solution is a worldwide harmonization of the 40M allocation and
> separation from the SWBC folks, which hopefully makes the agenda at the
> coming WRC.

Amen.

>
> ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ 73, de Hans, K0HB

w3rv

311. Re: Why hams think we deserve the 5 mhz band (was: You have to be kidding!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-06 16:05:56 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns92FB70D47AE9Aelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 59394

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in
news:f45722ac.0301060545.26f97db4@posting.google.com:

> Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:<Xns92FB4403C63elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in
>> news:f45722ac.0301051943.71ca2e80@posting.google.com:
>>
>> > Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>> > news:<Xns92FABB0899B4Celektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> >> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
>> >> news:d22b54c3.0301050639.6233f47e@posting.google.com:
>> >>
>> >> > Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>> >> > news:<Xns92FA157C9F25Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> >> >
>> >> >> > From a dxers perspective working split is a good idea,
>> >> >> > phone, cw, 40 or anywhere else.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> So you think it's a good idea to use twice the bandwidth!
>> >> >
>> >> > Lousy troll. No cigar. If you're so big into "spectrum
>> >> > conservation" why are you running phone?
>> >>
>> >> No-one has ever called me a troll before.
>> >
>> > Ya can't be a virgin forever in this NG. Welcome to The Group.
>> >>
>> >> You think it's being a troll just because I don't agree with you?
>> >
>> > Oh Geez, Alun, just back up and apologize. Then agree with him.
>> > Although he doesn't sound like one, he's an engineer. Of some kind.
>> > And he has military background. Yes, -real- military background.
>> > I'm not kidding.
>> >
>> > And don't forget to say good things about the Morse Code, or "troll"
>> > and "virgin" will be the least of the names he'll call you.
>> >
>> > Good luck to you now, and welcome to the group.
>> >
>> > Brian
>> >
>>

>> Firstly, I didn't say anything that I have to apologise for. All I
>> said was working split uses twice as much bandwidth.
>
> And it usually takes even more than that where the calling amateurs
> might be 10khz or more wide.
>

Exactly. I personally think it's better to stay on a single frequency, and
not answer people who call at the wrong time, but it takes a certain
amount of discipline, i.e. answer one of them and they'll all try to call
over the other guy you're working.

>> Secondly, I'm an engineer too. So what? What does that have to do with
>> the thread?
>
> Nothing. But he's brought it up sooo many times here.
>
>> What's the relevance of his military background to anything? Are you
>> trying to say he's dangerous?
>
> He's not dangerous, just loud.
>
>> Good things about the code? Yeah, I'm sure it's the greatest thing
>> since sliced bread. Can't stand it myself, of course ... but why do we
>> have to open that can of worms?
>>
>> 73 de Alun, N3KIP
>
> No, no. But that's what most everything here boils down to. Might as
> well get it out of the way so they can decide which side to put you
> on.
> Kind of like a young man named Val. He came on here saying all the
> right things about Morse code. He was their little darling. Said he
> was going to take the code test.
>
> There are four basic truths here:
>
> You took the code exam and you like code: you're OK.
> You took the code exam and you don't like the code: you're an idiot.

20 wpm, and I still don't like the code. Guess that makes me an idiot, HI.

> You never learned the code but want to: you're OK.
> You never learned the code and don't want to: you're an idiot.
>
> Kind of like a young man named Val. He came on here saying all the
> right things about Morse code. He was their little darling. Said he
> was going to take the code test.
>
> For the record, I don't support code testing as a separate pass/fail
> HF exam.

>
> 73, Brian

I agree, but that's another thread - or perhaps that's where all the
threads lead to.

312. Re: Why hams think we deserve the 5 mhz band (was: You have to be kidding!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-06 16:32:31 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns92FB7556074EFelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 59395

```
kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
news:d22b54c3.0301060715.33efe8a@posting.google.com:

> Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:<Xns92FABB0899B4Celektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
>> news:d22b54c3.0301050639.6233f47e@posting.google.com:
>>
>> > Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>> > news:<Xns92FA157C9F25Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> >
>> >> >> > From a dxers perspective working split is a good idea, phone,
>> >> >> > cw, 40 or anywhere else.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> So you think it's a good idea to use twice the bandwidth!
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >> > Lousy troll. No cigar. If you're so big into "spectrum
>> >> > conservation" why are you running phone?
>> >> >
>> >>
>> >> No-one has ever called me a troll before.
>> >
>> > Ya can't be a virgin forever in this NG. Welcome to The Group.
>>
>> You think it's being a troll just because I don't agree with you?
>
> No, it's because anybody who runs ssb on HF and also bleats about
> spectrum conservation is either trolling or is a nitwit.
>

The idea is to use the least bandwidth for the type of information you're
sending, whether it's phone, telegraphy or even television.

>
>> > Ya didn't answer the question.
>>
>> Partly because I was insulted,
>
> Pore abused, sensitive thing. See above WRT to RRAP virgins. Which YOU
> sure as hell ain't.
>
```

Most of my posts on here relate to code testing. even though I disagree strongly with some of the pro-testing people, none of them have ever called me a troll so far. Probably because I'm not.

Maybe this goes to the heart of what you're all really worried about - that when (not if, and it hasn't been 'if' for a long time) code testing is abolished the next battle will be over how much spectrum is reserved for CW.

>
>> and partly because I doubt if you really want an answer. However, I
>> use phone because I prefer it.
>
> We all have the option of shooting ourselves in the foot if that's
> what we prefer.
>

So you'd rather shoot yourself in the foot than work phone, and yet you admit to operating phone. Are you a masochist?

>
>> > I never even intimated any such thing. I've been hoping for the ITU
>> > 40M "harmonization" maneuver for years. In tbe best of all possible
>> > worlds the DX would get privs all the way up to 7.300. That would
>> > solve the problem.
>>
>> It would, but it will never happen. Do you really beleive that the
>> rest of the world will all change to solve a US internal problem? I
>> don't.
>
> We'll see about the "never happen" thing. Personally I don't have a
> problem with 40 just the way it is, I could care less when push come
> to shove. Just because you can't yak down to 7.075 does not make your
> problem any kind of "internal U.S. problem".
>

Ah, but it is. The FCC could make it go away tomorrow. The ITU can't.

>
>> > All extending U.S. phone privs down to 7.075 would do is cause
>> > problems on top of problems.
>>
>> Not atall. It would solve the problem at the point where it exists,
>> i.e. inside the US.
>
> Horespucky, you already conceded that the DX running ssb below 7.100
> is bitching about the CW and digital comms in that space. We don't
> have that problem.

So it's not a US problem that US operators bleep all over the phone subband? That explains a lot about your way of thinking.

> Why create the problem in the U.S.? Just because
> you don't happen to like to work split? Spare me the tears.

>

It's not working split that's the problem, that part's easy. The problem
is getting the DX to listen up.

>> Some people here would lose by it, but that's nothing
>> compared with the numbers of people who would be disturbed by moving
>> the whole band down 100 kHz.
>
> Blather. Let 'em eat cake. The 15M band jumped out of the gloom from
> nowhere in the late 40s when nobody had radios built for the band.
> Then came the three WARC bands in the late 70s for which "there were
> no radios". Today there are ham ops on 60m for which "there are no
> radios". And you think moving 40 down a lousy 100 is some kind of huge
> deal? I doubt that there is an HF xcvr out there which can't be very
> easily "snipped". If that would "disturb" some refer back to my
> comment about cake.

Sure, modifying the ham equipment is no problem. I was talking about the
broadcasters and other users. Realistically, a lot of the broadcasters
simply won't move no matter what rule changes are passed. The BC stations
could move easily enough, but a lot of them don't stay within the BC band
even now.

Each country gets a vote in the ITU, and realignment would benefit one
country, the US. So you think that every other delegate will fail to
suggest that the US could simply change it's own rules instead? I'm
betting more than one of them will suggest just that. That's why
realignment is a pipe dream. It's been pushed here only because changing
the rules in Part 97 to take some spectrum away from CW is a domestic,
internal, 'hot potato', not because there is any chance of success in
getting realignment.

>> I know that's not what you just proposed, but
>> that's even more laughable, suggesting moving the BC stations out
>> entirely.
>
> Have you ever tuned 6.900-7.000?
>

Not lately. I don't suppose there's much there, but it's allocated to
somebody, and they are sure to complain if it's taken away.

>
>> As the kids nowadays would say, that's just sooo not going to
>> happen. You call me a troll, but you're living in a dream world. Snap
>> out of it.
>
> Snap out of what Alun? I could give a rat's patooie less actually,
> I've been working the DX "tranceive" on 40 since back when I rode my
> dinosaur downtown to take the tests.
>

Sums it up really. It's suprising you stopped using spark. Or have you?

>
>> >> What language is that?
>> >
>> > CW.
>>
>> That's odd. I thought it used dits and dahs.
>
>
> Your lack of linguistic agility is not my problem. You keep having
> problems I don't have. Odd.
>
>>
>> >
>> >>
>> >> >
>> >> > w3rv
>> >> >
>> >

313. Re: Why hams think we deserve the 5 mhz band (was: You have to be kidding!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-06 16:40:38 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns92FB76B6AFF9Delektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 59396

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
news:d22b54c3.0301060727.6737a274@posting.google.com:

> "K HB" <k hb@arrl.DOTORG> wrote in message
> news:<%q8S9.18027$9N5.1666370@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>...
>> "Alun Palmer" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote
>>
>> : I have to admit that there is logic in that, but it would be nice to
>> : get some phone spectrum where everyone else has it. The rest of the
>> : world has at least 7.045-7.1 as a phone allocation, so a slice
>> : anywhere in that part of the band would fix the problem.
>>
>> It would fix one (perceived) problem, but would open another much
>> bigger problem. Amateurs outside ITU Region II have -ONLY- 100KHz of
>> spectrum on 40M in which they must squeeze all their modes. Putting a
>> voice allocation there for Region II american amateurs would make an
>> already crowded situation much, much worse.
>

And they already use phone from at least 7.045 up, so adding US stations
to part of it would add more people, but it's not as if they use other
modes in that part.

> Probably to the point where working ssb dx would become close to
> impossible. He doesn't get it. But then again maybe he does, eh?

How so? If, say, I'm on 7.174 and the other guy is on 7.084, then that
frequency is still in use. Bringing us both down there doesn't use more
spectrum, it uses less.

>
>> The real solution is a worldwide harmonization of the 40M allocation
>> and separation from the SWBC folks, which hopefully makes the agenda
>> at the coming WRC.

It would be nice, and I would like to see it, but I'm not holding my
breath.

>
> Amen.
>
>>
>> ��� 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
> w3rv

>

314. Re: What country?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-06 16:41:36 UTC
From: kh2d@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <3e19b15c.51617241@newsgroups.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 59397
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On 5 Jan 2003 20:34:15 GMT, Lloyd@no.spammmmm (Lloyd B) wrote:

>And if you don't understand the meaning of RFC, then you aren't
>qualified to comment.

Well, I understand the meaning of BULLSHIT, so I am qualified to
reply.....

>Brian wrote:
>>
>> Dave Heil wrote
>> > Brian wrote:
>> > >
>> > > Dave Heil wrote
>> > > > Brian wrote:
>> > > > >
>> > > > > Dave Heil wrote
>> > > > > > Brian wrote:
>> > > > > > >
>> > > > > > > Dave Heil wrote
>> > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
>> > > > > > > > >
>> > > > > > > > > Dave Heil wrote
>> > > > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
>> > > > > > > > > > >
>> > > > > > > > > > > Dave Heil wrote
>> > > > > > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
>> > > > > > > > > > > > >
>> > > > > > > > > > > > > Dave Heil wrote
>> > > > > > > > > > > > > > Brian wrote:

This is bullshit. Keep in RapCrap and do the guys in the other
newsgoup (DX) who don't want to read it a favor.......

73, Jim KH2D

315. Re: Why hams think we deserve the 5 mhz band (was: You have to be kidding!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-06 16:46:49 UTC
From: K�HB <k�hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <ZpiS9.16027$134.1806155@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 59398

"Alun Palmer" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote

: ....the next battle will be over how much spectrum is reserved
: for CW.

Shouldn't be much of a battle, since only a couple of hundred kHz are
reserved for CW. 100kHz on 6M and 100kHz on 2M.

��� 73, de Hans, K0HB
--
Help support youth involved in Amateur Radio.
http://www.mnyarc.org
http://www.k0bsa.org

316. Re: Why hams think we deserve the 5 mhz band (was: You have to be kidding!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-06 16:53:38 UTC
From: K<unk>HB <k<unk>hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <mwiS9.16043$134.1805749@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 59399

"Alun Palmer" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote

:
: And they already use phone from at least 7.045 up, so adding US stations
: to part of it would add more people, but it's not as if they use other
: modes in that part.
:

The rest of the world is restricted to that narrow little phone band on 40M.
We (in Region II) have an additional 200kHz of space above them. It borders
on outright arrogance (and is certainly incredibly selfish) to suggest that
we plonk our wideband signals down into that little sliver of spectrum just
because it's a little inconvenient to work "split".

<unk><unk><unk> 73, de Hans, K0HB
--
Help support youth involved in Amateur Radio.
http://www.mnyarc.org
http://www.k0bsa.org

317. Re: ARRL PROVIDING FCC LICENSE RENEWAL TO NONMEMBERS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-06 17:05:03 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <3HiS9.16066$134.1809270@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 59400

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote

: You're the one who established the kind of girl that the ARRL was,
: metaphorically.

I didn't "establish" anything. I told a joke.

You didn't make it an issue when W5YI was charging for the service. Why is
it
an issue when ARRL VEC charges for the service?

: I've looked at Part 97 and don't see anything about this.

If you think it's illegal, you should probably take them to court. Contact
K1MAN for assistance. He's on 20M several times a week.

Have a nice week.

73, de Hans, K0HB

318. Re: Why hams think we deserve the 5 mhz band (was: You have to be kidding!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-06 17:30:50 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <e3jS9.16150$134.1813131@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 59401

"Alun Palmer" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote

: All I actually asked for was phone from 7.075-7.1, which I really don't
: think is unreasonable.....

Reality check.

What you are asking for is almost half of their narrow little 40M "phone
band" as an enclave which Americans would immediately fill with plaintive
howls of "CQ DEEEEEE ECKS", crowding all of their intra-region phone
operations even further down-band.

I'm sorry, but you are simply out to lunch on this one.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

319. Re: Total Outrage!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-06 20:00:37 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E19E065.1080808@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 59409
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

N0VFP 2.0 wrote:
> I am totally outraged at our FCC today. Mr. Hollingsworth has lost all of
> my respect. To make a mistake is one thing, but to cancal a warning letter
> to well-known radio criminal, is unforgivable. ND8V is one of the worst ham
> radio offenders on 20 meters. Years ago, he would QRM the Purto Ricans on
> 14.300 and got a "time-out" from Riley.
>
> I am going to send membership to IARN and AARA - very soon. There is one
> person who can save Ham Radio from sudden destruction - Glenn Baxter

You and baxterboy will make a good pair.

320. Re: What country?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-06 20:08:34 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3E19E242.1080009@psu.edu>
Source record: 59404

Dave Heil wrote:
> "Grï¿½mwï¿½tch thï¿½ ï¿½nflï¿½ppï¿½blï¿½" wrote:
>
>>"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>>news:3E17D4B2.C307E519@earthlink.net...
>>
>>
>>>I'd be embarrassed too if I were you.
>>
>>I'd be embarrassed if I were either of you! What an incredible clutter of
>>unuseful drivel!
>>
>>Beware! The Celestial rrap/rradx Emperor may banish you both to the Big
>>Grumpy Place and you will have to perform square dances with Steve Robenson
>>and Len Anderson.
>>
>>BGO
>
>
> ...and you, the unidentified type worried that he might be subject to
> ridicule if his name/call should come out--what makes you read any of
> it?

Because it's in multiple threads.
Because people have to download it.
Because the threads have stuff in it we want to see, in addition to
your pitched battle with Brian.
Because you two are now just in the mode where one of you has to blink,
and neither of you plan to.
Because both of you are just restating the same thing over and over again.
Because both of you are just restating the same thing over and over again.

Both of you have made your point. And you've been asked to take it to
private email, or make another thread to continue (which we will be
quite free to ignore)

But as it is now, we have to wade through the thread, and yes, we can
ignore the posts from you and Brian , but what if you were to
accidentally post something that was on the thread topic? We'd miss it.

The only other alternative here is to filter the both of you out. But
that's not all that hot a solution. I for one like to read what the two
of you post.

So how about it? You two can have your very own thread in which you can
have your personal arguments, without annoying the rest of us. Heck,

I'll even start the thread for you. PSE K

(identified) - Mike KB3EIA -

321. Brian vs Dave

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-06 20:11:03 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3E19E2D7.8040803@psu.edu>
Source record: 59405

Here is the new thread in which Brian and Dave (hopefully) will continue
their personal battle.

Let's see what happens.

- Mike KB3EIA -

322. Re: ARRL PROVIDING FCC LICENSE RENEWAL TO NONMEMBERS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-06 20:11:47 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.h8axvyf.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 59402

On Mon, 6 Jan 2003 07:24:35 -0500, Steve Fleckenstein wrote:

>If you guys are so upset over the $12..
>
> Why doesn't some one who has already renewed using the FCC web process
>write down how they did it and post it here for all to enjoy rather than
>acting like crusty old farts ?
>
1. Get onto the ULS.
2. Log On with Call Sign and FRN.
3. Click on renewal.
4. Fill out the blanks that need filling/changing.
5. Follow the instructions to validate and submit.
6. Leave the ULS.

Less complicated than using an ATM.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

323. Re: ARRL PROVIDING FCC LICENSE RENEWAL TO NONMEMBERS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-06 20:11:55 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.h8axmve.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 59403

On 6 Jan 2003 05:50:39 -0800, Brian wrote:

>Yes and no. They've got Bart doing it.

If I designate a physician friend of mine as my agent to fill out
and submit a renewal form for me, is s/he providing medical services?
Obviously not.

>They also advertise it as something which falls under their VEC.

If I designate the ARRL, who assigns Bart, a paid ARRL staffer whose job, AMONG OTHER
THINGS, is to supervise the VC/VEC program, as my agent to fill out
and submit a renewal form for me, is he acting as the VEC?
Obviously not.

>I'm just curious where this body of rules are that authorizes VEC's
>to circumvent the FCC application and renewal process where it is not
>associated with an exam,

Where is the alleged "circumvention" taking place? To renew an
amateur license, anyone can get on the ULS and bang information into
the proper blanks. Some of us here have already had to do it. I've
done it for relatives whose mailing address is the same as mine but
who live overseas and at the time did not have ULS access.

No big deal.

>and for the VEC to collect $12 along the way.

This is a service fee, similar to the service fee that H&R Block
charges to file your income tax return for you.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

324. Re: Total Outrage!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-06 21:40:35 UTC
From: Jon Van Allen <kf7yn@qwest.net>
Message-ID: <3E19F7D2.EC9F384@qwest.net>
Source record: 59406
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Like anyone gives a rats ass what you think Lloyd.

"N0VFP 2.0" wrote:

> I am totally outraged at our FCC today. Mr. Hollingsworth has lost all of
> my respect. To make a mistake is one thing, but to cancal a warning letter
> to well-known radio criminal, is unforgivable. ND8V is one of the worst ham
> radio offenders on 20 meters. Years ago, he would QRM the Purto Ricans on
> 14.300 and got a "time-out" from Riley.
>
> I am going to send membership to IARN and AARA - very soon. There is one
> person who can save Ham Radio from sudden destruction - Glenn Baxter
>
> I also support the efforts of Sam Voron, VK2BVS.
>
> At least Glenn wont charge me to look at his website, like Hal Turner will
> soon.......
>
> Take a look and you will know what I mean
> http://www.halturnershow.com

325. Re: Total Outrage!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-06 21:53:04 UTC
From: signalchaser <williamsmith208@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <v1juma579pn0a@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 59407
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Poor Poor Lloyd, Sounds like a groupie to me. What a loser

"Jon Van Allen" <kf7yn@qwest.net> wrote in message
news:3E19F7D2.EC9F384@qwest.net...
> Like anyone gives a rats ass what you think Lloyd.
>
>
>
> "N0VFP 2.0" wrote:
>
> > I am totally outraged at our FCC today. Mr. Hollingsworth has lost all
of
> > my respect. To make a mistake is one thing, but to cancal a warning
letter
> > to well-known radio criminal, is unforgivable. ND8V is one of the worst
ham
> > radio offenders on 20 meters. Years ago, he would QRM the Purto Ricans
on
> > 14.300 and got a "time-out" from Riley.
> >
> > I am going to send membership to IARN and AARA - very soon. There is
one
> > person who can save Ham Radio from sudden destruction - Glenn Baxter
> >
> > I also support the efforts of Sam Voron, VK2BVS.
> >
> > At least Glenn wont charge me to look at his website, like Hal Turner
will
> > soon.......
> >
> > Take a look and you will know what I mean
> > http://www.halturnershow.com
>

326. Re: ARRL PROVIDING FCC LICENSE RENEWAL TO NONMEMBERS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-06 22:35:51 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3E1A04C6.F96A99DC@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 59408

Brian wrote:

> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> > And it's being done by an ARRL staffer in his or her paid employee
> > capacity, not as a VE/VEC.
>
> Yes and no. They've got Bart doing it. They also advertise it as
> something which falls under their VEC. I'm just curious where this
> body of rules are that authorizes VEC's to circumvent the FCC
> application and renewal process where it is not associated with an
> exam, and for the VEC to collect $12 along the way.

It's the equivalent of paying a secretary to fill out forms for you and
going down to the post office and mailing them in.

327. Re: ARRL PROVIDING FCC LICENSE RENEWAL TO NONMEMBERS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-06 23:03:58 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3E1A0B5E.C7758969@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 59410

Phil Kane wrote:

> >
> 1. Get onto the ULS.
> 2. Log On with Call Sign and FRN.
> 3. Click on renewal.
> 4. Fill out the blanks that need filling/changing.
> 5. Follow the instructions to validate and submit.
> 6. Leave the ULS.
>
> Less complicated than using an ATM.
>

Hardest part is finding the link to get to it from their
main page http://www.fcc.gov

It's at http://wireless.fcc.gov/uls/index.html

First thing is to find out what your FRN is. I found out
mine by going to http://www.qrz.com and looking up
my callsign. Then when you callsign's info is presented,
click "detailed info" which will then take you to a page
of your detailed info, including a link to "ULS listing"
Click that and you are taken to the FCC's ULS web
site with your info including the magic FRN, license ID
and SGIN numbers. Bookmark that page.
Then at the bottom of that page
click "ULS filing" and it will upload a plug-in.
Then you have to reboot Netscape. Use bookmarks
to get back to that page and click it again. If you
remember your password (!), then enter the FRN
and it and you're on your way. Or else click
"register with CORES". For some people this is
getting to be a real pain at this point, so paying $12 for the guy at
the ARRL may be worth it.

328. Re: ARRL PROVIDING FCC LICENSE RENEWAL TO NONMEMBERS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-07 00:39:01 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <FkpS9.55009$4j5.7847049@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 59411

"Steve Fleckenstein" <spfleck@citlink.net> wrote in message
news:v1itc4d8a9f9b3@corp.supernews.com...
> If you guys are so upset over the $12..
>
> Why doesn't some one who has already renewed using the FCC web process
> write down how they did it and post it here for all to enjoy rather than
> acting like crusty old farts ?
>
>
>

Step by step directions for those who wish to do it themselves are already
available at the ARRL website.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

329. Re: ARRL PROVIDING FCC LICENSE RENEWAL TO NONMEMBERS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-07 00:44:18 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.h8barzg.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 59413

On Tue, 07 Jan 2003 00:44:53 GMT, Dee D. Flint wrote:

>You overlooked registering in the CORES first if you have not already done
>so.
>
IIRC the FCC has done that for those of us who didn't do it for
ourselves. I am the trustee of two clubs and also provide a US mail
address for two relatives who live overseas where the USPS does not
deliver mail. IIRC Gettysburg has already sent FRNs for everyone.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

330. Re: ARRL PROVIDING FCC LICENSE RENEWAL TO NONMEMBERS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-07 00:44:53 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <9qpS9.55011$4j5.7848059@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 59412

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.h8axvyf.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Mon, 6 Jan 2003 07:24:35 -0500, Steve Fleckenstein wrote:
>
> >If you guys are so upset over the $12..
> >
> > Why doesn't some one who has already renewed using the FCC web process
> >write down how they did it and post it here for all to enjoy rather than
> >acting like crusty old farts ?
> >
> 1. Get onto the ULS.
> 2. Log On with Call Sign and FRN.
> 3. Click on renewal.
> 4. Fill out the blanks that need filling/changing.
> 5. Follow the instructions to validate and submit.
> 6. Leave the ULS.
>
> Less complicated than using an ATM.
>
> ---
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

You overlooked registering in the CORES first if you have not already done
so.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

331. Re: Total Outrage!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-07 01:31:31 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <avdakd$a5s$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 59414
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

This is not the 'real LLLLLooooyyyyddddd'. How do I know....read it and think about the real LLLLooooooyyyydddd.

This comment about the Spanish stations and Mike. Yep he raised holy hell with them. But guess what? MOST OF THEM WERE BOOTLEGGERS. And guess what else? FCC got them GONE. Remember all those PR stations that didn't go for a retest? You can thank Mike for that.

You go right ahead and join up with the American Amateur Radio Nitwit. Im sure the justice department won't have a problem checking you out too.

Have a nice day.

Dan/W4NTI

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message news:3E19E065.1080808@mailcity.moc...
>
>
> N0VFP 2.0 wrote:
> > I am totally outraged at our FCC today. Mr. Hollingsworth has lost all of
> > my respect. To make a mistake is one thing, but to cancal a warning letter
> > to well-known radio criminal, is unforgivable. ND8V is one of the worst ham
> > radio offenders on 20 meters. Years ago, he would QRM the Purto Ricans on
> > 14.300 and got a "time-out" from Riley.
> >
> > I am going to send membership to IARN and AARA - very soon. There is one
> > person who can save Ham Radio from sudden destruction - Glenn Baxter
>
>
> You and baxterboy will make a good pair.
>

332. Re: Why hams think we deserve the 5 mhz band (was: You have to be kidding!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-07 02:15:45 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0301061815.9d5fee7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59415

Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns92FB7556074EFelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
> news:d22b54c3.0301060715.33efe8a@posting.google.com:

> > No, it's because anybody who runs ssb on HF and also bleats about
> > spectrum conservation is either trolling or is a nitwit.
> >
>
> The idea is to use the least bandwidth for the type of information you're
> sending, whether it's phone, telegraphy or even television.

With split when the dx is talking your're listening, same total
occupied bandwidth as transceive.

> Maybe this goes to the heart of what you're all really worried about -
> that when (not if, and it hasn't been 'if' for a long time) code testing
> is abolished the next battle will be over how much spectrum is reserved
> for CW.

The only CW setasides are 50.000-50.100 and 144.000-144.100. You did
pass a test on the regs at some point right?

> > We all have the option of shooting ourselves in the foot if that's
> > what we prefer.
> >
>
> So you'd rather shoot yourself in the foot than work phone, and yet you
> admit to operating phone. Are you a masochist?

No, of course you're not a troll . . .

Yeah, I've run some phone here and there. I'm two cards short of an
SSB WAZ and I have a JT card. At least 1/3 of my 80 & 40 5BDXCC cards
are for ssb contacts. Almost all for split freq contacts. Check some
of the country totals on 40 in the CQ WW ssb contest, 75 countries in
48 hours without transceive on 7.075-7.100 is not heroics. If this is
"masochism" gimmee more of it.

> > We'll see about the "never happen" thing. Personally I don't have a
> > problem with 40 just the way it is, I could care less when push come
> > to shove. Just because you can't yak down to 7.075 does not make your
> > problem any kind of "internal U.S. problem".
> >
>

> Ah, but it is. The FCC could make it go away tomorrow. The ITU can't.

Goes right back to where this started, ask the FCC for the NPRM. Put up or shaddup. And hurry up willya, I'm holding my breath in anticipation . . .

> >> > All extending U.S. phone privs down to 7.075 would do is cause
> >> > problems on top of problems.
> >>
> >> Not atall. It would solve the problem at the point where it exists,
> >> i.e. inside the US.
> >
> > Horespucky, you already conceded that the DX running ssb below 7.100
> > is bitching about the CW and digital comms in that space. We don't
> > have that problem.
>
> So it's not a US problem that US operators bleep all over the phone
> subband? That explains a lot about your way of thinking.

I really hate to bust yer bubble again but the biggest bitch the dx has with cw & digital ops is their own ops working the each other with RTTY and PSK31 on those freqs.

>
> > Why create the problem in the U.S.? Just because
> > you don't happen to like to work split? Spare me the tears.
> >
>
> It's not working split that's the problem, that part's easy. The problem
> is getting the DX to listen up.

Ahhhhh . . there it is . . truth will out eventually: finally! So your "need" to be able to "work" the dx transceive is so that you can bludgeon them into acknowledging your existence whether they want to work the U.S. or not. What a nice guy YOU are! The Ugly American syndrome epitomized. You just provided the best rationale possible for NOT opening up 7.075-7.100 U.S. ssb to people like you.

>
> Sure, modifying the ham equipment is no problem. I was talking about the
> broadcasters and other users. Realistically, a lot of the broadcasters
> simply won't move no matter what rule changes are passed. The BC stations
> could move easily enough,

No they can't which is their biggest problem but never mind.

> but a lot of them don't stay within the BC band
> even now.
>
> Each country gets a vote in the ITU, and realignment would benefit one
> country, the US.

Uhhhh . . don't look now Alun but the major thrust of harmonization is
to increase the size of 40m for the DX. We have our 300Khz, they
don't. DUH?

> So you think that every other delegate will fail to
> suggest that the US could simply change it's own rules instead? I'm
> betting more than one of them will suggest just that. That's why
> realignment is a pipe dream. It's been pushed here only because changing
> the rules in Part 97 to take some spectrum away from CW

Take what spectrum away? I can beep from 7.001 to 7.299 at will. I
hope you're not silly enough to think that's gonna change in any
meaningful timeframe.

>
> >> I know that's not what you just proposed, but
> >> that's even more laughable, suggesting moving the BC stations out
> >> entirely.
> >
> > Have you ever tuned 6.900-7.000?
> >
>
> Not lately. I don't suppose there's much there, but it's allocated to
> somebody, and they are sure to complain if it's taken away.

That's in line with the rest of the issues & facts you obviously don't
know anything about.

> > Snap out of what Alun? I could give a rat's patooie less actually,
> > I've been working the DX "tranceive" on 40 since back when I rode my
> > dinosaur downtown to take the tests.
> >
>
> Sums it up really. It's suprising you stopped using spark. Or have you?

Whatever it takes Alun, I'll work 'em one way or another while you're
still whining about not being able to work 'em transceive with ssb.

> >> >> >
> >> >> > w3rv
> >> >> >
> >> >

333. Re: Why hams think we deserve the 5 mhz band (was: You have to be kidding!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-07 02:36:44 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301061836.3185e391@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59416

Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns92FB70D47AE9Aelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> > And it usually takes even more than that where the calling amateurs
> > might be 10khz or more wide.
> >
>
> Exactly. I personally think it's better to stay on a single frequency, and
> not answer people who call at the wrong time, but it takes a certain
> amount of discipline, i.e. answer one of them and they'll all try to call
> over the other guy you're working.

They're like Lays Classic Potato Chips. I you work one, you've got to
work the whole bag.

> I agree, but that's another thread - or perhaps that's where all the
> threads lead to.

All roads lead to Rome.

334. Re: Why hams think we deserve the 5 mhz band (was: You have to be kidding!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-07 02:39:28 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301061839.6023cc9d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59417

"K HB" <k hb@arrl.DOTORG> wrote in message
news:<ZpiS9.16027$134.1806155@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>...
> "Alun Palmer" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote
>
> : ....the next battle will be over how much spectrum is reserved
> : for CW.
>
> Shouldn't be much of a battle, since only a couple of hundred kHz are
> reserved for CW. 100kHz on 6M and 100kHz on 2M.

I don't see any HF on your short list.

Does this mean K0HB works phone on 14.005?

Why or Why Not?

335. Re: ARRL PROVIDING FCC LICENSE RENEWAL TO NONMEMBERS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-07 02:43:39 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301061843.5463c0a1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59418

"K HB" <k hb@arrl.DOTORG> wrote in message
news:<3HiS9.16066$134.1809270@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote
>
> : You're the one who established the kind of girl that the ARRL was,
> : metaphorically.
>
> I didn't "establish" anything. I told a joke.

Why? What did it have to do with the ARRL?

> You didn't make it an issue when W5YI was charging for the service. Why is
> it
> an issue when ARRL VEC charges for the service?
>
> : I've looked at Part 97 and don't see anything about this.
>
> If you think it's illegal,

How could anyone tell if it were legal or not?

you should probably take them to court. Contact
> K1MAN for assistance. He's on 20M several times a week.
>
> Have a nice week.

Thanks, Hans. You have a nice week to.

336. Re: Total Outrage!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-07 02:55:29 UTC
From: BDK <kingrat@buckeye-express.com>
Message-ID: <MPG.18840baf8af3a0099896b3@news.buckeye-express.com>
Source record: 59419
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

In article <v1juma579pn0a@corp.supernews.com>,
williamsmith208@hotmail.com says...
> Poor Poor Lloyd, Sounds like a groupie to me. What a loser
>
> "Jon Van Allen" <kf7yn@qwest.net> wrote in message
> news:3E19F7D2.EC9F384@qwest.net...
> > Like anyone gives a rats ass what you think Lloyd.
> >
> >
> >
> > "N0VFP 2.0" wrote:
> >
> > > I am totally outraged at our FCC today. Mr. Hollingsworth has lost all
> of
> > > my respect. To make a mistake is one thing, but to cancal a warning
> letter
> > > to well-known radio criminal, is unforgivable. ND8V is one of the worst
> ham
> > > radio offenders on 20 meters. Years ago, he would QRM the Purto Ricans
> on
> > > 14.300 and got a "time-out" from Riley.
> > >
> > > I am going to send membership to IARN and AARA - very soon. There is
> one
> > > person who can save Ham Radio from sudden destruction - Glenn Baxter
> > >
> > > I also support the efforts of Sam Voron, VK2BVS.
> > >
> > > At least Glenn wont charge me to look at his website, like Hal Turner
> will
> > > soon.......
> > >
> > > Take a look and you will know what I mean
> > > http://www.halturnershow.com
> >
>
>
>

Jeez, a groupie for Glenn Baxter, can he get any sadder??

BDK

337. Re: Total Outrage!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-07 03:03:25 UTC
From: kooks on shortwave <victorlimabravo2@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <3e1a4515@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 59420
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"N0VFP 2.0" <brother_lloyd_99@yahoo.com.spma> wrote in message
news:3e19e6a9$1_7@server....

Take a long walk off of a short pier or better yet
go have wild oil monkeysex with another man from
14.275 ;)

338. Re: Why hams think we deserve the 5 mhz band (was: You have to be kidding!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-07 03:21:01 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <xIrS9.17906$134.1910943@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 59421

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote

: I don't see any HF on your short list.

That's because there are no HF freqs which are reserved exclusively for CW,
none whatsoever.

: Does this mean K0HB works phone on 14.005?

No.

: Why or Why Not?

Because it is not allowed in the rules.

But modes other than CW are allowed at 14.005. For example, PSK31 is
perfectly legal at 14.005.

Good luck on this one now.

73, de Hans, K0HB

339. Things of Interest to Mike Coslo

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-07 04:53:53 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E1A5DAF.AAA708D9@earthlink.net>
Source record: 59422

Here, Mike. I've saved you the trouble of wading through various threads and going through all the work of laboriously downloading newsgroup posts. Just check under this thread periodically to see if anyone has posted anything which might be of interest to you.

Dave K8MN

340. Re: Why hams think we deserve the 5 mhz band (was: You have to be kidding!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-07 05:30:48 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3E1A6607.8DBE807@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 59423

Brian Kelly wrote:

> With split when the dx is talking your're listening, same total
> occupied bandwidth as transceive.
>

That would imply that I could jump in in between on your xmit
freq and work someone else while you are listening to your contact.

Yeah....

341. Re: Why hams think we deserve the 5 mhz band (was: You have to be kidding!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-07 06:00:36 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns92FCA32D42C5elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 59424

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
news:d22b54c3.0301061815.9d5fee7@posting.google.com:

> Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:<Xns92FB7556074EFelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
>> news:d22b54c3.0301060715.33efe8a@posting.google.com:
>
>
>> > No, it's because anybody who runs ssb on HF and also bleats about
>> > spectrum conservation is either trolling or is a nitwit.
>> >
>>
>> The idea is to use the least bandwidth for the type of information
>> you're sending, whether it's phone, telegraphy or even television.
>
> With split when the dx is talking your're listening, same total
> occupied bandwidth as transceive.
>
>
>> Maybe this goes to the heart of what you're all really worried about -
>> that when (not if, and it hasn't been 'if' for a long time) code
>> testing is abolished the next battle will be over how much spectrum is
>> reserved for CW.
>
> The only CW setasides are 50.000-50.100 and 144.000-144.100. You did
> pass a test on the regs at some point right?
>
>> > We all have the option of shooting ourselves in the foot if that's
>> > what we prefer.
>> >
>>
>> So you'd rather shoot yourself in the foot than work phone, and yet
>> you admit to operating phone. Are you a masochist?
>
> No, of course you're not a troll . . .
>
> Yeah, I've run some phone here and there. I'm two cards short of an
> SSB WAZ and I have a JT card. At least 1/3 of my 80 & 40 5BDXCC cards
> are for ssb contacts. Almost all for split freq contacts. Check some
> of the country totals on 40 in the CQ WW ssb contest, 75 countries in
> 48 hours without transceive on 7.075-7.100 is not heroics. If this is
> "masochism" gimmee more of it.

>
>
>> > We'll see about the "never happen" thing. Personally I don't have a
>> > problem with 40 just the way it is, I could care less when push come
>> > to shove. Just because you can't yak down to 7.075 does not make
>> > your problem any kind of "internal U.S. problem".
>> >
>>
>> Ah, but it is. The FCC could make it go away tomorrow. The ITU can't.
>
> Goes right back to where this started, ask the FCC for the NPRM. Put
> up or shaddup. And hurry up willya, I'm holding my breath in
> anticipation . . .
>
>
>> >> > All extending U.S. phone privs down to 7.075 would do is cause
>> >> > problems on top of problems.
>> >>
>> >> Not atall. It would solve the problem at the point where it exists,
>> >> i.e. inside the US.
>> >
>> > Horespucky, you already conceded that the DX running ssb below 7.100
>> > is bitching about the CW and digital comms in that space. We don't
>> > have that problem.
>>
>> So it's not a US problem that US operators bleep all over the phone
>> subband? That explains a lot about your way of thinking.
>
> I really hate to bust yer bubble again but the biggest bitch the dx
> has with cw & digital ops is their own ops working the each other with
> RTTY and PSK31 on those freqs.
>
>
>>
>> > Why create the problem in the U.S.? Just because
>> > you don't happen to like to work split? Spare me the tears.
>> >
>>
>> It's not working split that's the problem, that part's easy. The
>> problem is getting the DX to listen up.
>
>
> Ahhhhh . . there it is . . truth will out eventually: finally! So your
> "need" to be able to "work" the dx transceive is so that you can
> bludgeon them into acknowledging your existence whether they want to
> work the U.S. or not. What a nice guy YOU are! The Ugly American
> syndrome epitomized. You just provided the best rationale possible for
> NOT opening up 7.075-7.100 U.S. ssb to people like you.
>

Beleive it or not, many of them aren't aware there is anyone listening
down.

>
>>
>> Sure, modifying the ham equipment is no problem. I was talking about
>> the broadcasters and other users. Realistically, a lot of the
>> broadcasters simply won't move no matter what rule changes are passed.
>> The BC stations could move easily enough,
>
> No they can't which is their biggest problem but never mind.
>
>> but a lot of them don't stay within the BC band
>> even now.
>>
>> Each country gets a vote in the ITU, and realignment would benefit one
>> country, the US.
>
>
> Uhhhh . . don't look now Alun but the major thrust of harmonization is
> to increase the size of 40m for the DX. We have our 300Khz, they
> don't. DUH?
>
>
>> So you think that every other delegate will fail to
>> suggest that the US could simply change it's own rules instead? I'm
>> betting more than one of them will suggest just that. That's why
>> realignment is a pipe dream. It's been pushed here only because
>> changing the rules in Part 97 to take some spectrum away from CW
>
> Take what spectrum away? I can beep from 7.001 to 7.299 at will. I
> hope you're not silly enough to think that's gonna change in any
> meaningful timeframe.
>
>>
>> >> I know that's not what you just proposed, but
>> >> that's even more laughable, suggesting moving the BC stations out
>> >> entirely.
>> >
>> > Have you ever tuned 6.900-7.000?
>> >
>>
>> Not lately. I don't suppose there's much there, but it's allocated to
>> somebody, and they are sure to complain if it's taken away.
>
> That's in line with the rest of the issues & facts you obviously don't
> know anything about.
>
>
>> > Snap out of what Alun? I could give a rat's patooie less actually,
>> > I've been working the DX "tranceive" on 40 since back when I rode my

>> > dinosaur downtown to take the tests.
>> >
>>
>> Sums it up really. It's suprising you stopped using spark. Or have
>> you?
>
> Whatever it takes Alun, I'll work 'em one way or another while you're
> still whining about not being able to work 'em transceive with ssb.
>
>
>
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> > w3rv
>> >> >> >
>> >> >
>

342. Re: Another Morse Code Opinion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-07 09:48:49 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <aveqfp31dpp@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 59432

Now here's a question..... 10-3 and 10-4 are supposed to be an
affirmation or an acknowlegment..... aren't those two the same thing???
(10-3 and 10-4 from the APCO listing)

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

"Symbolism is for the simple minded....."

> However, having said that, certain 10-codes like 10-3, 10-4, 10-7, 10-8,
10-9,
> 10-19, and 10-36 seem to have pretty consistent meanings. Therefore, I
would
> not question their use on a ham radio repeater. Anyone who would is only
> playing "radio cop" and would be better off to mind his own business.
>

343. Re: Ham Running For Office - Orange County, California

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-07 10:02:59 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <aveqfq41dpp@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 59431

Thanks,

I vote for the individual, and what I have learned about the politician through as many sources as possible, to figure out which one is the LEAST crooked as well as aligned with my personal ideals.

I have spoken with about a dozen michigan senators/representatives (current) as well as some of the ones that have ran in the past 2 1/4 years and only one actually knew anything about ham radio!!!! This is where our local clubs need to get on board..... invite them to a club meeting! Share your concerns regarding amateur radio. Even if it does not work much in your favor, at least they will have gained some insight to the hobby. Hell, get 'em licensed!!!!

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

"Symbolism is for the simple minded....."

"William A. Wetzel" <n6rky@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:dYOR9.15890$9N5.1463144@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> Ryan,
>
> You have an excellent point there. If amateur radio enthusiasts voted
> independently as you had suggested, the voice would be unified and heard all
> the way to Washington. Many interest groups do just that. Why not amateur
> radio as well? Something to think about :)
>
> Best Wishes,
> & Thank you for your support!
> --
> William A. Wetzel
> http://home.earthlink.net/~n6rky
> http://www.qsl.net/n6rky
> mailto:n6rky@earthlink.net
> mailto:n6rky@qsl.net
>
> KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
> news:aupff85adl@enews2.newsguy.com...
> >
> > "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> > news:cuvyxnansvbet.h7rb50w.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> > > On Thu, 26 Dec 2002 04:15:32 -0500, KC8PMX wrote:

> > >
> > > >Anyone who votes democrat or republican is nuts.... It is
> > > >a no-win situation on either side of that political coin. Look at
this
> > last
> > > >presidential election, neither partie's candidate was worth a damn,
> > except
> > > >for being a puppet on a string for their respective parties.
> > >
> > > "None of the above" was not an option.
> >
> > There were other candidates other that the Big 2 parties...
> >
> >
> > >
> > > >"Vote Independant; Think For Yourself, Not What People Want You To
> > Think"
> > >
> > > The last "independents" in Presidemtial elections were Ross Perot
> > > and Ralph Nader, both of whom were scarier than the Demo-Rep
> > > candidates.
> >
> >
> > Maybe I should have cleared that one up a bit.... Independant meaning
any
> > party other than the republican and democrat parties.
> >
> >
> > >
> > > The first and last independent that I voted for was John Anderson in
> > > 1980, because neither Carter nor Reagan were acceptable.
> > >
> > > None of the above were hams....
> > >
> > > ---
> > > 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
> >
> > Maybe that would be the ultimate goal for the ARRL? After all, aren't
> these
> > the people (any elected officials that is) that we are going to look to
> for
> > defense, and support? Me thinks they would understand the hobby better
if
> > they knew more about it if they were licensed also. I would almost join
> the
> > ARRL just to get a motion made to get that to happen.... :)
> >
> >
> > --
> > Ryan, KC8PMX

> > FF/MFR
> > REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
> >
> > "Symbolism is for the simple minded....."
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
>
>

344. Re: What country?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-07 10:07:46 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <aveqfr51dpp@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 59429
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Ya missed the point.... morse code is the language or coding scheme that you would be sending the callsign.... you would be sending the morse code over a CW. Not necessarily interchangeable. One is a language/coding scheme and the other is a method of radio transmission.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

"Symbolism is for the simple minded....."

> > > Or you could pound out "whiskey bravo nine november mary echo" in CW.
> > :-)
> > >
> > ^^^^^^^^
> >
> > in morse code that is.
>
> Why not? CW is supposed to be a lot of fun, and by first converting
> all the Q-signals to longhand, then converting them to phonetic
> alphabet, you can make your fun last even longer. With all that fun
> practice, you'll be up to 50baud in no time.

345. Re: You have to be kidding!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-07 10:11:28 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <aveqfs61dpp@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 59430

Would be an awesome vanity callsign also if she worked in the media!

Ryan

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:xPLR9.6770$yN1.407@news.bellsouth.net...
>
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:eJkR9.54264$4j5.7349497@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> > Though in practice, I find that there isn't a significant difference
> > between 13 and 15. However I do notice the difference when it goes
above
> > 15.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
> Aha! A female ham with a normal call sign!
>
>
>

346. Re: Why hams think we deserve the 5 mhz band (was: You have to be kidding!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-07 12:36:34 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301070436.6acae8a2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59425

"K HB" <k hb@arrl.DOTORG> wrote in message
news:<xIrS9.17906$134.1910943@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote
>
> : I don't see any HF on your short list.
>
> That's because there are no HF freqs which are reserved exclusively for CW,
> none whatsoever.
>
> : Does this mean K0HB works phone on 14.005?
>
> No.
>
> : Why or Why Not?
>
> Because it is not allowed in the rules.
>
> But modes other than CW are allowed at 14.005. For example, PSK31 is
> perfectly legal at 14.005.
>
> Good luck on this one now.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

Alun didn't use the word, "exclusively." Why did you just introduce
it to the thread?

347. Re: What country?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-07 13:13:33 UTC
From: Sivac <sivac@sivac.com>
Message-ID: <3E1AD27D.3060201@sivac.com>
Source record: 59426
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
Walt Davidson wrote:
> On Sun, 05 Jan 2003 03:20:16 GMT, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
> wrote:
>
>
>> Your rrap bar room brawl might be better confined to one
>>thread. PSE K.
>
>
> It might better be confined to email.
>
> To make matters worse, they are both quoting every line of all the
> previous posts, every time. :-((((
>
> No 73 de G3NYY
>

How about they exchange telephone numbers :-))
```

348. Re: Why hams think we deserve the 5 mhz band (was: You have to be kidding!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-07 13:47:48 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0301070547.4541fa7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59427

Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns92FCA32D42C5elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
> news:d22b54c3.0301061815.9d5fee7@posting.google.com:

> >
> >
> > Ahhhhh . . there it is . . truth will out eventually: finally! So your
> > "need" to be able to "work" the dx transceive is so that you can
> > bludgeon them into acknowledging your existence whether they want to
> > work the U.S. or not. What a nice guy YOU are! The Ugly American
> > syndrome epitomized. You just provided the best rationale possible for
> > NOT opening up 7.075-7.100 U.S. ssb to people like you.
> >
>
> Beleive it or not, many of them aren't aware there is anyone listening
> down.

I doubt there's a dx station anywhere which doesn't understand that
all he has to do to work the U.S. on 40 ssb is tune up the band to see
if he has the propagation then call CQ and "listening on 7190". If
they don't do that they're not interested in working you or anybody
else in the U.S. and ya deal with it.

'Course you could use the oldest trick in the book and give 'em a call
with CW . .

>
> >> >> >> >
> >> >> >> > w3rv
> >> >> >> >
> >> >> >
> >

349. Re: Why hams think we deserve the 5 mhz band (was: You have to be kidding!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-07 14:49:22 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <SNBS9.21327$9N5.1928058@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 59428

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote

:
: Alun didn't use the word, "exclusively." Why did you just introduce
: it to the thread?
:

To take the wiggle room away from Andersonesque style rrap cowboys. (If the
foo shits, and all that ...)

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

350. Re: Another Morse Code Opinion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-07 16:01:04 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <4RCS9.21457$9N5.1939215@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 59433

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:aveqfp31dpp@enews4.newsguy.com...
: Now here's a question..... 10-3 and 10-4 are supposed to be an
: affirmation or an acknowlegment..... aren't those two the same thing???
: (10-3 and 10-4 from the APCO listing)

I though 10-3 meant QRT.

Even so, strictly speaking an "affirmation" is a positive answer to a question; in other words equivalent to "yes". An "acknowledgement" (as in 10-4) simply means that you have received the message.

73, de Hans, K0HB

351. Re: ARRL PROVIDING FCC LICENSE RENEWAL TO NONMEMBERS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-07 18:40:37 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.h8clgdk.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 59434

On 6 Jan 2003 18:43:39 -0800, Brian wrote:

>> : I've looked at Part 97 and don't see anything about this.
>>
>> If you think it's illegal,
>
>How could anyone tell if it were legal or not?

In American law, if an action is not specifically declared illegal,
it's legal. In this case, there's no bar to having a third party
fill out the form when so requested by the applicant. The FCC
considers the form as submitted by the applicant, not the third
party.

"Trust me".

Enough of this nonsense. Ignorance is curable. Stupidity is not.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

352. Re: Why hams think we deserve the 5 mhz band (was: You have to be kidding!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-07 19:24:46 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0301071124.2e87d728@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59435

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:<3E1A6607.8DBE807@ix.netcom.com>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> > With split when the dx is talking your're listening, same total
> > occupied bandwidth as transceive.
> >
>
> That would imply that I could jump in in between on your xmit
> freq and work someone else while you are listening to your contact.
>
> Yeah....

That never happened to you or what?

w3rv

353. Re: Why hams think we deserve the 5 mhz band (was: You have to be kidding!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-07 21:38:00 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns92FCA92114F68elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 59436

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in
news:f45722ac.0301070436.6acae8a2@posting.google.com:

> "K HB" <k hb@arrl.DOTORG> wrote in message
> news:<xIrS9.17906$134.1910943@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>...
>> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote
>>
>> : I don't see any HF on your short list.
>>
>> That's because there are no HF freqs which are reserved exclusively
>> for CW, none whatsoever.
>>
>> : Does this mean K0HB works phone on 14.005?
>>
>> No.
>>
>> : Why or Why Not?
>>
>> Because it is not allowed in the rules.
>>
>> But modes other than CW are allowed at 14.005. For example, PSK31 is
>> perfectly legal at 14.005.
>>
>> Good luck on this one now.
>>
>> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
> Alun didn't use the word, "exclusively." Why did you just introduce
> it to the thread?
>

Thankyou

354. Re: Why hams think we deserve the 5 mhz band (was: You have to be kidding!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-07 22:07:50 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <WcIS9.19347$134.2044273@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 59437

"Alun Palmer" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote

: >
: > Alun didn't use the word, "exclusively." Why did you just introduce
: > it to the thread?
: >
:
: Thankyou
:

Brian, Alun, Len, Robert, et.al.,

You fellas all form a circle and join hands now, and have yourself a
rewarding group pout about Hans is making you look silly.

"When a true genius appears in this world, you may know him by this sign,
that the dunces are all in confederacy against him." --Jonathan Swift

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB
--
This space intentionally has nothing but text explaining why this
space has nothing but text explaining that this space would otherwise
have been left blank, and would otherwise have been left blank.

355. Re: Why hams think we deserve the 5 mhz band (was: You have to be kidding!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-08 02:57:51 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301071857.41df4850@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59438

"K HB" <k hb@arrl.DOTORG> wrote in message
news:<SNBS9.21327$9N5.1928058@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote
>
> :
> : Alun didn't use the word, "exclusively." Why did you just introduce
> : it to the thread?
> :
>
> To take the wiggle room away from Andersonesque style rrap cowboys. (If the
> foo shits, and all that ...)

You know, Hans, I've always wondered when this group would self destruct.

356. Re: Why hams think we deserve the 5 mhz band (was: You have to be kidding!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-08 03:00:15 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301071900.2aad4bf4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59439

"K HB" <k hb@arrl.DOTORG> wrote in message
news:<WcIS9.19347$134.2044273@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>...
> "Alun Palmer" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote
>
> : >
> : > Alun didn't use the word, "exclusively." Why did you just introduce
> : > it to the thread?
> : >
> :
> : Thankyou
> :
>
> Brian, Alun, Len, Robert, et.al.,
>
> You fellas all form a circle and join hands now, and have yourself a
> rewarding group pout about Hans is making you look silly.
>
> "When a true genius appears in this world, you may know him by this sign,
> that the dunces are all in confederacy against him." --Jonathan Swift
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB

I'm always amazed when one of you geniuses gets his appendage stuck in
his zipper, then declares how silly everyone else looks.

357. Re: ARRL PROVIDING FCC LICENSE RENEWAL TO NONMEMBERS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-08 03:04:59 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301071904.3c38f836@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59440

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.h8clgdk.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> On 6 Jan 2003 18:43:39 -0800, Brian wrote:
>
> >> : I've looked at Part 97 and don't see anything about this.
> >>
> >> If you think it's illegal,
> > >
> > >How could anyone tell if it were legal or not?
>
> In American law, if an action is not specifically declared illegal,
> it's legal. In this case, there's no bar to having a third party
> fill out the form when so requested by the applicant. The FCC
> considers the form as submitted by the applicant, not the third
> party.
>
> "Trust me".
>
> Enough of this nonsense. Ignorance is curable. Stupidity is not.
>
> ---
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

Why is it I can fill out the short form when I use a go-between, but I
have to use the long form when dealing directly with the FCC?

358. Re: What country?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-08 03:13:51 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301071913.60ef0003@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59441
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

OK?

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<aveqfr51dpp@enews4.newsguy.com>...
> Ya missed the point.... morse code is the language or coding scheme that you
> would be sending the callsign.... you would be sending the morse code over a
> CW. Not necessarily interchangeable. One is a language/coding scheme and
> the other is a method of radio transmission.
>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF/MFR
> REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
>
> "Symbolism is for the simple minded....."
>
>
> > > > Or you could pound out "whiskey bravo nine november mary echo" in CW.
> > > :-)
> > > >
> > > ^^^^^^^^
> > >
> > > in morse code that is.
> >
> > Why not? CW is supposed to be a lot of fun, and by first converting
> > all the Q-signals to longhand, then converting them to phonetic
> > alphabet, you can make your fun last even longer. With all that fun
> > practice, you'll be up to 50baud in no time.

359. Re: Why hams think we deserve the 5 mhz band (was: You have to be kidding!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-08 03:35:19 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <X%MS9.19834$134.2096121@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 59442

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote

:
: You know, Hans, I've always wondered when this group would self destruct.
:

Happened years and years ago. You were working DX pileups in T5 at the
time, so I expect it escaped your notice.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB
--
Five years ago I was on a flight from Vegas to Dallas. The pilot said,
"Those of you on the right side of the plane can look down and see
Meteor Crater. N0iMD looked down and exclaimed 'Wow, it almost
hit that road!'"

360. Re: Things of Interest to Mike Coslo

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-08 03:39:22 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <e17n1voo07l5ftkcau2robm7o72m8g700t@4ax.com>
Source record: 59443

On Tue, 07 Jan 2003 04:53:53 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Here, Mike. I've saved you the trouble of wading through various
>threads and going through all the work of laboriously downloading
>newsgroup posts. Just check under this thread periodically to see if
>anyone has posted anything which might be of interest to you.
>
>Dave K8MN

Why thanks Dave. I really appreciate that. Why don't you just
go back to your inconsiderate hijacking of threads to argue with
Brian. I guess its just how you are; no use cramping your style. ;^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

361. Re: Why hams think we deserve the 5 mhz band (was: You have to be kidding!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-08 03:50:19 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <%dNS9.19861$134.2099661@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 59444

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote

:
: I'm always amazed when one of you geniuses gets his appendage stuck in
: his zipper, then declares how silly everyone else looks.
:

And here we have Brian who considers himself a self-made wit, thus relieving the Almighty of the terrible task of explaining what He did wrong in that Burke experiment.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

362. Baxter vs. Sherin: Clash Of The Egos?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-08 04:27:31 UTC
From: Anderson <Sarcasm@anon.com>
Message-ID: <avg9a5$62m$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 59445
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

After reading posts from Glenn Baxter and Bob Sherin I find it rather odd that these two megahertz megalomaniacs, while so much alike, are so diametrically opposed. These two Hams, while at odds with one another insofar as how operating procedures are to be conducted, are more alike than opposite.
Both are clearly unashamed to laud themselves in the "I, Me" categories and both seem to take great pleasure in broadcasting their narrow philosophy to any and all within earshot.
Sherin, like Baxter, has gone to great lengths to post missives that are nothing more than braggadocio. One gets the distinct feeling that both Hams are lacking in self-confidence and must therefore, "toot their own horns".
Both operators have a commonality that is unappealing to the Every Day Joe in that they both apparently feel that the "wordier" their posts, the more impressed we will be with their alleged intellect and worldly advice.
Both operators have been known to interfere with ongoing conversations whether intentional or not, and neither one is the kind of Ham Operator that neophytes should emulate. Their claims to fame, however inflated, should be looked upon with healthy skepticism. Consider the source.....or sources, for what they are.

363. Re: Baxter vs. Sherin: Clash Of The Egos?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-08 04:38:13 UTC
From: shortwave kooks <phatang@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <3e1bab3e@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 59446
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Anderson" <Sarcasm@anon.com> wrote in message
news:avg9a5$62m$0@pita.alt.net...
> After reading posts from Glenn Baxter and Bob Sherin I find it rather
odd
> that these two megahertz megalomaniacs, while so much alike, are so
> diametrically opposed.

You guys NEED to give this K1MAN bullshit a rest !!

Go here and take a break from all this ham radio bull shit:

http://ww3.voyeurweb.com/main/fse01/FS67852aat/index9.html

http://ww3.voyeurweb.com/main/VQe01/vq20021220-7663/index9.html

http://ww3.voyeurweb.com/main/VQe01/VQ67875ndsGG/index9.html

.......and finally, last but not least (?) here's one that EVE, JYZ
and MAN can fight over who gets to hop in the sack with "her":

http://ww3.voyeurweb.com/main/VQe01/vq20021222-7932/index.html

364. Re: Things of Interest to Mike Coslo

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-08 04:41:05 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E1BABE1.559AF0ED@earthlink.net>
Source record: 59447

Mike Coslo wrote:
>
> On Tue, 07 Jan 2003 04:53:53 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Here, Mike. I've saved you the trouble of wading through various
> >threads and going through all the work of laboriously downloading
> >newsgroup posts. Just check under this thread periodically to see if
> >anyone has posted anything which might be of interest to you.
> >
> >Dave K8MN
>
> Why thanks Dave. I really appreciate that. Why don't you just
> go back to your inconsiderate hijacking of threads to argue with
> Brian. I guess its just how you are; no use cramping your style. ;^)
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Why, Mike, I'm quite surprised. You outlined a litany of problems caused by Brian's posts and mine. I've provided you your very own thread so you won't miss any of the really important things which are often posted to this newsgroup.

Are you interested in Brian's latest problem with the ARRL? Lloyd's support of K1MAN? Alun's difficulties with 40m DXing? I wouldn't want you to miss any of the really worthwhile material :-)

Dave K8MN

365. Re: Brian vs Dave

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-08 04:46:50 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E1BAD2B.689778B6@earthlink.net>
Source record: 59448

Mike Coslo wrote:
>
> Here is the new thread in which Brian and Dave (hopefully) will continue
> their personal battle.
>
> Let's see what happens.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

I don't want you to think I'm not grateful to you, Mike so I'll take the opportunity to help Brian in coming clean.

Brian--

You'll appear to be more forthright and less disingenuous if you'll provide us with answers to the following about your operation from Somalia:

What callsign was used?

What equipment and antennas were used?

Who did the equipment belong to?

What amateur bands and modes were used?

What countries and continents were worked?

How were the QSLs delivered?

Dave K8MN

366. Re: Baxter vs. Sherin: Clash Of The Egos? (part II)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-08 04:49:33 UTC
From: shortwave kooks <phatang@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <3e1bade6@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 59449
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Forgot to add this one:

http://ww3.voyeurweb.com/main/VQe01/VQ67923nosGG/index.html

(now I ask you in all honesty, would you rather listen to a bunch of kooks on 14.275/14.313 - or would you rather be watching above ?)

367. Re: Baxter vs. Sherin: Clash Of The Egos?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-08 04:52:49 UTC
From: Duh! <NoWay@anon.com>
Message-ID: <avgapi$91k$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 59450
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

>
> Go here and take a break from all this ham radio bull shit:
>
> http://ww3.voyeurweb.com/main/fse01/FS67852aat/index9.html
>
> http://ww3.voyeurweb.com/main/VQe01/vq20021220-7663/index9.html
>
> http://ww3.voyeurweb.com/main/VQe01/VQ67875ndsGG/index9.html
>
> ....and finally, last but not least (?) here's one that EVE, JYZ
> and MAN can fight over who gets to hop in the sack with "her":

Like you think anybody wants to go to a Porno site with three hundred
pop-ups?

Stick it...

368. Re: Baxter vs. Sherin: Clash Of The Egos?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-08 06:12:13 UTC
From: 'Doc <w5lz@cwis.net>
Message-ID: <3E1BC13D.833C37D1@cwis.net>
Source record: 59451
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Anderson,
And so what's your point?
'Doc

369. Re: Why hams think we deserve the 5 mhz band (was: You have to be kidding!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-08 06:25:43 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3E1BC467.CCB51AC6@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 59452

Brian Kelly wrote:

> Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:<3E1A6607.8DBE807@ix.netcom.com>...
> > Brian Kelly wrote:
> >
> > > With split when the dx is talking your're listening, same total
> > > occupied bandwidth as transceive.
> > >
> >
> > That would imply that I could jump in in between on your xmit
> > freq and work someone else while you are listening to your contact.
> >
> > Yeah....
>
> That never happened to you or what?
>

Yes. it's happened, but usually not in a manor that doesn't
interfere with each other.... You implied that two QSOs
using the same split could coexist. Usually two QSOs
not using slit and operating on different freqs can coexist
no problem. The fact that the two QSOs sharing the same
split will eventually collide (interfere) means that it is better
to not use split, but have each QSO on different freqs.
Thus the amount of bandwidth cannot be thought of as
equal.

370. Re: Baxter vs. Sherin: Clash Of The Egos?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-08 06:55:30 UTC
From: Scott <scott@scotti.shit>
Message-ID: <3E1BCB62.1E987184@scotti.shit>
Source record: 59453
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

'Doc wrote:
>
> Anderson,
> And so what's your point?
> 'Doc

He's the gas, match and pile of wood.

371. Re: Baxter vs. Sherin: Clash Of The Egos?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-08 08:20:39 UTC
From: Wannabe <Aolster@anon.com>
Message-ID: <avgmv9$8e1$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 59454
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"'Doc" <w5lz@cwis.net> wrote in message news:3E1BC13D.833C37D1@cwis.net...
>
>
> Anderson,
> And so what's your point?
> 'Doc

Wassa matter, Doc? Feeling left out?

372. Re: Baxter vs. Sherin: Clash Of The Egos?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-08 08:39:10 UTC
From: Wannabe <Aolster@anon.com>
Message-ID: <avgo21$c35$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 59455
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"'Doc" <w5lz@cwis.net> wrote in message news:3E1BC13D.833C37D1@cwis.net...
>
>
> Anderson,
> And so what's your point?
> 'Doc

Oh, NO! Far be it that Doc be left out (or ignored) of an ongoing argument.
Doc simply cannot pass up a good opportunity to interject his words of
alleged wit.
Tread lightly, Doc, for Bob Sherin will take it upon himself to make light
of your posts....Bob is, after all, our resident self-apointed
pastor/mentor/know-it-all.
You will find, Doc, that Sherin has an ego that easily surpassed your own
and should you not believe this, just ask him.

373. Re: Baxter vs. Sherin: Clash Of The Egos? (part II)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-08 08:47:44 UTC
From: Wannabe <Aolster@anon.com>
Message-ID: <avgoi3$du5$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 59456
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"shortwave kooks" <phatang@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:3e1bade6@snipnews.snip.net...
> Forgot to add this one:
>
> http://ww3.voyeurweb.com/main/VQe01/VQ67923nosGG/index.html
>
> (now I ask you in all honesty, would you rather listen to a
> bunch of kooks on 14.275/14.313 - or would you rather be
> watching above ?)
>
>And would you prefer to listen to Dumb-Ass Donnie Anderson?
If so, why?
Donnie aint much smarter than a door with no hinges....

374. Re: Baxter vs. Sherin: Clash Of The Egos?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-08 12:58:09 UTC
From: Lloyd <Lloyd@LloydBARF.edu>
Message-ID: <avh78i$af9$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 59457
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

As all the Assorted Fruits & Nuts gather on 14275, ASX,
JYZ, VR, ad nauseam, the only nut remaining is the self-appointed
wannabe chaplin N4FZ. Where is he?

Lloyd

375. Re: Why hams think we deserve the 5 mhz band (was: You have to be kidding!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-08 13:21:07 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301080521.73234d1b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59458

"K HB" <k hb@arrl.DOTORG> wrote in message
news:<%dNS9.19861$134.2099661@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote
>
> :
> : I'm always amazed when one of you geniuses gets his appendage stuck in
> : his zipper, then declares how silly everyone else looks.
> :
>
> And here we have Brian who considers himself a self-made wit, thus relieving
> the Almighty of the terrible task of explaining what He did wrong in that
> Burke experiment.

Hans, you've already said you don't believe in the Almighty (a chain
letter, I think), so your statement above is nonsense. Even you
cannot believe it, so why do you make it?

So back to your metaphor. In the context of what the ARRL is doing,
how does your little joke fit in?

376. Re: Why hams think we deserve the 5 mhz band (was: You have to be kidding!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-08 13:29:00 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301080529.1a4e092@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59459

"K HB" <k hb@arrl.DOTORG> wrote in message
news:<X%MS9.19834$134.2096121@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote
>
> :
> : You know, Hans, I've always wondered when this group would self destruct.
> :
>
> Happened years and years ago. You were working DX pileups in T5 at the
> time, so I expect it escaped your notice.

I expect you weren't on the web at the time. So why do you say things
you know are false?

Anyway, we've lost Carl Stevenson, Jim Kehler, Steve Adell, Kurt the
sailor, Mike Deignan, Cecil, Eric June, Ed Hare, darling Val, Cutie
Boy, Mark Morgan.

Dick passed away.

Don't see much of Dixie or Len Anderson anymore either.

377. Re: Why hams think we deserve the 5 mhz band (was: You have to be kidding!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-08 14:42:54 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <ONWS9.22797$9N5.2086736@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 59460

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote

: > Happened years and years ago. You were working DX pileups in T5 at the
: > time, so I expect it escaped your notice.
:
: I expect you weren't on the web at the time. So why do you say things
: you know are false?
:

False? What is false? Did you not work DX pileups in T5?

In the beginning ARPA created the ARPANET. And the ARPANET was without form
and void. And darkness was upon the deep. And the spirit of ARPA moved upon
the face of the network and ARPA said, "Let there be a protocol," and thre
was a protocol. And ARPA saw that it was good. And ARPA said, "Let there be
usenet" and it was so. And ARPA saw that is was good. And Usenet rose and
said, "Let there be rrap and it was so."

: Anyway, we've lost Carl Stevenson, Jim Kehler, Steve Adell, Kurt the
: sailor, Mike Deignan, Cecil, Eric June, Ed Hare, darling Val, Cutie
: Boy, Mark Morgan.
:
: Dick passed away.
:
: Don't see much of Dixie or Len Anderson anymore either.

Maybe we should construct a "Hall of Fame", errrrr, I mean a "Hall of Flame"
to honor these departed ones?. Ask Larry about he and WA4D getting kicked
out of the "Hall of Flame" on COMPUSERVE Hamnet (back about the time you
were working DX in T5).

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

378. Re: Why hams think we deserve the 5 mhz band (was: You have to be kidding!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-08 14:49:42 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <aUWS9.22814$9N5.2087403@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 59461

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0301080521.73234d1b@posting.google.com...
: "K HB" <k hb@arrl.DOTORG> wrote in message
news:<%dNS9.19861$134.2099661@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>...
: > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote
: >
: > :
: > : I'm always amazed when one of you geniuses gets his appendage stuck in
: > : his zipper, then declares how silly everyone else looks.
: > :
: >
: > And here we have Brian who considers himself a self-made wit, thus
relieving
: > the Almighty of the terrible responsibility of explaining what He did
wrong in that
: > Burke experiment.
:
: Hans, you've already said you don't believe in the Almighty (a chain
: letter, I think), so your statement above is nonsense. Even you
: cannot believe it, so why do you make it?

It's foma, pure foma.

From the Book of Bokonon, Chapter 1

Verse 1: All of the true things that I am about to tell you are shameless
lies.

Verses 2-4 : In the beginning, God created the earth, and he looked upon it
in His cosmic loneliness.

And God said, "Let Us make living creatures out of mud, so the mud can see
what We have done." And God created every living creature that now moveth,
and one was man. Mud as man alone could speak. God leaned close as mud as
man sat up, looked around, and spoke. Man blinked. "What is the purpose of
all this?" he asked politely.

"Everything must have a purpose?" asked God.

"Certainly," said man.

"Then I leave it to you to think of one for all this," said God.

And He went away.

: So back to your metaphor. In the context of what the ARRL is doing,
: how does your little joke fit in?

I have no idea how it fits in. Do you?

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB
Lord Exhalted Liberator of the Electric Smoke

379. Re: Another Morse Code Opinion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-08 17:26:18 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030108122618.01922.00000075@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 59526

>Subject: Re: Another Morse Code Opinion
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 1/7/03 9:38 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030107223833.02011.00000184@mb-mk.aol.com>

>Some enjoy it, some don't. This is known. (Nothing new).

Expression of apathy noted. Nothing new added.

>It takes some effort to learn. (Nothing new).

Expression of apathy noted. Nothing new added.

>Others have used this argument before.(Nothing new).

Expression of apathy noted. Nothing new added.

>Others have used this argument before.(Nothing new)

Expression of apathy noted. Nothing new added.

>Sneak attack on CB. Sneak attack on CB has been done before.(Nothing new).

No attack on anyone. Use of non-Amateur practice 10-code only item
discussed. Expression of apathy noted. Nothing new added.

>Your whole post is nothing new, so how could it be ANOTHER Morse code
>opinion?
>Its another vote for Morse, but not another opinion.

Nothing YOU said had anything to add, ergo it was a waste of bandwidth.
It was not a "vote" for anything. It was the retelling of the author's own
experiences. Perhaps if you actaully spent some time on the air, Vipul, you
MIGHT have some tales of your own to tell...?

Steve, K4YZ

380. Re: Baxter vs. Sherin: Clash Of The Egos?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-08 18:48:46 UTC
From: 'Doc <w5lz@cwis.net>
Message-ID: <3E1C728E.784DCA72@cwis.net>
Source record: 59462
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Wannabe,
It just so happens that I have known Bob Sherin and
Glen Baxter for some time. Please believe me, NOT being
associated with either of them doesn't hurt my feelings
at all. If either of them remember me at all, they are
aware of how I feel about most of their 'garbage'.
As far as my being ignored, please feel free to do so.
'Doc

381. Re: ARRL PROVIDING FCC LICENSE RENEWAL TO NONMEMBERS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-08 19:56:46 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.h8emzkz.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 59463

On 7 Jan 2003 19:04:59 -0800, Brian wrote:

>Why is it I can fill out the short form when I use a go-between, but I
>have to use the long form when dealing directly with the FCC?

Have you ever done one of their on-line renewal, modification, or
update filings? It comes up with most if not all the boxes filled
in with the info on file. Make the chnages necessaru, validate the
form, click "Submit".

In actuality it's an intelligence test. See if you pass.

If all else fails, my engineering firm will be glad to submit the
form for you. Our rate for clerical work is $60 an hour for simple
non-contested filings.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

382. Re: Why hams think we deserve the 5 mhz band (was: You have to be kidding!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-08 20:47:09 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030108154709.03862.00000750@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 59527

In article <aUWS9.22814$9N5.2087403@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG> writes:

>"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
>news:f45722ac.0301080521.73234d1b@posting.google.com...
>: "K HB" <k hb@arrl.DOTORG> wrote in message
>news:<%dNS9.19861$134.2099661@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>...
>: > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote
>: >
>: > : I'm always amazed when one of you geniuses gets his appendage stuck in
>: > : his zipper, then declares how silly everyone else looks.
>: >
>: > And here we have Brian who considers himself a self-made wit, thus
>relieving
>: > the Almighty of the terrible responsibility of explaining what He did
>wrong in that
>: > Burke experiment.
>:
>: Hans, you've already said you don't believe in the Almighty (a chain
>: letter, I think), so your statement above is nonsense. Even you
>: cannot believe it, so why do you make it?
>
>It's foma, pure foma.

...oh, no, here we go, folks...!

>From the Book of Bokonon, Chapter 1
>
<snip>

Hans Bokonon flies again!

>I have no idea how it fits in. Do you?

Yes, we all do, Mr. Quotation.

You got your whatzit caught in your fly again and it pinched.
Unable to come up with original words you cut-and-paste
from a big macro of quotations.

Problem is, the quotations are obscure and unfunny.

Try something from the Holy Book of St. Hiram or the
Collected Sayings of Maud'ib by Princess Irulan.

Try borrowing Sgt Putz' Big Mirror where he tries to reflect
others' words as "replies" thinking himself very clever.

With all kind regards and a beep, beep...

383. Re: Why hams think we deserve the 5 mhz band (was: You have to be kidding!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-08 20:47:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030108154710.03862.00000751@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 59529

In article <f45722ac.0301080529.1a4e092@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>"K HB" <k hb@arrl.DOTORG> wrote in message
>news:<X%MS9.19834$134.2096121@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>...
>> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote
>>
>> : You know, Hans, I've always wondered when this group would self destruct.
>>
>> Happened years and years ago. You were working DX pileups in T5 at the
>> time, so I expect it escaped your notice.
>
>I expect you weren't on the web at the time. So why do you say things
>you know are false?
>
>Anyway, we've lost Carl Stevenson, Jim Kehler, Steve Adell, Kurt the
>sailor, Mike Deignan, Cecil, Eric June, Ed Hare, darling Val, Cutie
>Boy, Mark Morgan.
>
>Dick passed away.
>
>Don't see much of Dixie or Len Anderson anymore either.

Gone but not forgotten... :-)

384. Re: Why hams think we deserve the 5 mhz band (was: You have to be kidding!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-08 20:47:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030108154711.03862.00000753@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 59528

In article <f45722ac.0301071900.2aad4bf4@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>"K HB" <k hb@arrl.DOTORG> wrote in message
>news:<WcIS9.19347$134.2044273@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>...
>> "Alun Palmer" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote
>>
>> : >
>> : > Alun didn't use the word, "exclusively." Why did you just introduce
>> : > it to the thread?
>> : >
>> :
>> : Thankyou
>> :
>>
>> Brian, Alun, Len, Robert, et.al.,
>>
>> You fellas all form a circle and join hands now, and have yourself a
>> rewarding group pout about Hans is making you look silly.
>>
>> "When a true genius appears in this world, you may know him by this sign,
>> that the dunces are all in confederacy against him." --Jonathan Swift
>>
>> With all kind wishes,
>>
>> de Hans, K0HB
>
>I'm always amazed when one of you geniuses gets his appendage stuck in
>his zipper, then declares how silly everyone else looks.

HAR!!! :-)

Quotation time: "Few have the spark of genius...all the rest seem
to have ignition trouble." - Anon.

385. Re: Why hams think we deserve the 5 mhz band (was: You have to be kidding!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-08 20:47:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030108154711.03862.00000752@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 59530

In article <f45722ac.0301080521.73234d1b@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>"K HB" <k hb@arrl.DOTORG> wrote in message
>news:<%dNS9.19861$134.2099661@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>...
>> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote
>>
>> :
>> : I'm always amazed when one of you geniuses gets his appendage stuck in
>> : his zipper, then declares how silly everyone else looks.
>> :
>>
>> And here we have Brian who considers himself a self-made wit, thus
>relieving
>> the Almighty of the terrible task of explaining what He did wrong in that
>> Burke experiment.
>
>Hans, you've already said you don't believe in the Almighty (a chain
>letter, I think), so your statement above is nonsense. Even you
>cannot believe it, so why do you make it?

He may believe He *IS* the Almighty... :-)

Folks who are Managers at work are like that...

>So back to your metaphor. In the context of what the ARRL is doing,
>how does your little joke fit in?

If a Holy One approves of such it is sacrosanct.

So morse it be.

386. Re: Just One More Example

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-08 20:47:14 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030108154714.03862.00000755@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 59531

In article <20030107145932.18625.00000341@mb-cq.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>> By the way...You still haven't told me what would be a convienient
>time
>>>for me to stop by and give you that first hand demonstration of my weapon's
>>>skills that you said I don't have...
>>
>> Oh, my, the alleged "combat veteran" is now implying threats
>> to senior citizens of the USA?
>
> Oh My...Lennie is suffering from MPSS...Markie-like Paranoid Stalker
>Syndrome. Quite delusional.

Not me, you're the nutso, Sgt Putz. :-)

> YOU stated that I probably was lying or misrepreseting my marksmanship
>skills. I have offered on several occassions to give you a first hand
>demonstration of just what those skills are.

I'd hate to see you continue shooting yourself in the foot again...

> You have yet to suggest an opportunity to do that.

Next February 30th at 0900 good enough for you?

> Naaaaaaw....I can keep your lying rants under cheque from right here. No
>RedEye Special needed.

Your "cheque" may be in the mail but you forgot postage.

Note: C-H-E-C-K, not "cheque." See a dictionary.

> The "sick" part is that you try to make it look threatening.

"Threaten?" Crazies like Sgt Putz are unpredictable...there's
no telling which wall they will bounce off of next in their
rubber room.

> If you doubt someone's skills at ANYTHING, don't "call" them on it
>unless
>you want them to show you. I can professionally demonstrate my weapon's
>skills
>without putting a round anywhere near you, a family member or in such a way
>as to threaten you.

Ooooo! Ooooo! Big Badass COMBAT VETERAN!

How does that relate to AMATEUR RADIO, mighty warrior?

> No implied threat, Lennie. I'll just show up at your front door in the
>broad light of day, knock and ask if Lennie can come out and play. It's up
>to you from there.

BWAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA
AHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA
HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAH
!!!
!!!

...GEEZ! Grow up little boy. TRY to act the adult.

> Poor baby. Doesn't pay attention to what's being said by anyone except
>himself. Ignorant to the end.

Don't try the Mirror thing, little boy.

It must be a side effect of the purloined tranquilizers you use in
order to calm down and avoid those rage-induced typos...?

>>The FCC has stated publicly, in 1990 and again in 1999, that it
>> does not consider morse code testing elements to be of any
>> useful purpose in deciding whether or not an applicant should be
>> granted an amateur radio license. It stated (in 1990 and 1999)
>> that it must include them to meet ITU-R Recommendation S25.5.
>
> Exactly. The FCC is bound by international treaty.

No. The entire US administration is bound by agreement to the
terms of the United Nations charter. The International
Telecommunications Union is a UN organization.

There is NO "international treaty" in regards to amateur radio.
There is only the agreement of the United States of America
to meet the terms of the United Nations charter. That includes
all UN organizations in which the USA is a member.

The United States Congress legislated the existance of the
US Federal Communications Commission (1934, through the
passing of the Communications Act of 1934). The FCC acts
independently only insofar as permitted by the US Congress.

The US Administration to the ITU is composed of the US
Department of State, National Telecommunications and
Information Agency, and the Federal Communications
Commission.

>I haev said this all along.

Nonsense. Note: H-A-V-E, not "haev." Temper, temper...

>YOU continue to insist that it is due to some "lodge hall conspiracy"
>by "long-time 1x2's".

I have just stated the United States organization for radio
regulation and agreement with the United Nations and its

organizations. I can continue to repeat that until you reach
some semblance of understanding of reality.

No one can discuss, debate, or even argue with the fantasyland
environment of Sgt Putz' mind.

>That the FCC has not issued a declaration we can nail on the wall is not
>necessary.

Hypocritical statement.

Sgt Putz continues to DEMAND "exact proofs" of what He said
in previous messages in a word-for-word comparison...yet now
such things are "not necessary."

Sorry, reality does not allow altering environments to suit some
alleged message-point "win." Hypocrisy is not allowed and the
above is a prima facie example of HYPOCRISY. [caps for
emphasis]

The Federal Communications Commission makes many PUBLIC
statements of its policy views and most of the rest of the public
accepts those as the FCC's policy. Those are, as stated, all in
public view. There is NO separate collection of "insider viewpoints"
that "represents" the FCC.

>>Conjecture of a personal nature is NOT "proof" of anything.
>
> Not conjecture on MY part, Lennie. It's what THEY said.

Sgt Putz is very busy with conjectures, imagining things that
aren't there all to attempt winning message points. Foul. No
points won. Penalty...points taken away. Game over.

387. Re: Another Morse Code Opinion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-08 23:24:42 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030108182442.02022.00000099@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 59536

From: K4YZ
> Expression of apathy noted. Nothing new added.

I was responding to the original post. How can I add something new when the original post is nothing new?

>Perhaps if you actaully spent some time on the air, Vipul, you
>MIGHT have some tales of your own to tell...?

Those were the old days. I was on the air briefly. "Worked" mobile and HF. THEN, I discovered "Ham" radio.

Amateur radio got me into trouble. My passion was my demise. I had the chance to sell out. My not taking that chance is now my regret.

Now, Ham Radio will probably be just a novelty. I will forget about experimentation, because "What's the point?". I'll keep my radio as a lingering of the past. I will probably get on the air as some kind of diversion. I will eat more. Eventually, as I will need something new, I will learn Morse code.

388. Re: ARRL PROVIDING FCC LICENSE RENEWAL TO NONMEMBERS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-09 00:45:36 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301081645.17adf7f7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59464

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.h8emzkz.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> On 7 Jan 2003 19:04:59 -0800, Brian wrote:
>
> >Why is it I can fill out the short form when I use a go-between, but I
> >have to use the long form when dealing directly with the FCC?
>
> Have you ever done one of their on-line renewal, modification, or
> update filings? It comes up with most if not all the boxes filled
> in with the info on file. Make the chnages necessaru, validate the
> form, click "Submit".
>
> In actuality it's an intelligence test. See if you pass.
>
> If all else fails, my engineering firm will be glad to submit the
> form for you. Our rate for clerical work is $60 an hour for simple
> non-contested filings.

What happens if someone contests it?

389. Re: Why hams think we deserve the 5 mhz band (was: You have to be kidding!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-09 00:51:00 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301081651.479ac6b7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59465

```
"K HB" <k hb@arrl.DOTORG> wrote in message
news:<aUWS9.22814$9N5.2087403@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0301080521.73234d1b@posting.google.com...
> : "K HB" <k hb@arrl.DOTORG> wrote in message
> news:<%dNS9.19861$134.2099661@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>...
> : > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote
> : >
> : > :
> : > : I'm always amazed when one of you geniuses gets his appendage stuck in
> : > : his zipper, then declares how silly everyone else looks.
> : > :
> : >
> : > And here we have Brian who considers himself a self-made wit, thus
> relieving
> : > the Almighty of the terrible responsibility of explaining what He did
> wrong in that
> : > Burke experiment.
> :
> : Hans, you've already said you don't believe in the Almighty (a chain
> : letter, I think), so your statement above is nonsense. Even you
> : cannot believe it, so why do you make it?
>
> It's foma, pure foma.
>
> From the Book of Bokonon, Chapter 1
>
> Verse 1: All of the true things that I am about to tell you are shameless
> lies.
>
> Verses 2-4 : In the beginning, God created the earth, and he looked upon it
> in His cosmic loneliness.
>
> And God said, "Let Us make living creatures out of mud, so the mud can see
> what We have done." And God created every living creature that now moveth,
> and one was man. Mud as man alone could speak. God leaned close as mud as
> man sat up, looked around, and spoke. Man blinked. "What is the purpose of
> all this?" he asked politely.
>
> "Everything must have a purpose?" asked God.
>
> "Certainly," said man.
>
```

> "Then I leave it to you to think of one for all this," said God.
>
> And He went away.

You should look him up.

> : So back to your metaphor. In the context of what the ARRL is doing,
> : how does your little joke fit in?
>
> I have no idea how it fits in. Do you?

If your words have no meaning to you, then they certainly have no meaning to me.

390. Re: Why hams think we deserve the 5 mhz band (was: You have to be kidding!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-09 01:36:00 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <4m4T9.604$Dq.49723@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 59466

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote

:
: If your words have no meaning to you, then they certainly have no meaning
to me.
:

Sunuvagun! You have finally figured out the significance of rrap. It is
meaningless.

I want you to be fully aware of your role in rrap. It goes like this: K8MN
is the organ grinder, playing a song called "Tee Five Slim". You are the
little monkey in a bright red hat hopping up and down and acting silly for
our amusement.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB
Most Reverend and Exhalted Keeper of the Codes of Q

391. Re: Another Morse Code Opinion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-09 02:29:57 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030108212957.01735.00000822@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 59514

In article <aveqfp31dpp@enews4.newsguy.com>, "KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> writes:

>Now here's a question..... 10-3 and 10-4 are supposed to be an
>affirmation or an acknowlegment..... aren't those two the same thing???
>(10-3 and 10-4 from the APCO listing)

10-3 is not an acknowledgement or affirmation. 10-3 means "ready to
receive, proceed with your message."

73 de Larry, K3LT

392. Re: ARRL PROVIDING FCC LICENSE RENEWAL TO NONMEMBERS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-09 03:07:59 UTC
From: jbloom@arrl.org
Message-ID: <f8026928.0301081907.177a18d8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59467

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0301060550.54c6c66f@posting.google.com>...
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.h89s1q8.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> > On 5 Jan 2003 20:18:54 -0800, Brian wrote:
> >
> > >Where is the body of rules by which a VEC can establish and charge for
> > >non-examining services?
> >
> > Don't want to pay? Do it yourself, as hams had done from time
> > immemorial. Don't have 'net access? Call the FCC and get a paper
> > application sent to you.
> >
> > And it's being done by an ARRL staffer in his or her paid employee
> > capacity, not as a VE/VEC.
>
> Yes and no. They've got Bart doing it. They also advertise it as
> something which falls under their VEC. I'm just curious where this
> body of rules are that authorizes VEC's to circumvent the FCC
> application and renewal process where it is not associated with an
> exam, and for the VEC to collect $12 along the way.

http://216.239.57.100/search?q=cache:WhSKjFWzMMIC:www.fcc.gov/Bureaus/Wireless/Orders/da961144.wp

393. Re: Total Outrage!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-09 06:22:19 UTC
From: skuld-chan <skuld@mail.ru>
Message-ID: <vy8T9.497830$GR5.214528@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 59468
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Why do you care what happens on 20 meters? Your a tech.

"N0VFP 2.0" <brother_lloyd_99@yahoo.com.spma> wrote in message
> to well-known radio criminal, is unforgivable. ND8V is one of the worst
ham
> radio offenders on 20 meters. Years ago, he would QRM the Purto Ricans
on
> 14.300 and got a "time-out" from Riley.
>

394. An interesting article

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-09 06:23:01 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <avjgvd02lgs@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 59469

[Ran across this in an old 73 magazine article and noticed that some of the items discussed over 30 years ago are some of the same things discussed now. Times have changed but the gripes remain the same, have we really advanced in 30+ years? Ryan KC8PMX]

Hams Are A Funny Bunch Of People
Al Brogdon, K3KMO
73 Magazine
December, 1970
[Reprinted in its entirety]

Hams are a funny bunch of people. They will work for days with their beam antenna orientation to make sure it is pointed within one-half degree of the indicated direction-never considering the fact that the beamwidth of the antenna is 40 degrees.

They will overload their transmitters by factors of 50% or more, and milk that last watt of it-when it takes a power increase of four times to make one S-unit difference.

They will stay out of the ham club and complain until the cows come home about how poorly it is run. But they never want to join and work to straighten out the club's problems.

They will spend five hours and more building and installing ham equipment, telling the wife all the while that they just don't have the time to put a new line cord on her iron.

Some of them will crank their final amplifiers up a little and run 3kW PEP, never thinking about the fact that they would have to run more than 5kW to make a significant difference in signal strength about 2kW PEP. A few of these hams have the time to think this over during their license suspension period.

They will spend hours a day talking with people all over the world, but never say hello to their next door neighbor.

They will tell their wives they can't afford a new chair for the living room while they are writing out the order for a new $700 mobile installation.

They will buy surplus equipment to save money, and then spend an amount of money on it's conversion that would have bought good commercial gear that would have done the same job better.

They will set up stations with which they could communicate their ideas, but they will give a brief signal report, a brief weather report, a

description of their station, and run out of things to talk about.

They will spend an entire 48 hour contest period at the rig, leaving it only to catch short naps and take care of necessary bodily functions, but during the week they can't spare 10 minutes of their time to play with their kids.

They will buy complex and expensive keyers so the extra dots and dashes of their sloppy keying causes will be well-formed and correctly spaced. They use Q signals on voice, and the have to use phonetics to get the letters across, since voice is better suited for communicating words than for transmitting individual letters.

They will apply for every ham aware they can qualify for to document their accomplishments, when many of the certificates are for a level of accomplishment roughly equivalent to being able to cross the street without getting run over.

They will load half a ton of amateur gear and antennas into the car and take off for Field Day, but then have to suspend operation halfway through the contest because they didn't bring a spare fuse.

They will take great pride in being a ham radio operator, and tell all their nonham friends of many accomplishments of ham operators, and of the advances in the state of the art brought about by hams, when they themselves haven't been on the air in three years.

But one of the funniest things of all about hams is the typically human short-sidedness of most hams. They see all the faults of their fellow hams, and they are quick to criticize, but they are not aware of their own shortcomings. Aren't you glad that you and I aren't that way?

395. Re: Another Morse Code Opinion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-09 11:06:59 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030109060659.01857.00000239@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 59515

>Subject: Re: Another Morse Code Opinion
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 1/8/03 5:24 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030108182442.02022.00000099@mb-df.aol.com>

>I was responding to the original post. How can I add something new when the
>original post is nothing new?

If it's "nothing new", then WHY waste time "responding" anyway?

Sheeeesh!

>>Perhaps if you actaully spent some time on the air, Vipul, you
>>MIGHT have some tales of your own to tell...?
>
>Those were the old days. I was on the air briefly. "Worked" mobile and HF.
>THEN, I discovered "Ham" radio.

So you were bootlegging before you got a license? Is that period of
illegal operating why you get so "defensive" over CBers?

>Amateur radio got me into trouble. My passion was my demise. I had the chance
>to sell out. My not taking that chance is now my regret.

"Amateur radio got (you) into trouble"...?!?! An ARRL official kidnapped a
family member and forced you to rob a bank while they held them? You were
forced to film pornographic acts with animals? How did "Amateur Radio" get you
into trouble...?!?!

>Now, Ham Radio will probably be just a novelty. I will forget about
>experimentation, because "What's the point?".

"What's the point" indeed. If the rest of the world won't change just for
you, why go on? As a matter of fact, as dismal as the rest of your life
seemingly is, why not let me get a referal for you to Jack Kevorkian? I
understand he found several unique ways to help people whose lives have come to
an impasse and there is no use for THEM to go on. I am sure he could find a
plan you'd like.

>I'll keep my radio as a lingering
>of the past. I will probably get on the air as some kind of diversion. I will
>eat more. Eventually, as I will need something new, I will learn Morse code.

There are so many things you could do in Amateur Radio RIGHT NOW that
would keep you busy for many a year, Vipul. That YOU only care to focus on
using it as a "diversion" is your problem.

Steve, K4YZ

396. Re: Just One More Example

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-09 11:24:54 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030109062454.01857.00000240@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 59520

>Subject: Re: Just One More Example
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 1/8/03 2:47 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030108154714.03862.00000755@mb-cg.aol.com>

>Not me, you're the nutso, Sgt Putz.

For someone who doesn't know who he's talking to, I'd say your assessment
is in error!

>>You have yet to suggest an opportunity to do that.
>
>Next February 30th at 0900 good enough for you?

You do seem to like to ignore the facts, Lennie. I am not surprised.

>How does that relate to AMATEUR RADIO, mighty warrior?

How does anything YOU post here relate to Amateur Radio, Lennie? You have
long-ago left any semblence of being germane.

>GEEZ! Grow up little boy. TRY to act the adult.

If acting like you is "adult", then I'll be glad to stay just like this.
Better thought childlike than as decrepit, meaningless and lying.

>Don't try the Mirror thing, little boy.

I see. Only Lennie may say "poor baby".....Poor baby Lennie. Wants to
take his ball and go home...(Don't we wish...! ! !)

>No one can discuss, debate, or even argue with the fantasyland
> environment of Sgt Putz' mind.

Debate is always welcome. The kind of mean, vile and deceitful rantings
you promulgate are not "debate" by any milestone.

>>That the FCC has not issued a declaration we can nail on the wall is not
>>necessary.
>
> Hypocritical statement.

"Hypocritical statement"...?!?!

>Sgt Putz is very busy with conjectures, imagining things that
> aren't there all to attempt winning message points. Foul. No
> points won. Penalty...points taken away. Game over.

No conjectures, Lennie. No imagining nor "message points". Just Leonard H. Anderson spamming an Amateur Radio related newsgroup with his vile hatred of anything "not Lennie".

I really do pity you, Anderson. A shame your life has come down to slinging virtual mudballs at those you hate, isn't it?

Perhaps if you had really amounted to something once upon a time...

Steve, K4YZ

397. Re: An interesting article

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-09 11:30:35 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030109063035.01857.00000241@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 59519

>Subject: An interesting article
>From: "KC8PMX" kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net
>Date: 1/9/03 12:23 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <avjgvd02lgs@enews2.newsguy.com>

>They will stay out of the ham club and complain until the cows come home
>about how poorly it is run. But they never want to join and work to
>straighten out the club's problems.

Sounds like Lennie.

>They will tell their wives they can't afford a new chair for the living
>room while they are writing out the order for a new $700 mobile
>installation

And the problem with THIS is...?!?!

>They will buy surplus equipment to save money, and then spend an amount of
>money on it's conversion that would have bought good commercial gear that
>would have done the same job better.

But did they learn anything in the process (other than what it really cost
in the long run?)

>They will apply for every ham award they can qualify for to document their
>accomplishments, when many of the certificates are for a level of
>accomplishment roughly equivalent to being able to cross the street without
>getting run over.

But have you priced wallpaper lately? The awards look much nicer!

I never cared for "73" magazine much!

73

Steve, K4YZ

398. Re: Why hams think we deserve the 5 mhz band (was: You have to be kidding!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-09 13:00:47 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301090500.330b506b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59470

"K HB" <k hb@arrl.DOTORG> wrote in message
news:<4m4T9.604$Dq.49723@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote
>
> :
> : If your words have no meaning to you, then they certainly have no meaning
> to me.
> :
>
> Sunuvagun! You have finally figured out the significance of rrap. It is
> meaningless.
>
> I want you to be fully aware of your role in rrap. It goes like this: K8MN
> is the organ grinder, playing a song called "Tee Five Slim". You are the
> little monkey in a bright red hat hopping up and down and acting silly for
> our amusement.

And you're Ms Congeniality.

399. Re: Why hams think we deserve the 5 mhz band (was: You have to be kidding!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-09 15:39:57 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <hJgT9.1415$Qr4.145526@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 59471

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote

:
: And you're Ms Congeniality.
:

No, Sandra Bullock played that role. Rather fetchingly too, IMHO.

73, de Hans, K0HB

400. Suggested new 14275 IARN link...?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-09 18:54:27 UTC
From: Ham radio kooks <bigdic3885@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <3e1dc566@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 59472
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Here's a new link for the Boy Broadcaster
of 14.275 to put on his web page!

The GENUINE Official home
page for The Democratic People's Republic
of North Korea !

I am not kidding, click here
you Imperialist Yankee dogs: http://www.korea-dpr.com/

(be sure to go to and download the various patriotic
musical Anthems - great stuff to have playin in the
background in the shack when 14.275 is busy.
Kim Il Sung/Kim Il Jong in one ear and Baxter's
propaganda in the other.....it don't get much better
than that folks!)

Hambone the veteran 14.313 FZ/MM booer wars qrmer.

401. Re: An interesting article

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-09 18:59:16 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <avkgqvkvl1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 59473

Traditions..ain't it just wonderful????

Dan/W4NTI

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:avjgvd02lgs@enews2.newsguy.com...
> [Ran across this in an old 73 magazine article and noticed that some of
the
> items discussed over 30 years ago are some of the same things discussed
now.
> Times have changed but the gripes remain the same, have we really advanced
> in 30+ years? Ryan KC8PMX]
>
>
> Hams Are A Funny Bunch Of People
> Al Brogdon, K3KMO
> 73 Magazine
> December, 1970
> [Reprinted in its entirety]
>
> Hams are a funny bunch of people. They will work for days with their beam
> antenna orientation to make sure it is pointed within one-half degree of
the
> indicated direction-never considering the fact that the beamwidth of the
> antenna is 40 degrees.
>
> They will overload their transmitters by factors of 50% or more, and milk
> that last watt of it-when it takes a power increase of four times to make
> one S-unit difference.
>
> They will stay out of the ham club and complain until the cows come home
> about how poorly it is run. But they never want to join and work to
> straighten out the club's problems.
>
> They will spend five hours and more building and installing ham
equipment,
> telling the wife all the while that they just don't have the time to put a
> new line cord on her iron.
>
> Some of them will crank their final amplifiers up a little and run 3kW
PEP,
> never thinking about the fact that they would have to run more than 5kW to
> make a significant difference in signal strength about 2kW PEP. A few of
> these hams have the time to think this over during their license
suspension

> period.
>
> They will spend hours a day talking with people all over the world, but
> never say hello to their next door neighbor.
>
> They will tell their wives they can't afford a new chair for the living
> room while they are writing out the order for a new $700 mobile
> installation.
>
> They will buy surplus equipment to save money, and then spend an amount
of
> money on it's conversion that would have bought good commercial gear that
> would have done the same job better.
>
> They will set up stations with which they could communicate their ideas,
> but they will give a brief signal report, a brief weather report, a
> description of their station, and run out of things to talk about.
>
> They will spend an entire 48 hour contest period at the rig, leaving it
> only to catch short naps and take care of necessary bodily functions, but
> during the week they can't spare 10 minutes of their time to play with
their
> kids.
>
> They will buy complex and expensive keyers so the extra dots and dashes
of
> their sloppy keying causes will be well-formed and correctly spaced.
> They use Q signals on voice, and the have to use phonetics to get the
> letters across, since voice is better suited for communicating words than
> for transmitting individual letters.
>
> They will apply for every ham aware they can qualify for to document
their
> accomplishments, when many of the certificates are for a level of
> accomplishment roughly equivalent to being able to cross the street
without
> getting run over.
>
> They will load half a ton of amateur gear and antennas into the car and
> take off for Field Day, but then have to suspend operation halfway through
> the contest because they didn't bring a spare fuse.
>
> They will take great pride in being a ham radio operator, and tell all
> their nonham friends of many accomplishments of ham operators, and of the
> advances in the state of the art brought about by hams, when they
themselves
> haven't been on the air in three years.
>
> But one of the funniest things of all about hams is the typically human
> short-sidedness of most hams. They see all the faults of their fellow

hams,
> and they are quick to criticize, but they are not aware of their own
> shortcomings. Aren't you glad that you and I aren't that way?
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

402. Re: Suggested new 14275 IARN link...?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-09 21:12:37 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <avkokm$r03$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 59474
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Now thats funny !!

Dan/W4NTI

"Ham radio kooks" <bigdic3885@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:3e1dc566@snipnews.snip.net...
> Here's a new link for the Boy Broadcaster
> of 14.275 to put on his web page!
>
> The GENUINE Official home
> page for The Democratic People's Republic
> of North Korea !
>
> I am not kidding, click here
> you Imperialist Yankee dogs: http://www.korea-dpr.com/
>
> (be sure to go to and download the various patriotic
> musical Anthems - great stuff to have playin in the
> background in the shack when 14.275 is busy.
> Kim Il Sung/Kim Il Jong in one ear and Baxter's
> propaganda in the other.....it don't get much better
> than that folks!)
>
> Hambone the veteran 14.313 FZ/MM booer wars qrmer.
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

403. Re: An interesting article

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-09 21:39:57 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E1DEC2D.5080606@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 59477

KC8PMX wrote:
> [Ran across this in an old 73 magazine article and noticed that some of the
> items discussed over 30 years ago are some of the same things discussed now.
> Times have changed but the gripes remain the same, have we really advanced
> in 30+ years? Ryan KC8PMX]
>
>
> Hams Are A Funny Bunch Of People
> Al Brogdon, K3KMO
> 73 Magazine
> December, 1970

<snip>

It goes back even further than that. Here is an article from the
Zero Bias column of CQ magazine.

Zero Bias
Several recent letters have asked, "Is anything all right with
amateur
radio?" Sure, almost everything is all right. In fact, one of the few
big troubles today is that there aren't enough amateurs to enjoy its
blessings.

There are far fewer young amateurs to be seen, and talking to
them on
the air will verify this.

Amateur today is attracting older men.

Equipment prices have been forced higher along with everything
else in
our daily lives.

Perhaps an even more compelling reason for this lack of
enthusiasm for
our hobby by the younger generation is they have had little
encouragement.

And what is happening is that we are creating a lost generation of
amateurs - a generation that amateur radio can sorely afford to lose.
We must have new amateurs to replace those who drop out, those who
find
other interest or have too little time, and at the present moment
we're
not doing that.

Don't think not having these youngsters means less QRM, because the active amateurs of today won't appreciate the difference in their life-
time of operation. It does mean that eventually there may be less QRM and there may be less year after year until ham radio isn't justified in terms of its frequency allocations. It would be a crime laid directly on the steps of present day amateurs because in order to protect themselves against more QRM they didn't want to encourage new amateurs - they would be so selfish as to deprive others of the pleas-
ure they themselves derive from amateur radio.

That was CQ October, 1948.

404. Re: Suggested new 14275 IARN link...?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-09 21:41:55 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns92FEA9CC95E8Felektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 59475
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

>
> Hambone the veteran 14.313 FZ/MM booer wars qrmer.
>

All admitted jammers will be killfiled

405. Re: Suggested new 14275 IARN link...?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-09 22:14:21 UTC
From: more ham radio chimps <praisebobs@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3e1df467$1@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 59476
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Alun Palmer" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns92FEA9CC95E8Felektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>
> >
> > Hambone the veteran 14.313 FZ/MM booer wars qrmer.
> >
>
> All admitted jammers will be killfiled

Before of after ? (smbbpwrotflmacc) <--- shhhh it's top secret

406. Re: Suggested new 14275 IARN link...?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-10 02:06:10 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3E1E2A92.22FB78AB@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 59478
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Ham radio kooks wrote:

> Here's a new link for the Boy Broadcaster
> of 14.275 to put on his web page!
>
> The GENUINE Official home
> page for The Democratic People's Republic
> of North Korea !
>
> I am not kidding, click here
> you Imperialist Yankee dogs: http://www.korea-dpr.com/
>

Sure. Probably resides in a server farm somewhere in Silicon Valley.

407. Re: Why hams think we deserve the 5 mhz band (was: You have to be kidding!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-10 02:07:56 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301091807.63c1f300@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59479

"K HB" <k hb@arrl.DOTORG> wrote in message
news:<hJgT9.1415$Qr4.145526@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote
>
> :
> : And you're Ms Congeniality.
> :
>
> No, Sandra Bullock played that role. Rather fetchingly too, IMHO.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

Hans, are you assuming that there were no Ms Congenialities prior to
Sandra, and that there will be none after her? She is the one True
One?

408. Re: Why hams think we deserve the 5 mhz band (was: You have to be kidding!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-10 02:14:45 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <p0qT9.2260$Dq.216997@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 59480

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote

: Hans, are you assuming that there were no Ms Congenialities prior to
: Sandra, and that there will be none after her? She is the one True
: One?

As they used to say in the Navy, I'd crawl through a mile of briars to watch her skivvies go past in a laundry truck. She looks Truly Congenial to me, far beyond my powers to challenge her for the title.

Would you challenge her for the role? If so, post photos.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

409. Re: An interesting article

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-10 02:15:51 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <avladg$q7t$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 59481

Yep....I remember the same BS when I came on the ham scene...back in 1961.
Not to worry....everything is fine in ham radio.

Dan/W4NTI

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:3E1DEC2D.5080606@mailcity.moc...
>
>
> KC8PMX wrote:
> > [Ran across this in an old 73 magazine article and noticed that some of
the
> > items discussed over 30 years ago are some of the same things discussed
now.
> > Times have changed but the gripes remain the same, have we really
advanced
> > in 30+ years? Ryan KC8PMX]
> >
> >
> > Hams Are A Funny Bunch Of People
> > Al Brogdon, K3KMO
> > 73 Magazine
> > December, 1970
>
> <snip>
>
> It goes back even further than that. Here is an article from the
> Zero Bias column of CQ magazine.
>
> Zero Bias
> Several recent letters have asked, "Is anything all right with
> amateur
> radio?" Sure, almost everything is all right. In fact, one of the few
> big troubles today is that there aren't enough amateurs to enjoy its
> blessings.
>
> There are far fewer young amateurs to be seen, and talking to
> them on
> the air will verify this.
>
> Amateur today is attracting older men.
>
> Equipment prices have been forced higher along with everything
> else in
> our daily lives.

>
> Perhaps an even more compelling reason for this lack of
> enthusiasm for
> our hobby by the younger generation is they have had little
> encouragement.
>
> And what is happening is that we are creating a lost generation of
> amateurs - a generation that amateur radio can sorely afford to lose.
> We must have new amateurs to replace those who drop out, those who
> find
> other interest or have too little time, and at the present moment
> we're
> not doing that.
>
> Don't think not having these youngsters means less QRM, because the
> active amateurs of today won't appreciate the difference in their
> life-
> time of operation. It does mean that eventually there may be less QRM
> and there may be less year after year until ham radio isn't justified
> in terms of its frequency allocations. It would be a crime laid
> directly on the steps of present day amateurs because in order to
> protect themselves against more QRM they didn't want to encourage new
> amateurs - they would be so selfish as to deprive others of the pleas-
> ure they themselves derive from amateur radio.
>
> That was CQ October, 1948.
>

410. Re: An interesting article

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-10 02:36:31 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <v1scej1beq8s7f@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 59482

JJ,

I'm starting to believe what the "big kahuna" (N0BK) said. A lot of amateurs may start out as kids (I was first licensed at 15), but pretty quick, girls start taking priority over radio. Then usually comes marriage and a family. Often, folks will become inactive for years. I was WA3RJX just before moving back into New York around 1972 and obtained the call N2JH. I never was on the air with that call and let my licenses expire in the early 80s. I regained an interest and called the Rochester Amateur Radio Association in the fall of 1993 asking when the exams were given. The first test of the season was that very evening! So I went and tested out. I obtained my new license and got back on the air as an oldster. Hmmmm .... the ticket is renewable in a few months - I'm going to have to check the date. I suspect amateur radio has always been and will continue to be pretty healthy.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.435 / Virus Database: 244 - Release Date: 12/30/02

411. Re: Ham Running For Office - Orange County, California

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-10 04:00:02 UTC
From: "William A. Wetzel" <n6rky@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <6zrT9.2398$Dq.235570@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 59483

Ryan,

You have good advice here. I will do just that!!!

Best Wishes,
--
William A. Wetzel
http://home.earthlink.net/~n6rky
http://www.qsl.net/n6rky
mailto:n6rky@earthlink.net
mailto:n6rky@qsl.net

KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:aveqfq41dpp@enews4.newsguy.com...
> Thanks,
>
> I vote for the individual, and what I have learned about the politician
> through as many sources as possible, to figure out which one is the LEAST
> crooked as well as aligned with my personal ideals.
>
> I have spoken with about a dozen michigan senators/representatives
(current)
> as well as some of the ones that have ran in the past 2 1/4 years and only
> one actually knew anything about ham radio!!!! This is where our local
> clubs need to get on board..... invite them to a club meeting! Share your
> concerns regarding amateur radio. Even if it does not work much in your
> favor, at least they will have gained some insight to the hobby. Hell,
get
> 'em licensed!!!!
>
>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF/MFR
> REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
>
> "Symbolism is for the simple minded....."
>
>
> "William A. Wetzel" <n6rky@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:dYOR9.15890$9N5.1463144@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> > Ryan,
> >
> > You have an excellent point there. If amateur radio enthusiasts voted
> > independently as you had suggested, the voice would be unified and heard

> all
> > the way to Washington. Many interest groups do just that. Why not
amateur
> > radio as well? Something to think about :)
> >
> > Best Wishes,
> > & Thank you for your support!
> > --
> > William A. Wetzel
> > http://home.earthlink.net/~n6rky
> > http://www.qsl.net/n6rky
> > mailto:n6rky@earthlink.net
> > mailto:n6rky@qsl.net
> >
> > KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
> > news:aupff85adl@enews2.newsguy.com...
> > >
> > > "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> > > news:cuvyxnansvbet.h7rb50w.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> > > > On Thu, 26 Dec 2002 04:15:32 -0500, KC8PMX wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > >Anyone who votes democrat or republican is nuts.... It is
> > > > >a no-win situation on either side of that political coin. Look at
> this
> > > last
> > > > >presidential election, neither partie's candidate was worth a damn,
> > > except
> > > > >for being a puppet on a string for their respective parties.
> > > >
> > > > "None of the above" was not an option.
> > >
> > > There were other candidates other that the Big 2 parties...
> > >
> > >
> > > >
> > > > >"Vote Independant; Think For Yourself, Not What People Want You To
> > > Think"
> > > >
> > > > The last "independents" in Presidemtial elections were Ross Perot
> > > > and Ralph Nader, both of whom were scarier than the Demo-Rep
> > > > candidates.
> > >
> > >
> > > Maybe I should have cleared that one up a bit.... Independant meaning
> any
> > > party other than the republican and democrat parties.
> > >
> > >
> > > >
> > > > The first and last independent that I voted for was John Anderson

in
> > > > 1980, because neither Carter nor Reagan were acceptable.
> > > >
> > > > None of the above were hams....
> > > >
> > > > ---
> > > > 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
> > >
> > > Maybe that would be the ultimate goal for the ARRL? After all, aren't
> > these
> > > the people (any elected officials that is) that we are going to look
to
> > for
> > > defense, and support? Me thinks they would understand the hobby
better
> if
> > > they knew more about it if they were licensed also. I would almost
join
> > the
> > > ARRL just to get a motion made to get that to happen.... :)
> > >
> > >
> > > --
> > > Ryan, KC8PMX
> > > FF/MFR
> > > REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
> > >
> > > "Symbolism is for the simple minded....."
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
>
>
>

412. Re: ARRL PROVIDING FCC LICENSE RENEWAL TO NONMEMBERS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-10 05:03:15 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.h8h63e3.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 59484

On 8 Jan 2003 16:45:36 -0800, Brian wrote:

>> If all else fails, my engineering firm will be glad to submit the
>> form for you. Our rate for clerical work is $60 an hour for simple
>> non-contested filings.
>
>What happens if someone contests it?

Then the rate goes up to $200/hour because I put my lawyer hat
on and get involved.

It's all spelled out in the client agreement signed up front.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

413. Re: Why hams think we deserve the 5 mhz band (was: You have to be kidding!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-10 12:43:03 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301100443.786dc735@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59485

"K HB" <k hb@arrl.DOTORG> wrote in message
news:<p0qT9.2260$Dq.216997@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote
>
> : Hans, are you assuming that there were no Ms Congenialities prior to
> : Sandra, and that there will be none after her? She is the one True
> : One?
>
> As they used to say in the Navy, I'd crawl through a mile of briars to watch
> her skivvies go past in a laundry truck. She looks Truly Congenial to me,
> far beyond my powers to challenge her for the title.

I've never heard a sailor speak so eloquently.

But if that's the case, the organ grinder's monkey position was filled
long ago, in a land far away. You'll have to go elsewhere to sling
insults.

Brian

414. Re: Suggested new 14275 IARN link...?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-10 12:54:46 UTC
From: shortwave kooks <bignose6n78ths@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <3e1ec6df@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 59486
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3E1E2A92.22FB78AB@ix.netcom.com...
> Ham radio kooks wrote:
>
> > Here's a new link for the Boy Broadcaster
> > of 14.275 to put on his web page!
> >
> > The GENUINE Official home
> > page for The Democratic People's Republic
> > of North Korea !
> >
> > I am not kidding, click here
> > you Imperialist Yankee dogs: http://www.korea-dpr.com/
> >
>
> Sure. Probably resides in a server farm somewhere in Silicon Valley.

KOREA-DPR.COM WHOIS Results

Alejandro Cao de Benos de Les (template COCO-664474)
vientian@hotmail.com Lopez Pelaez, 12 BIS, tercero, sexta Tarragona,
Tarragona 43002 ES Domain Name: korea-dpr.com Status:
production Admin Contact, Zone Contact: Alejandro Cao de Benos de Les
(COCO-664474) vientian@hotmail.com +34 000 000 000 Technical Contact:
Salvador Salas Prieto (COCO-124384) salva@digival.es +34 983 217400
(FAX) +34 983 217401 CORE Registrar: CORE-11 Record last modified:
2002-07-03 18:38:48 UTC by CORE-11 Record created: 2000-08-08
08:44:38 UTC by CORE-11 Record expires: 2003-08-08 03:51:24 UTC
Domain servers in listed order: ns0.serveisonline.org
ns1.serveisonline.org Database last updated on 2003-01-10 03:47:01 UTC

(looks like the website was created by a sterotypical Monty
Pythonesque "greasy Spainard" folks. Perhaps he's a
decendent of General Alissimo Francisco Franco....?? --- who is still
dead)

415. Re: Why hams think we deserve the 5 mhz band (was: You have to be kidding!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-10 16:53:07 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <TTCT9.3330$Qr4.308671@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 59487

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote

:
: I've never heard a sailor speak so eloquently.
:

Thank you.

G'nite Chet. Turn out the lights when you leave.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB
--
This space intentionally has nothing but text explaining why this
space has nothing but text explaining that this space would otherwise
have been left blank, and would otherwise have been left blank.

416. Re: ARRL PROVIDING FCC LICENSE RENEWAL TO NONMEMBERS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-10 18:30:18 UTC
From: Steve Fleckenstein <spfleck@citlink.net>
Message-ID: <v1u49pt1p2vdda@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 59488

I give up.. here is the answer. Anyone still bickering about the issue will be demoted to twit and must spend the next 20 years on baycom 1200 bps packet sending code vs no code haunts around the globe.

Go to web site:
http://wireless.fcc.gov/services/amateur/licensing/renewal.html

You will find the following info there:

Licensing
Renewing a License

There are several ways of filing an application to renew a license. You can file through a Volunteer Examiner, through certain Volunteer Examiner Coordinators, or by:

Using the Universal Licensing System
Manually Filing Using Paper Form 605

You may use FCC Form 605 to apply for renewal of your amateur operator/primary station license grant, including those station license grants within the grace period. Use purpose RO (Renew Only) for this. If it is necessary to also modify your name or mailing address shown on your amateur operator/primary station license grant, use purpose RM (Renew/Modify). If you are not requesting a call sign change, file the Main form only. (Club or military recreation stations need to file through a Club Station Call Sign Administrator. See the Public Notice on CSCSAs. RACES stations are no longer being renewed.)

You may receive a license expiration notification from an entity that is also a VEC, but you are not required to use its services. File for renewal 30-60 days, but no more than 90 days, before your license expiration date. 47 CFR Section 97.21, provides that when your application for renewal has been received by the FCC on or before the license expiration date, your operating authority is continued until the final disposition of your application. If your license expires, you may apply for renewal of the license for another term during a two-year filing grace period. The application document must be received by the FCC on or before the end of the grace period. Unless and until the license is renewed, no amateur operator or station operating privileges are conferred. Applications received after the grace period has ended cannot be granted.

Section 1.913(f) requires that all applications, other than applications that must be filed through a VEC, may be submitted manually to the address below.

There is no fee for renewing your amateur operator/primary station license grant.

Using the Universal Licensing System

You may renew your license through the Universal Licensing System (ULS) at any time within 90 days of the expiration date for the license and up to two years after the license expires.

To renew, go to the ULS Home, select Online Filing, and follow the instructions below.

Renewal Only
(To renew your license and make no other changes. "Renewal with modification" is explained below)

Login with your FRN and password.
(Note: If you don't know your FRN, go back to ULS Home, and select Search/Licenses. On the next page, choose General from the pull-down menu, and click Continue. On the License Search -- General screen, enter your Call Sign in the appropriate space, and click the Search button at the bottom of the page. Your FRN will be displayed on the search results screen or your license record.)

For Purpose of Application, select Renewal Only and click Continue. If you have current applications saved in the system, they will be displayed in a list. Click the Select New Filing button at the bottom of the page to choose an application purpose.

Your call sign(s) will appear on the next screen. Click the box to enter a check mark for each call sign you want to update.
(Note: Your call signs will not appear if 1) you are attempting to renew prior to 90 days before the license expiration date, or 2) you have not associated the call signs with your FRN. To associate a call sign with an FRN, return to ULS Home and choose the CORES/Call Sign button. On the next screen, select Update Call Sign/ASR information, and click Continue. Next, enter your FRN and password and click Continue. The FRN/Call Sign/ASR Registration page will appear. Click the button at the bottom of the page labeled Enter Call Signs. Enter your call signs in the spaces provided on the following screen. Choose Submit to associate these call signs with your FRN. Finally, return to ULS Home and repeat the steps for Renewing your license.)

Sign your application by typing your name in the appropriate boxes at the bottom of the page.

Click Renew to file your application with the Commission.

If there the are errors in your application, you will be prompted to return and correct the errors. Otherwise, a confirmation screen will appear stating that your application has been successfully submitted and will display the file number of your application. Print this page for your records.

Renewal/Modification
(To renew your license and make changes to it)

Login with your FRN and password.
(Note: If you don't know your FRN, go back to ULS Home, and select Search/Licenses. On the next page, choose General from the pull-down menu, and click Continue. On the License Search -- General screen, enter your Call Sign in the appropriate space, and click the Search button at the bottom of the page. Your FRN will be displayed on the search results screen or your license record.)

For Purpose of Application, select Renewal/Modification and click Continue. (If you have current applications saved in the system, they will be displayed in a list. Click the Select New Filing button at the bottom of the page to choose an application purpose.)

A drop down box will appear for you to select the call sign(s) you wish to renew and modify.
(Note: Your call signs will not appear 1) if you are attempting to renew prior to 90 days before the license expiration date, or 2) if you have not associated call signs with your FRN. To associate a call sign with an FRN, return to ULS Home and choose the CORES/Call Sign button. On the next screen, select Update Call Sign/ASR information, and click Continue. Next, enter your FRN and password and click Continue. The FRN/Call Sign/ASR Registration page will appear. Click the button at the bottom of the page labeled Enter Call Signs. Enter your call signs in the spaces provided on the following screen. Choose Submit to associate these call signs with your FRN. Finally, return to ULS Home and repeat the steps for Renewing your license.)

The application, prefilled with information from your license, will appear. Make changes by clicking and highlighting the appropriate information. Choose Next Page to move to the next screen of the application.

Sign your application by typing your name in the appropriate boxes and click next page.

When you are finished modifying your license, sign your application by typing your name and the date in the appropriate boxes. Then click Submit to file your application with the Commission.

If there the are errors in your application, you will be prompted to return and correct the errors. Otherwise, aconfirmation screen will appear stating that your application has been successfully submitted and will display the file number of your application. Print this page for your records.

Return to Top

Manually Filing Using Paper Form 605

You may alternatively submit a paper FCC Form 605 by mail or in person to:

FCC
1270 Fairfield Road
Gettysburg, PA 17325-7245

You can request forms by calling (800) 418-FORM (3676), download the form or call our Fax-on-demand system at (202) 418-0177 from the handset of a

facsimile machine.

Return to Top

Last reviewed/updated on 8/8/2002.

417. Research Help/Callbook Census

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-10 23:56:30 UTC
From: Bruce <K1BG@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <3E1F5DAE.6BBA190@hotmail.com>
Source record: 59489
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

I'm doing a research project, trying to come up with US Amateur Census data going back for as long as it is available. I'm asking for a little help in gathering the data.

My 1980 Callbook (only printed US Callbook I have) on page 10 has the "Census of Amateur Radio Licenses in the U.S.A.". I'm looking for the Grand total at the bottom of the page. For instance, in 1980 there were:

Novice 75,036
Tech 71,883
General 125,559
Advanced 87,127
Extra 25,506

I'm not interested in Club or Military numbers. The Census was printed in both the US and International Callbook editions.

If you have some callbooks on your bookshelf, I'm asking if you could gather a little data for me. If you could send me the numbers for one or maybe two years, I will compile data and publish it on the internet. Hopefully, there will be enough responses that no one person will have to spend a lot of time on this. Also, I will let you know what years I have numbers for as I get information in. There is no use in sending me information that someone else has already researched.

Thanks in advance for your help!

Bruce, K1BG

K1BG@hotmail.com

418. Re: Suggested new 14275 IARN link...?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-10 23:57:38 UTC
From: dafirebottle@aol.comnojunk
Message-ID: <20030110185738.02045.00000061@mb-ff.aol.com>
Source record: 59517

<< Subject: Re: Suggested new 14275 IARN link...?
From: "shortwave kooks" bignose6n78ths@hotmail.com
Date: Fri, Jan 10, 2003 6:54 AM
Message-id: <3e1ec6df@snipnews.snip.net>

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3E1E2A92.22FB78AB@ix.netcom.com...
> Ham radio kooks wrote:
>
> > Here's a new link for the Boy Broadcaster
> > of 14.275 to put on his web page!
> >
> > The GENUINE Official home
> > page for The Democratic People's Republic
> > of North Korea !
> >
> > I am not kidding, click here
> > you Imperialist Yankee dogs: http://www.korea-dpr.com/
> >
>
> Sure. Probably resides in a server farm somewhere in Silicon Valley.

KOREA-DPR.COM WHOIS Results

Alejandro Cao de Benos de Les (template COCO-664474)
vientian@hotmail.com Lopez Pelaez, 12 BIS, tercero, sexta Tarragona,
Tarragona 43002 ES Domain Name: korea-dpr.com Status:
production Admin Contact, Zone Contact: Alejandro Cao de Benos de Les
(COCO-664474) vientian@hotmail.com +34 000 000 000 Technical Contact:
Salvador Salas Prieto (COCO-124384) salva@digival.es +34 983 217400
(FAX) +34 983 217401 CORE Registrar: CORE-11 Record last modified:
2002-07-03 18:38:48 UTC by CORE-11 Record created: 2000-08-08
08:44:38 UTC by CORE-11 Record expires: 2003-08-08 03:51:24 UTC
Domain servers in listed order: ns0.serveisonline.org
ns1.serveisonline.org Database last updated on 2003-01-10 03:47:01 UTC

(looks like the website was created by a sterotypical Monty
Pythonesque "greasy Spainard" folks. iard Perhaps he's a
decendent of General Alissimo Francisco Franco....?? --- who is still
dead)

>>

"Spainard"??? How about "Spaniard"...

"General Alissimo Francisco Franco"

How about "Generalissimo Francisco Franco"....

How about the dumbing down of America?? And, amateur operators leading the way???

Can you say idiot??

Firebottle

419. Re: ARRL PROVIDING FCC LICENSE RENEWAL TO NONMEMBERS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-11 00:27:19 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0301101627.22b0c27e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59490

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.h8h63e3.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> On 8 Jan 2003 16:45:36 -0800, Brian wrote:
>
> >> If all else fails, my engineering firm will be glad to submit the
> >> form for you. Our rate for clerical work is $60 an hour for simple
> >> non-contested filings.
> >
> >What happens if someone contests it?
>
> Then the rate goes up to $200/hour because I put my lawyer hat
> on and get involved.
>
> It's all spelled out in the client agreement signed up front.

Somebody would have to read it to him.

>
> ---
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

w3rv

420. Re: Research Help/Callbook Census

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-11 00:51:21 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns92FFC9F8B4C9Eelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 59491
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Bruce <K1BG@hotmail.com> wrote in news:3E1F5DAE.6BBA190@hotmail.com:

> I'm doing a research project, trying to come up with US Amateur Census
> data going back for as long as it is available. I'm asking for a little
> help in gathering the data.
>
> My 1980 Callbook (only printed US Callbook I have) on page 10 has the
> "Census of Amateur Radio Licenses in the U.S.A.". I'm looking for the
> Grand total at the bottom of the page. For instance, in 1980 there
> were:
>
> Novice 75,036
> Tech 71,883
> General 125,559
> Advanced 87,127
> Extra 25,506
>
> I'm not interested in Club or Military numbers. The Census was printed
> in both the US and International Callbook editions.
>
> If you have some callbooks on your bookshelf, I'm asking if you could
> gather a little data for me. If you could send me the numbers for one
> or maybe two years, I will compile data and publish it on the internet.
> Hopefully, there will be enough responses that no one person will have
> to spend a lot of time on this. Also, I will let you know what years I
> have numbers for as I get information in. There is no use in sending me
> information that someone else has already researched.
>
> Thanks in advance for your help!
>
> Bruce, K1BG
>
> K1BG@hotmail.com
>
>

I have the '92 and '03 callbooks. Here are the numbers (I've added your
numbers for '80 in as well):

Class 1980 1992 2003
----- ---- ---- ----

Novice 75,036 96,914 51,589
Tech 71,883 146,893 258,474

Tech Plus 87,423
General 125,559 120,165 143,491
Advanced 87,127 103,332 86,652
Extra 25,506 55,008 104,254

As you can see, I've added an additional row, as Tech Plus is now listed separately. The '03 callbook is unfortunately the last issue of the Radio Amateur Callbook.

The ham radio store in Laurel, MD used to have a back room with every issue of the callbook, for customers' use, but I don't know what happened to them when they closed down. It is possible that someone in the Laurel VEC might know?

It's quite lucky that our collective callbooks are fairly evenly spaced, with 12 years between yours and my old one, and then 11 years from that one to the current one. Hope you get lots of people to submit a lot of others. One from about 1970 would be informative. I bet some libraries have some old ones.

73 de N3KIP

421. Re: Research Help/Callbook Census

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-11 02:05:37 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030110210537.01697.00000397@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 59523

The only hard copy Callbook I have is from 1983 (USA Listings), purchased at a hamfest a few years ago for a buck. Here's the data:

Callbook Year: 1983 (U.S.)

Novice: 87,479
Technician: 79,620
General: 123,161
Advanced: 95,509
Extra: 31,782
Total: 417,551

Total excludes 4,181 club, military, and repeater station licenses, but you said that you didn't want that data.

73 de Larry, K3LT

422. FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-11 05:34:15 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030111003415.15122.00001145@mb-fe.aol.com>
Source record: 59525

FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade, to operate HF. Cbplusser tells FCC, that thats unfair, and he shouldnt have to take anymore tests. Sounds normal for the present new Hams. Here comes the next cry from the Knuckle Dragging Mentally Challenged. We need more Dumbing Down for the Mentally Challenged. Isnt Dumbing Down great.

423. Re: ARRL PROVIDING FCC LICENSE RENEWAL TO NONMEMBERS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-11 13:22:27 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301110522.2c2a2c9c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59492

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0301101627.22b0c27e@posting.google.com>...
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.h8h63e3.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> > On 8 Jan 2003 16:45:36 -0800, Brian wrote:
> >
> > >> If all else fails, my engineering firm will be glad to submit the
> > >> form for you. Our rate for clerical work is $60 an hour for simple
> > >> non-contested filings.
> > >
> > >What happens if someone contests it?
> >
> > Then the rate goes up to $200/hour because I put my lawyer hat
> > on and get involved.
> >
> > It's all spelled out in the client agreement signed up front.
>
> Somebody would have to read it to him.

I elect the engineer with the dunce cap on.

424. Re: ARRL PROVIDING FCC LICENSE RENEWAL TO NONMEMBERS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-11 13:28:16 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301110528.4efbbade@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59493

"Steve Fleckenstein" <spfleck@citlink.net> wrote in message
news:<v1u49pt1p2vdda@corp.supernews.com>...
> I give up.. here is the answer. Anyone still bickering about the issue will
> be demoted to twit and must spend the next 20 years on baycom 1200 bps
> packet sending code vs no code haunts around the globe.

Steve, that was very gracious of you. Of all the Steve's that have
ever posted on rrap, you are by far the most kind.

Thank you.

Brian

425. Re: Another Morse Code Opinion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-11 14:04:52 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030111090452.22983.00000543@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 59518

From N2EY:
>More to the point - what's his "passion", and how come he can't sell out now?

My passion is radio (or more accurately, rf). I can't sell out now because lightening rarely strikes twice in the same place.

426. Re: ARRL PROVIDING FCC LICENSE RENEWAL TO NONMEMBERS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-11 15:13:58 UTC
From: David Robbins <k1ttt@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <-aOdna3vbO8zqb2jXTWcqg@crocker.com>
Source record: 59494

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0301110522.2c2a2c9c@posting.google.com...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0301101627.22b0c27e@posting.google.com>...
> > "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.h8h63e3.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> > > On 8 Jan 2003 16:45:36 -0800, Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > >> If all else fails, my engineering firm will be glad to submit the
> > > >> form for you. Our rate for clerical work is $60 an hour for
simple
> > > >> non-contested filings.
> > > >
> > > >What happens if someone contests it?
> > >
> > > Then the rate goes up to $200/hour because I put my lawyer hat
> > > on and get involved.
> > >
> > > It's all spelled out in the client agreement signed up front.
> >
> > Somebody would have to read it to him.
>
> I elect the engineer with the dunce cap on.

that is not always the best choice. where i work we have 2 licenses for uhf base and ht's we use. we got got these very official looking notices from a company called 'universal licensing service' (obviously selected so their initials mimic the fcc's system name). they want $80 to renew each of our licenses... well i checked the fcc site and we can do that ourselves for $50 each. so our manager asked me to take care of it directly, of course after i figure out the forms, spend time on the phone with the fcc getting walked through the process the first time, get the application rejected because our accounting people didn't send a check in fast enough, reapply with credit card payment, send in for refund for check that was cashed even though the application had already been rejected for no payment, do expense account to pay off credit card, etc, etc, etc, it probably cost them $1000 per license! and of course in 10 years when its due again there will probably be a new and improved system to learn, but i sure won't be doing it!

427. Re: ARRL PROVIDING FCC LICENSE RENEWAL TO NONMEMBERS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-11 19:38:07 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301111138.65fece98@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59495

"David Robbins" <k1ttt@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:<-aOdna3vbO8zqb2jXTWcqg@crocker.com>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0301110522.2c2a2c9c@posting.google.com...
> > kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
> news:<d22b54c3.0301101627.22b0c27e@posting.google.com>...
> > > "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> news:<cuvyxnansvbet.h8h63e3.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> > > > On 8 Jan 2003 16:45:36 -0800, Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > >> If all else fails, my engineering firm will be glad to submit the
> > > > >> form for you. Our rate for clerical work is $60 an hour for
> simple
> > > > >> non-contested filings.
> > > > >
> > > > >What happens if someone contests it?
> > > >
> > > > Then the rate goes up to $200/hour because I put my lawyer hat
> > > > on and get involved.
> > > >
> > > > It's all spelled out in the client agreement signed up front.
> > >
> > > Somebody would have to read it to him.
> >
> > I elect the engineer with the dunce cap on.
>
> that is not always the best choice. where i work we have 2 licenses for uhf
> base and ht's we use. we got got these very official looking notices from a
> company called 'universal licensing service' (obviously selected so their
> initials mimic the fcc's system name). they want $80 to renew each of our
> licenses... well i checked the fcc site and we can do that ourselves for $50
> each. so our manager asked me to take care of it directly, of course after
> i figure out the forms, spend time on the phone with the fcc getting walked
> through the process the first time, get the application rejected because our
> accounting people didn't send a check in fast enough, reapply with credit
> card payment, send in for refund for check that was cashed even though the
> application had already been rejected for no payment, do expense account to
> pay off credit card, etc, etc, etc, it probably cost them $1000 per license!
> and of course in 10 years when its due again there will probably be a new
> and improved system to learn, but i sure won't be doing it!

David, Kelley would have rolled out his "military background" and
wouldn't have had those problems.

428. Re: No more usernet for AOL'rs ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-11 22:11:00 UTC
From: CW <clinton.magers@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <UD0U9.18468$Dn.2658@sccrnsc03>
Source record: 59496
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

You forgot Web TV.

"Lloyd" <Lloyd@no.spammmmm> wrote in message
news:23710560.FF187649@taranews.net...
> On Sat, 11 Jan 2003 20:13:23 GMT, Joe <joe.amp@NOSPAMverizon.net> wrote:
> > There is a rumor that AOL "America Off Line" sent clandestine letters
about
> > restricting its posters
> > to their own domain, No more AOL posts to usenet?
>
> Where did you hear the rumor? That would be a development that Usenet
> users have dreamed about for years, and that's why I think it is
> proably too good to be true.
>
> If AOL users disapeared from Usenet, 90% of the idiots would be gone.

429. Re: Surprised this hasn't shown up here already

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-11 22:55:19 UTC
From: Chuck/KE4ETH <chuck_hawks@hotmailNOSPAMORAMA.com>
Message-ID: <H91U9.6757$Jm2.2630@news.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 59497

Think of the fun a high school student doing a research project on those
birds would do to obscene site blocking software

--
73,
Chuck
KE4ETH
USA-NA
Remove the obvious from Email.

"Lloyd" <Lloyd@no.spammmmm> wrote in message
news:tits.for.heil@taranews.net...
> On Sat, 11 Jan 2003 11:57:51 -0500, Herbert Khaury <Herbert@tiptoe.tp>
wrote:
> > http://www.nice-tits.org/
>
> You should have posted it to rrap where a lot of poeple are all spun
> up over tits. Who owns the site, Dave Heil or W5TIT?

430. Re: No more usernet for AOL'rs ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-12 00:26:55 UTC
From: Joe <joe.amp@NOSPAMverizon.net>
Message-ID: <jD2U9.3228$DQ5.1442@nwrddc04.gnilink.net>
Source record: 59498
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Update:

AOL users can read newsgroups, but any posts they make will be
seen ONLY by other AOL members.
All done in the typical criminal fashion, AOL has done nothing to inform
users.

-Joe

"Lloyd" <Lloyd@no.spammmmm> wrote in message
news:23710560.FF187649@taranews.net...
> On Sat, 11 Jan 2003 20:13:23 GMT, Joe <joe.amp@NOSPAMverizon.net> wrote:
> > There is a rumor that AOL "America Off Line" sent clandestine letters
about
> > restricting its posters
> > to their own domain, No more AOL posts to usenet?
>
> Where did you hear the rumor? That would be a development that Usenet
> users have dreamed about for years, and that's why I think it is
> proably too good to be true.
>
> If AOL users disapeared from Usenet, 90% of the idiots would be gone.

431. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-12 03:46:52 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030111224652.01703.00000135@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 59516

In article <20030111174653.18052.00001327@mb-mv.aol.com>, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) writes:

>>What is a "Cbplusser"? Never seen one of 'em. Not sure we have 'em around
>>here.
>
>Just check 2 Meter FM you will find a bunch of them

I've been on 2 meter FM since 1977 and haven't found any "Cbplussers". Met lots of nice hams, though.
>
>>Anyone who wants to operate an amateur radio station on the HF/MF amateur
>>bands needs to have the appropriate license. For most people, that means an
>>amateur radio license.
>
>Thats the point, the CBplusser has been operating on HF Phone, the FCC
>caught him and told him that if he didnt seize they would cancel his License, as
>well as fine him.

"told him if he didnt seize"?? I have no idea what that is supposed to mean.

Ah, so you are talking about one individual. Who is this person? Was there an FCC enforcement letter or other action?

If there's any info on line , how about posting a link so we can all read it for ourselves?

>his comment was he doesnt to take anymore Test, because there
>being un fair to him

So? People the FCC has caught have said all sorts of things.

> >IIRC, you avoided taking some tests by waiting until after April 2000 to
>>upgrade.
>
> Your right, I didnt need an Extra, still dont, the only reason I took it was
>the FCC was giving them away, and besides I got two Dumb Down CBplussers to
>pay
>me $250 to take it.

Uh huh.
>
>>Huh? How many "present new Hams" do you know?
>
>To many

Doesn't answer the question. Perhaps you are overgeneralizing based on a very small sample.
>
>>Hmmm, there's a saying about pots and kettles that may fit here.....

Indeed.

73 de Jim, N2EY

432. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-12 05:44:58 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030112004458.18073.00001163@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 59524

>I've been on 2 meter FM since 1977 and haven't found any "Cbplussers". Met
>lots
>of nice hams, though.
>>

You must have a problem with your 2 Meter CB

>Ah, so you are talking about one individual. Who is this person? Was there an
>FCC enforcement letter or other action?
>
>If there's any info on line , how about posting a link so we can all read it
>for ourselves?

Yes, its been sent out by ARRL

>me $250 to take it.
>
>Uh huh.

You dont have to believe it, but its fact.

>To many
>
>Doesn't answer the question.

Oh yes it does

433. test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-12 19:52:00 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E21C767.8080402@adelphia.net>
Source record: 59499

Sorry, I changed my newsreader again!

- Mike KB3EIA -

434. Re: I Love Killing Baseless Anti-Amateur Rants

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-12 20:44:35 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030112154435.01703.00000147@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 59500

In article <20030112132434.02018.00000332@mb-mn.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>From: K4YZ
>>Subject: I Love Killing Baseless Anti-Amateur Rants
>
>We know thats what you love to do.
>
And he does it so well!

73 de Jim, N2EY

435. Re: No more usernet for AOL'rs ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-12 23:08:01 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.h8m7ds4.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 59501
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

On Sun, 12 Jan 2003 00:26:55 GMT, Joe wrote:

>All done in the typical criminal fashion, AOL has done nothing to inform
>users.

What crime has been committed, and why does anyone think that AOL
would want to inform anyone of such a move before they just do it?

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

436. Re: Total Outrage!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-12 23:53:02 UTC
From: ronn1olf <ronn1olf@cox.net>
Message-ID: <ydnU9.53783$t06.2407945@news2.east.cox.net>
Source record: 59502
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

K1MAN is a god send to ham radio NOT NOT NOT. He takes the most widely used band and makes it a joke with his Bulletins and backs it up with "the bands are being taken if we don't use them". Well MAN 20 isn't being asked for so go to the bands that are and get your garbage off the 20 meter band.

--
Ronald L Bouthillier Jr. (W1VET)
41 Broad St
Warwick, Rhode Island 02888

http://members.cox.net/w1vet/

w1vet@arrl.net
w1vet@cox.net

"N0VFP 2.0" <brother_lloyd_99@yahoo.com.spma> wrote in message news:3e19e6a9$1_7@server....
> I am totally outraged at our FCC today. Mr. Hollingsworth has lost all of
> my respect. To make a mistake is one thing, but to cancal a warning letter
> to well-known radio criminal, is unforgivable. ND8V is one of the worst ham
> radio offenders on 20 meters. Years ago, he would QRM the Purto Ricans on
> 14.300 and got a "time-out" from Riley.
>
> I am going to send membership to IARN and AARA - very soon. There is one
> person who can save Ham Radio from sudden destruction - Glenn Baxter
>
> I also support the efforts of Sam Voron, VK2BVS.
>
> At least Glenn wont charge me to look at his website, like Hal Turner will
> soon.......
>
> Take a look and you will know what I mean
> http://www.halturnershow.com
>
>
>

437. A Website for all 75M & 20M wankers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-13 00:25:18 UTC
From: 6-fingers man <pgastinkear@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <3e22077f@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 59503
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

...over-the-hill? need viagra? - have one foot in the grave? a retired blue
or white collar worker - engineer - ex-soldier - ex-policeman - mariner
- pilot - farmer - old wino ? - You now have a home! ...and all traveling
salesmen - ex-communicated catholic priests, dirty old men, dead-beat
dads, ex-cons, fats, thins, positives & negatives, life's leftovers,
shut-ins,
shut-outs, legless, lonely and anyone who has made it past 50 and plays
solitaire, right-handed, left-handed (or some other more creative method)
or wished they still could.......

***** Wankers Over 50 is YOUR Home on the Web!! *****

Click here ---> http://www.wankers.com/index.html

(someone please tell the 14.313 News page and/or K1MAN to
add a link to this site on their home page -)

438. Re: I Love Killing Baseless Anti-Amateur Rants

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-13 00:34:46 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030112193446.01838.00000337@mb-mn.aol.com>
Source record: 59504

>Subject: Re: I Love Killing Baseless Anti-Amateur Rants
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 1/12/03 12:24 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030112132426.02008.00000100@mb-cd.aol.com>

>Some EX-servicemen have difficulty adjusting to civilian life long
> after they have left service life. Military service, that is...

Yes...You have, haven't you, Lennie...?!?! Ex-rear area radio war hero
who wasn't anywhere near anything even CLOSE to "combat", yet who frequently
engenders his Army "career" as "heroic" because he was once a member of a unit
that suffered combat casulties three years before he joined it?

>"Contributions to public service" do not require the contributors
> to be granted amateur radio licenses.

No, it doesn't, but obviously YOU have a problem with those who DO have an
Amateur Radio license who DO contribute to public service.

It ruins YOUR "Amateur Radio is only a hobby" rants.

>> To wit:
>>
>>QUOTE FROM ARRL WEBPAGE:
>
> ARRL is a membership organization...(SNIP)

REGARDLESS of what ARRL is, it accurately reported a story on it's webpage
of a public acknowledgement of Amateur Radio's contributions by a
non-affiliated public official to the horrific acts of Septeember 11th, 2001.

Your disgusting, cowardly attempts to denigrate that fact are shamful, you
spiteful putz.

>ARRL is a MEMBERSHIP ORGANIZATION. It is not a
> journalistic endeavor yet it wants to be taken as one.

Just like you wanted to be taken as a "radio professional", yet you aren't
one, Lennie?

>ARRL is a MEMBERSHIP ORGANIZATION. Like all such
> membership organizations it must continue to glorify itself and
> amateur activity to retain the Belief System of membership.

It was a member of the New Jersey legislature that made the accolades,
Your Creepiness, not the ARRL. The ARRL only reported a story on it's web
page. The story is verifiable via third parties. Does the fact that the ARRL
reported the story on thier web page make it any less true?

YOUR "belief system" is that if you lie, cheat and snarl often enough someone will take you seriously.

The FACTS are that you are ONLY a lying, cheating, snarling PUTZ, who WAS gracious enough to immediately prove my point in the original post by making this immediate and predictible response.

Thanks.

>None of the above is any "rant against amateur radio."

Keep telling yourself that, Lennie. I am sure YOU think it's true. The FACTS are that it is a mean, insensitive and untruthful RANT.

>It is
> rather a realistic description of a regulatory term and a
> certain membership organization.

No, it was YOUR attempt to undo the obvious damage it did to one of your pet rants. It was yet one more piece of evidence that, despite your best spin, you have very little comprehension of what Amateur Radio is, what it means to those who really care about it and what it really means to those who have benifitted by it.

In other words, Leonard H. Anderson is an ignorant loser.

>Those who deny reality and prefer a fantasy, an idealistic
> mythos, will, of course, classify hard reality as a "lie."

It IS a lie, Lennie...No (denial of) reality, (prefrence of) a fantasy, nor "idealistic mythos".

The FACTS prove otherwise.

>Those are only fooling themselves with their delusion.
> They are very angry that rational beings do not enjoy their
> pet delusions.

As evidenced by this attempt to dig yourself out from yet one more bit of evidence that YOUR "belief system" is unfounded?

That the tons of putrid stench that eminate from your keyboard are only that?

The foul eminations of a very sick and demented old man who didn't get to play the game by HIS rules?

That sure is what it looks like to everyone BUT you.

What a CREEP.

439. Re: I Love Killing Baseless Anti-Amateur Rants

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-13 00:37:05 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030112193705.01838.00000338@mb-mn.aol.com>
Source record: 59505

>Subject: Re: I Love Killing Baseless Anti-Amateur Rants
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 1/12/03 12:24 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030112132434.02018.00000332@mb-mn.aol.com>
>
>From: K4YZ
>>Subject: I Love Killing Baseless Anti-Amateur Rants
>
>We know thats what you love to do.

Your point, Vipul, other than being irritated that I dragged you, kicking
and screaming into the daylight?

Steve, K4YZ

440. Re: No more usernet for AOL'rs ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-13 08:32:45 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0301130032.2185b4e2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59506
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Joe" <joe.amp@NOSPAMverizon.net> wrote in message
news:<jD2U9.3228$DQ5.1442@nwrddc04.gnilink.net>...
> Update:
>
> AOL users can read newsgroups, but any posts they make will be
> seen ONLY by other AOL members.
> All done in the typical criminal fashion, AOL has done nothing to inform
> users.
>
> -Joe

Note that AOL megaboss Chase bailed outta his CEO slot at AOL this
weekend before his BoD could shitcan him. Seems like the Micro$loth
business model is working better than Case's AOL model, etc. You think
AOL is bad news?? QRX for Our Bill to wind up with the whole
enchilada. That oughta send some shivers up & down some spines.

w3rv

>
> "Lloyd" <Lloyd@no.spammmmm> wrote in message
> news:23710560.FF187649@taranews.net...
> > On Sat, 11 Jan 2003 20:13:23 GMT, Joe <joe.amp@NOSPAMverizon.net> wrote:
> > > There is a rumor that AOL "America Off Line" sent clandestine letters
> about
> > > restricting its posters
> > > to their own domain, No more AOL posts to usenet?
> >
> > Where did you hear the rumor? That would be a development that Usenet
> > users have dreamed about for years, and that's why I think it is
> > proably too good to be true.
> >
> > If AOL users disapeared from Usenet, 90% of the idiots would be gone.

441. Re: County Issuing Radio Licenses

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-13 12:53:09 UTC
From: "T.M. Sommers" <tms2@mail.ptd.net>
Message-ID: <3E22B47C.39B50314@mail.ptd.net>
Source record: 59507
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Brian Running wrote:
>
> > Which is exactly why the FCC has the full jurisdiction in radio matters.
> >
> > > but the
> > > burden is on the FCC to prove their jurisdiction, not the other way
> > around.
> >
> > Not so, again, because the feds got full jurisdiction years ago.
>
> But that's the point, Bill -- jurisdiction is granted by 47 USC 152, that's
> the jurisdiction statute. And the statute says very specifically that there
> is no jurisdiction over intrastate radio communications. Here is the
> pertinent section:
>
> (b)
>
> Except as provided in sections 223 through 227 of this title, inclusive, and
> section 332 of this title, and subject to the provisions of section 301 of
> this title and subchapter V-A of this chapter, nothing in this chapter shall
> be construed to apply or to give the Commission jurisdiction with respect to
>
> (1)
>
> charges, classifications, practices, services, facilities, or regulations
> for or in connection with intrastate communication service by wire or radio
> of any carrier,
>

The key word is 'carrier'. From 47 USC 153(10):

The term ''common carrier'' or ''carrier'' means any person engaged as a
common carrier for hire, in interstate or foreign communication by wire
or radio or interstate or foreign radio transmission of energy, except
where
reference is made to common carriers not subject to this chapter; but a
person engaged in radio broadcasting shall not, insofar as such person
is so engaged, be deemed a common carrier.

442. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-13 13:36:45 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030113083645.15952.00000704@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 59508

In article <20030112004458.18073.00001163@mb-mv.aol.com>, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) writes:

>>I've been on 2 meter FM since 1977 and haven't found any "Cbplussers". Met
>>lots of nice hams, though.
>
> You must have a problem with your 2 Meter CB

Never seen one of those. You mean a MURS radio?

My 2 meter ham rig is a Heathkit HW-2036. Built it from a kit back in 1977. Still works great after all these years. Big, heavy and not many features compared to the more recent stuff.

And you still haven't explained what a "Cbplusser" is.
>
> >Ah, so you are talking about one individual. Who is this person? Was there
> >an FCC enforcement letter or other action?
>>
>>If there's any info on line , how about posting a link so we can all read it
>>for ourselves?
>
>Yes, its been sent out by ARRL

Guess you don't know how to post a link to it, then.
>
> >me $250 to take it.
>>
>>Uh huh.
>
>You dont have to believe it, but its fact.

Apostrophes are a fact, too.
>
>>To many
>>
>>Doesn't answer the question.
>
>Oh yes it does
>
No, it doesn't. For some things, one is too many.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>

443. Re: ARRL PROVIDING FCC LICENSE RENEWAL TO NONMEMBERS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-13 13:55:52 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <avugkpvic1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 59509

"Jon Bloom, KE3Z" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:f8026928.0301081907.177a18d8@posting.google.com...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0301060550.54c6c66f@posting.google.com>...
> > "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.h89s1q8.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> > > On 5 Jan 2003 20:18:54 -0800, Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > >Where is the body of rules by which a VEC can establish and charge
for
> > > >non-examining services?
> > >
> > > Don't want to pay? Do it yourself, as hams had done from time
> > > immemorial. Don't have 'net access? Call the FCC and get a paper
> > > application sent to you.
> > >
> > > And it's being done by an ARRL staffer in his or her paid employee
> > > capacity, not as a VE/VEC.
> >
> > Yes and no. They've got Bart doing it. They also advertise it as
> > something which falls under their VEC. I'm just curious where this
> > body of rules are that authorizes VEC's to circumvent the FCC
> > application and renewal process where it is not associated with an
> > exam, and for the VEC to collect $12 along the way.
>
>
http://216.239.57.100/search?q=cache:WhSKjFWzMMIC:www.fcc.gov/Bureaus/Wirele
ss/Orders/da961144.wp

Seems to me it would just be a simple case of running
a business. If I wanted to do the same thing, nuttin' would
prohibit me from doing so. Free enterprise...what a concept.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

444. Re: Total Outrage!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-13 14:20:22 UTC
From: Dafirebottle@aol.com
Message-ID: <edaa3c2a.0301130620.507614ad@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59510
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"skuld-chan" <skuld@mail.ru> wrote in message
news:<vy8T9.497830$GR5.214528@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net>...
> Why do you care what happens on 20 meters? Your a tech.
>
> "N0VFP 2.0" <brother_lloyd_99@yahoo.com.spma> wrote in message
> > to well-known radio criminal, is unforgivable. ND8V is one of the worst
> ham
> > radio offenders on 20 meters. Years ago, he would QRM the Purto Ricans
> on
> > 14.300 and got a "time-out" from Riley.
> >

lloyd is the eternal no code tech wannabe. Always riding someone's coat tails.

He is a delusional dork!

Firebottle

445. Re: County Issuing Radio Licenses

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-13 15:09:22 UTC
From: Doug Smith <me@invalid.invalid>
Message-ID: <3E22D6A2.2440BCDF@invalid.invalid>
Source record: 59511
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.shortwave

> > Which is exactly why the FCC has the full jurisdiction in radio matters.
> >
> > > but the
> > > burden is on the FCC to prove their jurisdiction, not the other way
> > around.
> >
> > Not so, again, because the feds got full jurisdiction years ago.
>
> But that's the point, Bill -- jurisdiction is granted by 47 USC 152, that's
> the jurisdiction statute. And the statute says very specifically that there
> is no jurisdiction over intrastate radio communications. Here is the
> pertinent section:
>
> (b)
>
> Except as provided in sections 223 through 227 of this title, inclusive, and
> section 332 of this title, and subject to the provisions of section 301 of
> this title and subchapter V-A of this chapter, nothing in this chapter shall
> be construed to apply or to give the Commission jurisdiction with respect to
>
> (1)
>
> charges, classifications, practices, services, facilities, or regulations
> for or in connection with intrastate communication service by wire or radio
> of any carrier,

Much of the FCC's jurisdiction comes from the fact that a low-powered
station, incapable of communicating outside the state, is still capable
of interfering with signals arriving from outside the state.

Imagine, for example, a 1-watt FM broadcast station located here in
Pleasant View, 25 miles from the Kentucky state line. Nobody's going to
be able to pick up this station anywhere in Kentucky - its broadcast
coverage is strictly intrastate, within Tennessee.

However, if it's operated on 98.7MHz it's definitely going to interfere
with reception of WHOP-98.7 on the same frequency. WHOP is licensed to,
and operates from, Hopkinsville, Kentucky. My 1-watt station may not
have coverage outside Tennessee, but it interferes with an out-of-state
station - interferes with the ability of WHOP-FM to conduct interstate
commerce.

Even stations operating on frequencies/locations that wouldn't
ordinarily interfere outside the state can cause interference during

unusual propagation conditions. A 5,000-watt FM broadcast station, located in central Texas and operating on 121.5MHz, certainly wouldn't interfere with communications on that frequency anywhere outside Texas under normal conditions. Given a tropospheric opening, however, it would make the emergency locator service useless in areas of Oklahoma, Arkansas, Louisiana, and/or other states.

Arguably, with widespread use of satellites, *any* frequency is capable of causing interference to communications outside the state.

It would be interesting to see the exceptions mentioned. I'd not be surprised if they serve to ensure the FCC is authorized to establish *technical* regulations for intrastate communications (again, on the basis that they can interfere with interstate communications); that the restrictions on the Commission's regulatory powers here go only to regulations on the charges and non-technical terms of intrastate communications services. i.e., the FCC can't regulate your local phone bill.
--
Doug Smith W9WI
Pleasant View (Nashville), TN EM66
http://www.w9wi.com

446. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-13 15:31:07 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030113103107.02093.00000343@mb-mu.aol.com>
Source record: 59512

>My 2 meter ham rig is a Heathkit HW-2036. Built it from a kit back in 1977.

ThaT explains it

>And you still haven't explained what a "Cbplusser" is.

A CBplusser is a No-Code Tech, they are only 1 Step Above a cber, and its
really a pretty tiny step, actually you really cant tell much difference

>Guess you don't know how to post a link to it, then.

I know how tp post it, but not going to do the work for you, if you really
wont to know look it up.

>Apostrophes are a fact, too.
>>

I dont like Apostrophes

>No, it doesn't. For some things, one is too many.

Your right, one is more than enough

447. Re: County Issuing Radio Licenses

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-13 17:55:23 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030113125523.29719.00000695@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 59513

>Subject: Re: County Issuing Radio Licenses
>From: Doug Smith me@invalid.invalid
>Date: 1/13/03 9:09 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3E22D6A2.2440BCDF@invalid.invalid>

>A 5,000-watt FM broadcast station,
>located in central Texas and operating on 121.5MHz, certainly wouldn't
>interfere with communications on that frequency anywhere outside Texas
>under normal conditions.

Of course about 30 minutes...maaaaaybe an hour after it showed up, so
would the federal marshals...At least for THAT frequency! =)

73

Steve, K4YZ

PS...Doug, youse guys any warmer than Franklin County? 29 at 11:54A

448. Re: Total Outrage!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-13 18:52:22 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <avv1sotad1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 59521
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Perhaps he can apply for a vanity call with those phonetics?

Dan/W4NTI

>
> He is a delusional dork!
>
> Firebottle

449. Re: ARRL PROVIDING FCC LICENSE RENEWAL TO NONMEMBERS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-13 19:01:06 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301131101.2bf89aaa@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59522

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<avugkpvic1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>...
> "Jon Bloom, KE3Z" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
> news:f8026928.0301081907.177a18d8@posting.google.com...
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
> news:<f45722ac.0301060550.54c6c66f@posting.google.com>...
> > > "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> news:<cuvyxnansvbet.h89s1q8.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> > > > On 5 Jan 2003 20:18:54 -0800, Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > >Where is the body of rules by which a VEC can establish and charge
> for
> > > > >non-examining services?
> > > >
> > > > Don't want to pay? Do it yourself, as hams had done from time
> > > > immemorial. Don't have 'net access? Call the FCC and get a paper
> > > > application sent to you.
> > > >
> > > > And it's being done by an ARRL staffer in his or her paid employee
> > > > capacity, not as a VE/VEC.
> > >
> > > Yes and no. They've got Bart doing it. They also advertise it as
> > > something which falls under their VEC. I'm just curious where this
> > > body of rules are that authorizes VEC's to circumvent the FCC
> > > application and renewal process where it is not associated with an
> > > exam, and for the VEC to collect $12 along the way.
> >
> >
> http://216.239.57.100/search?q=cache:WhSKjFWzMMIC:www.fcc.gov/Bureaus/Wirele
> ss/Orders/da961144.wp
>
> Seems to me it would just be a simple case of running
> a business. If I wanted to do the same thing, nuttin' would
> prohibit me from doing so. Free enterprise...what a concept.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

Len tells us the ARRL is a member organization. I guess he was wrong.
It is whatever it wants to be on any given day.

450. Re: County Issuing Radio Licenses

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-13 19:31:35 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.h8nud88.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 59532

(Crossposting removed)

On Mon, 13 Jan 2003 09:09:22 -0600, Doug Smith wrote:

>> But that's the point, Bill -- jurisdiction is granted by 47 USC 152, that's
>> the jurisdiction statute. And the statute says very specifically that there
>> is no jurisdiction over intrastate radio communications. Here is the
>> pertinent section:

>Much of the FCC's jurisdiction comes from the fact that a low-powered
>station, incapable of communicating outside the state, is still capable
>of interfering with signals arriving from outside the state.

That's the way it was until the early 1980s when The Congress
amemded Section 301 of the Comm Act specifically to give FCC
(exclusive) jurisdiction over intrastate radio transmissions as
well.

We kicked this around (cross-posted) with mostly wannabe non-lawyers
(and one non-communications lawyer to whom I hope I taught a few
things) several weeks ago.

Case Closed.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
ARRL Volunteer Counsel

451. Re: Just One More Example

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-13 21:09:22 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.h8nzo89.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 59533

On 08 Jan 2003 20:47:14 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:

> No. The entire US administration is bound by agreement to the
> terms of the United Nations charter. The International
> Telecommunications Union is a UN organization.
>
> There is NO "international treaty" in regards to amateur radio.
> There is only the agreement of the United States of America
> to meet the terms of the United Nations charter. That includes
> all UN organizations in which the USA is a member.

The International Telecommunications Convention is a separate treaty that the US is a signatory to, and requires specific ratification by the Senate to be effective. The International Radio Regulations is a separate treaty that the US is a signatory to, and requires specific ratifivation by the Senate to be effective.

I'm still POed at (now ex-) Senator John Glenn who held up Senate ratification of the 1979 WARC Radio Regs (published as the 1980 Edition) for several months. As an "astronaut" the rest of the Senate looked up to him on things scientific or technical, while the real reason for his antics was because of some ego pizzing contest he was having with the head of NASA over budget and expenditures - nothing to do with the content of the treaty.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

452. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-13 21:26:51 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3E232F1B.39096E16@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 59534

WA8ULX wrote:

> FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade, to operate HF. Cbplusser tells FCC, that
> thats unfair, and he shouldnt have to take anymore tests. Sounds normal for the
> present new Hams. Here comes the next cry from the Knuckle Dragging Mentally
> Challenged. We need more Dumbing Down for the Mentally Challenged. Isnt Dumbing
> Down great.

What, one idiot out of 200 thousand "CBplussers"? That's hardly like the
whole world of ham radio going down the toilet.

453. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-13 21:43:32 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030113164332.02780.00001330@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 59535

>What, one idiot out of 200 thousand "CBplussers"? That's hardly like the
>whole world of ham radio going down the toilet.

Im sure theres more

454. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-13 23:42:30 UTC
From: "Mike H. KC8UBH" <mhaas@nospam.insight.rr.com>
Message-ID: <G9IU9.58076$GF.17879716@twister.columbus.rr.com>
Source record: 59537

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030113103107.02093.00000343@mb-mu.aol.com...
> >My 2 meter ham rig is a Heathkit HW-2036. Built it from a kit back in
1977.
>
> ThaT explains it
>
> >And you still haven't explained what a "Cbplusser" is.
>
> A CBplusser is a No-Code Tech, they are only 1 Step Above a cber, and its
> really a pretty tiny step, actually you really cant tell much difference

Most of the No-Code Techs I know do more for the hobby on their feet and with their hands, heads, and hearts in Emergency and other Community Service Organizations than Extra's like you who sit on your asses in the shack, probably pissing other HAMS off by sarcastically announcing that the frequency you're camping out on (but not using) "is in use" and doing absolutely NOTHING to further the hobby.

Next time you go to Hamvention in Dayton, thank all those No-Code Techs who did *MOST* of the legwork setting up the entire event, you thankless slob. Next time you go to your next field day with a whole bunch of Extra class HAMS standing around looking important and being jerks, thank the No-Code Techs who did the *real* work setting THAT event up.

Mike H.

KC8UBH/AG - General Class privileges since 1/11/03.

455. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-14 00:11:19 UTC
From: "Jackie L." <buzzygirl@REMOVE.attbi.com>
Message-ID: <DAIU9.669920$WL3.701928@rwcrnsc54>
Source record: 59538

Unfortunately, even though I killfiled Mr. Illiterati a long time ago, his "contributions" to this forum still show up on my newsreader as a result of other people responding to his trollbait.

My advice is to killfile him. He gets his jollies yanking people's chains, and previously he admitted as much. Don't waste any more of your time with this dork.

Jackie
KC0ODY / AG

"Mike H. KC8UBH" <mhaas@nospam.insight.rr.com> wrote in message news:G9IU9.58076$GF.17879716@twister.columbus.rr.com...
>
> "WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message

456. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-14 00:55:30 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030113195530.18052.00001410@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 59539

>Next time you go to Hamvention in Dayton, thank all those No-Code Techs who
>did *MOST* of the legwork setting up the entire event, you thankless slob.

Of the course they do the Grunt work, there not good for much of anything else.

>Next time you go to your next field day with a whole bunch of Extra class
>HAMS standing around looking important and being jerks, thank the No-Code
>Techs who did the *real* work setting THAT event up.

They cant be trusted to do anything

457. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-14 01:25:24 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E236704.9080206@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 59544

WA8ULX wrote:
We need more Dumbing Down for the Mentally Challenged. Isnt Dumbing
> Down great.

It is for you, that's the only way you could make extra.

458. Re: An interesting article

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-14 01:27:10 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E236775.4020309@adelphia.net>
Source record: 59540

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:

>>Subject: An interesting article
>>From: "KC8PMX" kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net
>>Date: 1/9/03 12:23 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <avjgvd02lgs@enews2.newsguy.com>
>>
>
>>They will stay out of the ham club and complain until the cows come home
>>about how poorly it is run. But they never want to join and work to
>>straighten out the club's problems.
>>
>
> Sounds like Lennie.
>
>
>>They will tell their wives they can't afford a new chair for the living
>>room while they are writing out the order for a new $700 mobile
>>installation
>>
>
> And the problem with THIS is...?!?!
>
>
>>They will buy surplus equipment to save money, and then spend an amount of
>>money on it's conversion that would have bought good commercial gear that
>>would have done the same job better.
>>
>
> But did they learn anything in the process (other than what it really cost
> in the long run?)
>
>
>>They will apply for every ham award they can qualify for to document their
>>accomplishments, when many of the certificates are for a level of
>>accomplishment roughly equivalent to being able to cross the street without
>>getting run over.
>>
>
> But have you priced wallpaper lately? The awards look much nicer!
>
> I never cared for "73" magazine much!
>

How old is Vipul anyhow? This sounds a lot like him. Maybe his papa?

- Mike KB3EIA -

459. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-14 02:05:48 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030113210548.01791.00000391@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 59541

In article <20030113103107.02093.00000343@mb-mu.aol.com>, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) writes:

>>My 2 meter ham rig is a Heathkit HW-2036. Built it from a kit back in 1977.
>
>ThaT explains it

Expalins what? Have you ever built a VHF ham rig, even from a kit? Or do you think the cost of the equipment is some sort of indication of the skill and knowledge of the operator?

>
>>And you still haven't explained what a "Cbplusser" is.
>
>A CBplusser is a No-Code Tech,

I've seen quite a few ham licenses, and none of them say "code" or "no-code". What is your problem with Technician class licenses? They're real hams, same as any other license class.

>they are only 1 Step Above a cber, and its
>really a pretty tiny step, actually you really cant tell much difference

Maybe YOU can't, but I sure can. No such thing as a cb licnese, for one thing.

>
>>Guess you don't know how to post a link to it, then.
>
> I know how tp post it,

I doubt that very much.

> but not going to do the work for you,

Indeed.

>if you really
>wont to know look it up.

Where?

>
> >Apostrophes are a fact, too.
>>>
>
> I dont like Apostrophes
>
Nor periods, commas, hyphens, spelling, grammar, capitalization.......

Or spellcheckers.

>>No, it doesn't. For some things, one is too many.
>
>Your right, one is more than enough
>
I don't think we're talking about the same things, though.

73 de Jim, N2EY

460. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-14 02:24:59 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030113212459.21031.00000733@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 59542

In article <DAIU9.669920$WL3.701928@rwcrnsc54>, "Jackie L."
<buzzygirl@REMOVE.attbi.com> writes:

>Unfortunately, even though I killfiled Mr. Illiterati a long time ago, his
>"contributions" to this forum still show up on my newsreader as a result of
>other people responding to his trollbait.

Sorry, Jackie. I was just trying to figure out what he was talking about. I'm
still not sure. Something about my 2 meter rig being a problem?
>
>My advice is to killfile him.

Good advice.

>He gets his jollies yanking people's chains,
>and previously he admitted as much.

He's got a lot of company in that....

>Don't waste any more of your time with this dork.

Now there's a word I haven't seen in a while.

>Jackie
>KC0ODY / AG

CONGRATULATIONS!!

73 de Jim, N2EY

461. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-14 03:13:16 UTC
From: Jackie <no@address.given.com>
Message-ID: <gfLU9.671390$WL3.705879@rwcrnsc54>
Source record: 59543

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030113212459.21031.00000733@mb-fm.aol.com...
> In article <DAIU9.669920$WL3.701928@rwcrnsc54>, "Jackie L."
> <buzzygirl@REMOVE.attbi.com> writes:
>
> >Unfortunately, even though I killfiled Mr. Illiterati a long time ago,
his
> >"contributions" to this forum still show up on my newsreader as a result
of
> >other people responding to his trollbait.
>
> Sorry, Jackie. I was just trying to figure out what he was talking about.
I'm
> still not sure. Something about my 2 meter rig being a problem?

Nah, no need to apologize to me, Jim... just didn't want Mike (or anyone else) wasting their time trying to talk to this troglodyte. He has no respect for his fellow hams and even less respect for the written (typed) form of the English language. In the shrunken coprolyte that resides in his braincase, he somehow occasionally manages to find two synapses with enough spark between them to form incoherent rants against Technician-class hams, and/or against those who use 2 meters to talk to their local friends and fellow hams. A saving grace for him is the fact that on HF (or any other band, for that matter), no one knows you're a functional illiterate. But type, and remove all doubt.

J.

462. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-14 04:25:33 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0301132025.4f924b5d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59545

"Mike H. KC8UBH" <mhaas@nospam.insight.rr.com> wrote in message
news:<G9IU9.58076$GF.17879716@twister.columbus.rr.com>...

> Next time you go to your next field day with a whole bunch of Extra class
> HAMS standing around looking important and being jerks, thank the No-Code
> Techs who did the *real* work setting THAT event up.

Yeah, right, tell that to the horde of nocode rubberneckers who stood
around watching the last time I bothered opearating FD with them. When
3 or so of us beeped our way to two thirds of "their" score.

We haven't been back since, we don't need them to "set up the event"
or cook our hot dogs for us.

> Mike H.
>
> KC8UBH/AG - General Class privileges since 1/11/03.

w3rv

463. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-14 04:32:05 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030113233205.02254.00000316@mb-mu.aol.com>
Source record: 59546

>Have you ever built a VHF ham rig,

Yes

>They're real hams, same as
>any other license class.

Wrong there just make belive hams, basically just a Welfare Class of Ham

>No such thing as a cb licnese, for one thing.

Never said there was

>>if you really
>>wont to know look it up.
>
>Where?

On the Internet

>Nor periods, commas, hyphens, spelling, grammar, capitalization.......
>
>Or spellcheckers.

Correct

464. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-14 04:35:26 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030113233526.02254.00000317@mb-mu.aol.com>
Source record: 59547

>It is for you, that's the only way you could make extra.
>

Spoken like a true CBer that you are. Lets see, QRZ says your still a
CBplusser. I know you just cant handle that really tough Dumb Down General.

465. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-14 04:37:38 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030113233738.02254.00000318@mb-mu.aol.com>
Source record: 59548

>A saving grace for him is the fact that on HF (or any other
>band, for that matter), no one knows you're a functional illiterate. But
>type, and remove all doubt.

Just like when you key the Mic on your 2 Meter CB

466. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-14 04:41:25 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030113234125.02254.00000319@mb-mu.aol.com>
Source record: 59549

>We haven't been back since, we don't need them to "set up the event"
>or cook our hot dogs for us.
>

We stop letting them Cook for us, they couldnt even do that right. Now all we let them do is clean the Porta Potties, I can say they are good at that.

467. Re: County Issuing Radio Licenses

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-14 05:01:33 UTC
From: Ken K <KenK@yuvomail.com>
Message-ID: <b005ip$fk7$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 59550
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.shortwave

(groups restored)

No, no, no Phil, come come now. There were many prominent
individuals with credentials far more impressive than yours, especially
from the groups you conveniently deleted, who offered outstanding
debate on the subject, most of which you pretended didn't exist.
BTW, Davidson county continues to issue radio licenses.

Case very Open!

73 de Ken K

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.h8nud88.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> (Crossposting removed)
>
> On Mon, 13 Jan 2003 09:09:22 -0600, Doug Smith wrote:
>
> >> But that's the point, Bill -- jurisdiction is granted by 47 USC 152,
that's
> >> the jurisdiction statute. And the statute says very specifically that
there
> >> is no jurisdiction over intrastate radio communications. Here is the
> >> pertinent section:
>
> >Much of the FCC's jurisdiction comes from the fact that a low-powered
> >station, incapable of communicating outside the state, is still capable
> >of interfering with signals arriving from outside the state.
>
> That's the way it was until the early 1980s when The Congress
> amemded Section 301 of the Comm Act specifically to give FCC
> (exclusive) jurisdiction over intrastate radio transmissions as
> well.
>
> We kicked this around (cross-posted) with mostly wannabe non-lawyers
> (and one non-communications lawyer to whom I hope I taught a few
> things) several weeks ago.
>
> Case Closed.
>
> ---
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
> ARRL Volunteer Counsel
>

>

468. Re: An interesting article

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-14 05:11:49 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b09lnp224c0@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 59701

Understood, as I was posting that more for the reflection of the times as opposed to which magazine it was published in. All three main ham mags have their benefits and detriments. Now, if all three could somehow merge.....WOW what a mag!

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

"Symbolism is for the simple minded....."

>
> I never cared for "73" magazine much!
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ
>
>
>
>

469. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-14 11:32:14 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301140332.21729e56@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59551

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message news:<20030113210548.01791.00000391@mb-cb.aol.com>...
> In article <20030113103107.02093.00000343@mb-mu.aol.com>, wa8ulx@aol.com
> (WA8ULX) writes:

> > >Apostrophes are a fact, too.
> >
> > I dont like Apostrophes
> >
> Nor periods, commas, hyphens, spelling, grammar, capitalization.......
>
> Or spellcheckers.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Its not just that he can't spell, it's that he tells everyone else
they're stupid while presenting himself as a complete moron.

I'm glad to finally see the Holy Extras policing their own.

470. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-14 11:36:30 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030114063630.02538.00000991@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 59553

In article <d22b54c3.0301132025.4f924b5d@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>"Mike H. KC8UBH" <mhaas@nospam.insight.rr.com> wrote in message >news:<G9IU9.58076$GF.17879716@twister.columbus.rr.com>...
>
>> Next time you go to your next field day with a whole bunch of Extra class >> HAMS standing around looking important and being jerks, thank the No-Code >> Techs who did the *real* work setting THAT event up.
>
>Yeah, right, tell that to the horde of nocode rubberneckers who stood >around watching the last time I bothered opearating FD with them. When >3 or so of us beeped our way to two thirds of "their" score.

Hey! I was one of those 3 or so!

We had clueless newbie rubberneckers of all license classes. And clueless OTs, too. Lotsa fun anyhow. Like listening to the 40 SSB bandleader loudly proclaim how "his" station had peaked at something like 30 QSOs/hr for 40 minutes, then quietly pointing out how the 80 CW station had done a run 60 QSOs/hr for twice that long.....

Or the really funny looks when I pulled out the ARC-5-and-dynamotor setup to copy the W1AW message at 10 AM on Saturday. First 100 points of the event, earned in about ten minutes.

>We haven't been back since, we don't need them to "set up the event" >or cook our hot dogs for us.

Actually the guy in charge of food was a General, as I recall. But the best was the homemade hummus and pita brought by an Extra.

Six and a half months to the next one...

73 de Jim, N2EY

471. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-14 11:36:31 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030114063631.02538.00000992@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 59554

In article <G9IU9.58076$GF.17879716@twister.columbus.rr.com>, "Mike H. KC8UBH"
<mhaas@nospam.insight.rr.com> writes:

>Most of the No-Code Techs I know do more for the hobby on their feet and
>with their hands, heads, and hearts in Emergency and other Community Service
>Organizations than Extra's like you who sit on your asses in the shack,
>probably pissing other HAMS off by sarcastically announcing that the
>frequency you're camping out on (but not using) "is in use" and doing
>absolutely NOTHING to further the hobby.
>
>Next time you go to Hamvention in Dayton, thank all those No-Code Techs who
>did *MOST* of the legwork setting up the entire event, you thankless slob.
>Next time you go to your next field day with a whole bunch of Extra class
>HAMS standing around looking important and being jerks, thank the No-Code
>Techs who did the *real* work setting THAT event up.

Better yet, Mike, don't repeat the mistake of license-class bigotry evidenced
by someone who is simply trying to get you steamed. That's exactly what he
wants.

73 de Jim, N2EY

Extra class since 1970 (no big deal, really)

472. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-14 11:36:32 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030114063632.02538.00000993@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 59552

In article <gfLU9.671390$WL3.705879@rwcrnsc54>, "Jackie" <no@address.given.com>
writes:

>Nah, no need to apologize to me, Jim... just didn't want Mike (or anyone
>else) wasting their time trying to talk to this troglodyte.

Now why do you want to insult troglodytes?

>He has no
>respect for his fellow hams and even less respect for the written (typed)
>form of the English language.

Those lacks are dwarfed by the basic and pervasive lack of logic evidenced in
the posts.

>In the shrunken coprolyte that resides in his
>braincase, he somehow occasionally manages to find two synapses with
>enough
>spark between them to form incoherent rants against Technician-class hams,
>and/or against those who use 2 meters to talk to their local friends and
>fellow hams.

That includes a lot of people! With all the 2 meter FM QSOs I've had, I must be
heavily contaminated.

>A saving grace for him is the fact that on HF (or any other
>band, for that matter), no one knows you're a functional illiterate.

Not entirely true - some things come through regardless of mode. If you can't
or won't spell correctly on CW or one of the keyboard modes, it comes through
very fast.

>But type, and remove all doubt.
>
HAW!!!

73 de Jim, N2EY

473. Re: Why hams think we deserve the 5 mhz band (was: You have to be kidding!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-14 11:49:27 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301140349.55e62943@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59555

```
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030108154709.03862.00000750@mb-cg.aol.com>...
> In article <aUWS9.22814$9N5.2087403@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
> <kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG> writes:
>
> >"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> >news:f45722ac.0301080521.73234d1b@posting.google.com...
> >: "K HB" <k hb@arrl.DOTORG> wrote in message
> news:<%dNS9.19861$134.2099661@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>...
> >: > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote
> >: >
> >: > : I'm always amazed when one of you geniuses gets his appendage stuck in
> >: > : his zipper, then declares how silly everyone else looks.
> >: >
> >: > And here we have Brian who considers himself a self-made wit, thus
> relieving
> >: > the Almighty of the terrible responsibility of explaining what He did
> wrong in that
> >: > Burke experiment.
> >:
> >: Hans, you've already said you don't believe in the Almighty (a chain
> >: letter, I think), so your statement above is nonsense. Even you
> >: cannot believe it, so why do you make it?
> >
> >It's foma, pure foma.
>
> ...oh, no, here we go, folks...!
>
> >From the Book of Bokonon, Chapter 1
> >
> <snip>
>
> Hans Bokonon flies again!
>
>
> >I have no idea how it fits in. Do you?
>
> Yes, we all do, Mr. Quotation.
>
> You got your whatzit caught in your fly again and it pinched.

Reminded me of a line in "Something About Mary."
```

"We've got a bleeder!"

474. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-14 12:05:54 UTC
From: "Mike H. KC8UBH" <mhaas@nospam.insight.rr.com>
Message-ID: <C2TU9.62190$GF.18482838@twister.columbus.rr.com>
Source record: 59556

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030114063631.02538.00000992@mb-da.aol.com...
> In article <G9IU9.58076$GF.17879716@twister.columbus.rr.com>, "Mike H.
KC8UBH"
> <mhaas@nospam.insight.rr.com> writes:
>
> >Most of the No-Code Techs I know do more for the hobby on their feet and
> >with their hands, heads, and hearts in Emergency and other Community
Service
> >Organizations than Extra's like you who sit on your asses in the shack,
> >probably pissing other HAMS off by sarcastically announcing that the
> >frequency you're camping out on (but not using) "is in use" and doing
> >absolutely NOTHING to further the hobby.
> >
> >Next time you go to Hamvention in Dayton, thank all those No-Code Techs
who
> >did *MOST* of the legwork setting up the entire event, you thankless
slob.
> >Next time you go to your next field day with a whole bunch of Extra class
> >HAMS standing around looking important and being jerks, thank the No-Code
> >Techs who did the *real* work setting THAT event up.
>
> Better yet, Mike, don't repeat the mistake of license-class bigotry
evidenced
> by someone who is simply trying to get you steamed. That's exactly what he
> wants.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Extra class since 1970 (no big deal, really)

You're right...of course...but...but...but...but....ah, hell...

KC8UBH/AG
Mike H.

475. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-14 14:28:48 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030114092848.10348.00001218@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 59557

>I'm glad to finally see the Holy Extras policing their own.
>
>

When are the CBers going to start policing you CBplussers

476. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-14 14:29:48 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030114092948.10348.00001219@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 59558

>Better yet, Mike, don't repeat the mistake of license-class bigotry evidenced
>by someone who is simply trying to get you steamed. That's exactly what he
>wants.
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

BULL, just giving you the facts

477. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-14 14:32:56 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030114093256.10348.00001221@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 59559

```
>Six and a half months to the next one...
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Oh no, we got to to listen to the 10-4 Good Buddy No-Coders again.
```

478. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-14 15:11:12 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0301140711.1ce3df85@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59560

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message news:<20030114063630.02538.00000991@mb-da.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0301132025.4f924b5d@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >"Mike H. KC8UBH" <mhaas@nospam.insight.rr.com> wrote in message
> >news:<G9IU9.58076$GF.17879716@twister.columbus.rr.com>...
> >
> >> Next time you go to your next field day with a whole bunch of Extra class
> >> HAMS standing around looking important and being jerks, thank the No-Code
> >> Techs who did the *real* work setting THAT event up.
> >
> >Yeah, right, tell that to the horde of nocode rubberneckers who stood
> >around watching the last time I bothered opearating FD with them. When
> >3 or so of us beeped our way to two thirds of "their" score.
>
> Hey! I was one of those 3 or so!
>
> We had clueless newbie rubberneckers of all license classes. And clueless OTs,
> too. Lotsa fun anyhow. Like listening to the 40 SSB bandleader loudly proclaim
> how "his" station had peaked at something like 30 QSOs/hr for 40 minutes, then
> quietly pointing out how the 80 CW station had done a run 60 QSOs/hr for twice
> that long.....
>
> Or the really funny looks when I pulled out the ARC-5-and-dynamotor setup to
> copy the W1AW message at 10 AM on Saturday. First 100 points of the event,
> earned in about ten minutes.
>
> >We haven't been back since, we don't need them to "set up the event"
> >or cook our hot dogs for us.
>
> Actually the guy in charge of food was a General, as I recall.

Eric & Joey are both 20wpm Extras.

> But the best was
> the homemade hummus and pita brought by an Extra.
>
> Six and a half months to the next one...

Yeah, but you're not gonna put up with that bunch any more than I will huh?

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

479. Re: No more usernet for AOL'rs ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-14 15:39:08 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <waWU9.9388$Dq.982775@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 59561

"Joe" <joe.amp@NOSPAMverizon.net> wrote

:
: AOL users can read newsgroups, but any posts they make will be
: seen ONLY by other AOL members.
:

Finally an effective K4YZ/Len Anderson filter.

Sunuvagun! Life is good!

Hey, N0iMD, I hear AOL is giving away 1,000 free hours to new subscribers.
Check it out. Please!

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

480. Re: Another Morse Code Opinion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-14 17:06:50 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0301140906.594868e4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59562

vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030111090452.22983.00000543@mb-mf.aol.com>...
> From N2EY:
> >More to the point - what's his "passion", and how come he can't sell out now?
>
> My passion is radio (or more accurately, rf).

The two are different things, actually.

And the fact is that amateur radio offers you many, many opportunities
to explore that "passion". All sorts of spectrum, lots of modes, very
few rules on experimentation compared to other radio services.

If you take the opportunities, that is.

> I can't sell out now because
> lightening rarely strikes twice in the same place.

You can do whatever you choose to do. What you seem to be choosing to
do with your "passion" is mostly putting down other hams.

btw, lightning (that's the correct spelling) often strikes again in
the same place. Empire State Building gets struck several dozen times
a year.

73 de Jim, N2EY

481. ARNewsline 1326 - Jan 10 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-14 18:10:35 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030114131035.16998.00000881@mb-cf.aol.com>
Source record: 59563

Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1326 – January 10, 2003

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1326 with a release date of Friday, January 10, 2003 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T. Ham radio gets two new satellites and the F-C-C tells a radio club that it wont get involved in an internal club dispute. The details on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1326 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**
HAM RADIO IN SPACE: RUBIN-2 / SAFIR-M IN ORBIT

Two new ham radio satellites are in space. One is from Germany and the other from Saudi Arabia. Q-News Graham Kemp, VK4BB, has the details has the details on a German payload called SAFIR-M:

--
Audio Only Report. No text available. Hear it in MP3 at
http://www.arnewsline.org
--

More information is available i on the SAFIR-M website http://amend.gmxhome.de But be advised that it is in the German language. There is no English translation provided. (ANS, Q-News)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: SAUDISAT 1C ALSO IN ORBIT

The other new satellite is called SaudiSat 3. Its also known as SaudiSat One C and now as SO-50 – its ham radio designation.

As it name implies, this is the third in the unique SaudiSat series. It was also on board the same Russian launcher that orbited SAFIR-M.

Accordiing to AMSAT North America, this latest bird in the SaudiSat series comes by way of the Space Research Institute of the King Abdulaziz City for Science and Technology. For ham radio operation it carries what amounts to closed but available on-demand cross-band F-M repeater. The input uplink is on 145.85 MHz. The output channel is 436.775 at 250 milliwats into a quarter wave antenna.

And like a growing number of terrestrial repeaters, this orbital one requitres use of an access tone. In the case of SaudiSat, that tone frequency is 67.0 Hertz.

And there is one other similarity to closed terrestrial repeaters. SaudiSat-1C also requires that a designated control operator activate it on each pass so that it can be used by the general ham radio community. (ANS)

**

THE 5 MEGS EXPERIMENT: ARRL SAYS ITS WAITING FOR A NEW BAND

The ARRL is out of the 5 Mhz experiment and is now hoping for for the creation of a new ham band. Amateur Radio Nerwsline’s Norm Seeley, KI7UP, has the rest of the story:

--
The ARRL has permitted its WA2XSY experimental license for 5 Mhz to expire on January 1st. The League says that it is now pinning its hopes on the FCC to establish a new ham band in that spectrum but admits that it is facing some stiff opposition.

An ARRL bulletin says that starting in January 1999, 15 Amateur Radio clubs and individual hams took part in the 5-Mhz experimental operation that basically concluded in 2002. Through these operations the ARRL says that it obtained sufficient information to justify its petition for creation of the new band.

Last May, the FCC proposed going along with the ARRL's request to create a new domestic secondary High Frequency allocation from 5.25 to 5.4 Mhz. But in August the National Telecommunications and Information Administration requested that the Commission not go forward with the proposal. The NTIA says that several government agencies with allocations in the proposed spectrum had expressed reservations about sharing the spectrum with hams.

But the ARRL is still very hopeful the new band can be created. In fact, it has been working with the government to resolve the impasse. Meantime, the FCC has yet to act on the 5 Mhz request.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I’m, Norm Seeley, KI7UP.

--

The ARRL says that the new allocation at 5 MHz is an urgent priority for Amateur Radfo. It says such an allocation would enhance emergency communication activities by filling a propagation gap that exists between the 80 and 40 meter bands. In the meantime, experimental operations on 5 MHz continue on a limited basis in the United Kingdom and in Canada. (ARRL)

**

RESCUE RADIO FOLLOW-UP: THE GUAM SUPER TYPHOON

Guam continues to recover from the super typhoon which hit last month. Amateur Radio Newsline’s David Black, KB4KCH, has the latest:

--
By far, the best source of information during and after the December 8th super typhoon that hit Guam has been Duncan Campbell, KF6ILA. Campbell lived through the storm and reported on it and the welfare of Guam’s ham radio community through his postings to the QRZ.om website. In his latest report Campbell says

that the focus has shifted to recovery from the giant storm.

Campbell says that utility services are slowly being restored. As his report was filed about 30 percent of the island had both electricity and water. He says that the electrical restoration is hampered by a lack of transformers on the island. A shipment is expected shortly.

More signs of recovery Schools were slated to re-open on January 6th. Three schools which are too damaged to reopen. These students will be bused to other schools which are open.

As to ham radio on the island. As reported earlier all of Guam's radio amateurs are safe. There was s damage to some homes due to windows being blown out but no homes were destroyed. And two members of the Marianas Amateur Radio Club radio reportedly rode out the storm in their boat moored in the harbor.

Campbell says that a pair of Guam's more senior hams were not able to get their antennas down in time. He explains that the younger operators usually take care of them before a typhoon when there is notice. This time the typhoon was being reported as missing Guam by 100 miles up to 12 hours prior to landfall. So their antennas were still up when the typhoon hit. Needless to say the antennas and towers were destroyed.

Having talked to these two, Campbell reports that they do not know when, if ever, they will be able to replace their antennas. But help may be on the way. The Marianas Amateur Radio Club is already in discussions to install some wire dipoles for the high frequencies and some copper J-Poles for 2 meters at their homes.

Finally, Campbell says that the Red Cross, Salvation Army and FEMA are doing an outstanding job here on the island. Though he hears that the national news outlets are not covering this disaster, he wants the world of Amateur Radio to know that Guam is not being neglected..

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm David Black, KB4KCH.

--

According to Campbell, the Army field hospitals he reported having been flown in have now shut down and the medical professionals have now returned home. The hospitals have been stabilized with power and water, and the damage occurred has been patched, though final repairs are still months away. (KF6ILA, ARNewsline™)

**

Break 1

From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including the W5MCC New Orleans VHF Club 2 meter net heard Monday nights on their 146.86 MHz repeater.

(5 sec pause here)

**
ENFORCEMENT: ITS NOT OUR BUSINESS

If you are having a personal disagreement with a member of your radio club, don't bring it to the FCC. That's the message sent by the regulatory agency to a Texas group where it says that it will not iget involved. The agency's Daryl Duckworth, N-N-Zero-W, explains:

--
Duckworth:"The complaint of the Texas Soputhmost Amateur Radio Club concerning actions by a former trustee was dismissed. The club was told that the matter was Civil and best handled by the local courts."
--

By way of background in January of 2002 the San Benito, Texas, based filed a complaint with the FCC. It requested that the Commission issue a Cease and Desist Order to Thomas A. Tanner directing him to stop unauthorized operation of the club repeater. It also wanted him to remove his personal equipment from club property and discontinue unauthorized use of other club equipment.

But says the FCC says that setteling what amounts to interpersonal disputes is not within is jurisdiction or purview. Rather its a civil matter and not one that the Commission does not plan to pursue any further. (FCC, RAIN)

**

ENFORCEMENT: NO MUSIC ON 2 METERS

The FCC has told an California ham that he could face some strong punitive action. This, following allegations that he transmitted music in the two meter band.

The warning comes in a December 12th letter to Mark T. Sprague, KF6WAF of Antioch. In it the regulatory agency says that monitoring information indicates that on numerous occasions in October and November of 2002 that Sprague transmitted music on 146.415 MHz simplex and also failed to properly identify his station. The FCC says that direction finding bearings led them directly to Sprague's home.

The agency tells Sprague that these charges are violations of Sections 97.113 and 97.119 of the Amateur Service Rules. It adds that he could be subject to license revocation and suspension proceedings, as well as a monetary forfeiture or fine. (FCC)

**

ENFORCEMENT: STAY OFF 20 METERS

One last chance to straighten out your act or we we act against your ham license. Thats the jist of a warning from the FCC to a Michigan ham. Amateur Radio Newsline's Mert Garlick, N6AWE, takes an in-deoth look:

--
The threat of stern enforcement action comes in the form of a letter to to Michael E. Guernsey Sr., ND8V, of Parchment Michigan. Its from FCC rules

enforcer Riley Hollingsworth, K4ZDH. In it, Hollingsworth says that his agency continues to receive complaints of Guernsey's alleged appropriation of certain frequencies and interference to certain operators who attempt to use them. Among the frequencies mentioned in Hollingsworth's letter are 14.262 and 14.275 Mhz – both in the 20 meter band.

And the FCC notes that this is not the first time that it has taken up enforcement issues to Guernsey. Hollingsworth letter reminds ND8V that the agency has contacted him before regarding such incidents. Specifically on November 14, 2000 and May 20, 2002. And after the November 2000 incident Guernsey's authority to operate below 30 MHz was removed for a period of nine months.

And says Hollingsworth, he is not going to warn Guernsey again. He tells ND8V that if it writes to him another time it will be to notify him that the FCC is taking punitive action. Hollingsworth says that future incidents of such operation -- even a single incident -- will result in a fine being issued and revocation proceedings against Guernsey's ham radio license being initiated. That says the FCC, is the way that it is.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Mert Garlick, N6AWE.

--

Meantime, Hollingsworth has taken one step to defuse the overall problem. He has told Guernsey to stay off of the 20 Meter Amateur Band until the issues surrounding the allegations of his operation are resolved. (FCC)

**

ENFORCEMENT: HAM JAILED FOR SPYING STILL HOLDS HAM TICKET

A ham who is serving a life sentence for espionage still has his ticket. This even though he will probably never be permitted near a piece of ham gear again. Amateur Radio Newsline's Kenn Locke, N8PJN, tells us why:

--
Remember Robert Hanssen the former F-B-I agent convicted last year of spying? If you do, you will also recall that he held the Amateur Radio service call sign K-9-Q-V-L.

Well guess what. He still does.

Contrary to what many hams thought would happen, the FCC has not acted to revoke his Amateur Service licenses. The reason? Most likely nobody has bothered to ask it to.

While Hanssen may have been one of the highest profile cases in 2002, the charges against him did not involve prosecution by the FCC. It was a matter for the Department of Justice and Federal Prosecutors. As such, its very unlikely that anyone in either agency sat down to write a letter to their counterparts at the FCC asking them to cancel Hanssen's ham radio license.

The bottom line: Unless someone files a formal request, the chances are that Robert P. Hanssen will remain as K9QVL until his ticket expires. Maybe longer if he decides to try to renew it from his cell in the Federal Penitentiary where he will probably live out the rest of his natural life.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I’m Ken Locke, N8PJN.

--

Thanks Ken. (ARNewsline™)

**

REPEATER LISTINGS: ARRL SEEKS REPEATER LISTINGS FROM COORDINATORS

This note to frequency coordinators. The deadline for this year's submissions of listing for the 2003 ARRL Repeater Directory is Friday, February 7, 2003. As has been the case for many years, the ARRL only accepts listings from recognized frequency coordinators unless no coordinator exists in a specific region. For more information on how to list repeaters please contact Brennan Price, N4QX, at ARRL headquarters. His e-mail is n4qx@arrl.org. (Repeater Owners Remailer)

**

ARRL: LICENSE RENEWAL AND OTHER SERVICES TO NONMEMBERS

The ARRL is now providing F-C-C Amateur Radio license renewals, address changes and other license modification services to nonmembers. For a $12 fee, the League will renew a nonmember's Amateur Radio ticket within 90 days of expiration, file an application to change address or name or request issuance of a new sequential call sign.

For several years, the ARRL has been handling renewals, address and name changes and modifications free of charge for members. Nommembers were directed to the FCC's free Internet or hard-copy application options or to other providers of such services. (ARRL)

**

GOOD INFORMATION SOURCE: NEW RFR WEB SITE

Our friends over at the CGC Communicator report that RF Safety Solutions has a new web site dealing with that very subject.

As its name implies, RF Safety Solutions is a company that provides consulting for those concerned with human exposure to RF signals. It was founded in 2002 by Richard Strickland who is a well-known expert in the field of RF safety and who has developed RF safety programs and conducted training for a number of major wireless communications companies and broadcasters

The RF Safety Solutions web site covers RF safety reporting, safety programs and training. There is also a good overview of what RF radiation really is. Its really one of the best thought out places to learn about R-F safety. Look for it in cyberspace at www.rfsafetysolutions.com. (CGC)

**

NAMES IN THE NEWS: CHANGES AT THE CGC COMMUNICATOR

And speaking about the CGC Communicator, word of a major change at that broadcast industry publication. Editor - Publisher Bob Gonsett, W6VR, has announced that Steve Blodgett, W7RNA,
has assumed the helm as Letters Editor.

Formerlly WA7GFV, Steve Blodgett is well known to broadcasters nationwide. He holds an Adcanced class Amateur Radio license and has been actively engaged in broadcasting operations and engineering for nearly 35 years, with stations in Montana, Arizona, and California. For 14 years he worked as the Chief Engineer and Radio Engineering Manager with the late Gene Autry’s Golden West Broadcasters in Los Angeles. He also used to operate an on-line bullrtin board for Chapter 47 of the Society of Broadcast Engineers and served as chairman of the Southern California Frequency Coordinating Committe. Thats the group which handles broasdcast remote pick-up recommendations.

In making the announcement, Gonsett says that having Blodgett on board will allow him more time to concentrate on CGC's consultant radio engineering practice along with frequency and spectral monitoring services. It will also permit W6VR time to to pursue a number of new opportunities as well. (CGC)

**

FREE STUFF: WABA DIRECTORY ON THWE WEB

The Diamond DX Club reports that the new WABA or Worked Antarctic Bases Award Directory for 2003 is now available for free downloading. Its in Portable Document Format on the club's web site at www.ddxc.net. The new version includes a 12-page revised Antarctic bases listing with the latest corrections and a new column for Islands on the Air reference numbers. It also sports a a new section containing historical notes. Again that URL is www.ddxc.net. (Diamond DX Club)

**

BREAK 2

This is ham radio news for today’s radio amateur. From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org and being relayed by the volunteer services of the following radio amateur:

(5 sec pause here)

**

CHANGING OF THE GUARD: GRONK RADIO NETWORK FOUNDEER - SK

One of the pioneers of repeater interlinking has died. This, with word that Gary Belda, K6ENS, has become a silent key

According to a report from Bruce and Melanie Forestal -- thats WB6ARE and K5QQA -- Gary Belda was one of the principals behind the Gronk Radio Network. Gronk

is one of the oldest 440 intertied remote base systems in the South-Westen United States and stretches the most of the Calidornia coastline.

As one of its archetects, Gary Belda among the berst liked hams in the world of F-M and repeaters. He worked in the two-way radio industry for Advanced Electronics for many years before leaving to join the field of traffic control systems. He was an expert in the aera of two-way radio and always willing to lend a hand on a ham radio repeater project.

Belda died in whats described as an unfortunate accident possibly related to antenna work. No other details are available at this time. A memorial service was held for him on Thursday, January 9th, at the First United Methodist Church in Redondo Beach California. (W6KGB)

**

ON THE AIR: COMMEMORATING HISTORY

History is coming to the ham bands. This, with word from UT5UKY that special event station EM60USB will be active from January 23rd through February 2nd to commemorate the 60th anniversary of the Battle of Stalingrad.

The Battle of Stalingrad was one of the decisive World War II Russian victories. It stopped the German army’s southern advance and turned the tide of the war.

Now, 60 years later, ham radio will be an integral part of the commemoration of that historic event. And if you get to work EM6-0USB you are advised to QSL to UT5UKY either direct, or through the bureau. (UT5UKY)

**

INTERNATIONAL-CHINA: RADIO MAG LIFT TRAIN RUNS JAN 1

The world's first magnetic levitation or mag-lift passenger train began running in Shanghai China on January 1st. The radio controlled train reached 312 miles per hour in testing. In regular service it will carry passengers and freight at a top speed above 250 miles per hour between Pudong International Airport and Shanghai's financial district. The distance is 30 miles an the trip will take mere 7 minutes -- not even enough time to make a quick cell phone call. (Technology Online)

**

PROPAGATON ASSISTANCE: C6AFP BEACON MOVING

Steve Rutledge, N4JQQ, says that he plans to move the C6AFP beacon on 50.062 Mhz in the near future. It is currently located at Treasure Cay, Great Abaco, Bahamas in grid FL-16. It will be going to a new home on Green Turtle Cay, Bahamas which is about five miles away. This is another island, same grid. C6AGN has agreed to let Steve put the beacon up at his QTH. (VHF Reflector)

**

CONTESTING: LINDHOLM TO CQ WWW VHF CONTEST

Turning to on the air operations. Word that John Lindholm, W1XX is the new Director for the CQ World Wide VHF Contest. Lindholm replaces Gene Zimmerman, W3ZZ, who left to take over writing the World Above 50 Mhz column for QST magazine. (VHF Reflector)

**

DX

In DX, DK9GG and DJ4KW will be active as V31GW and V31YN from Belize until February 25th. On February 8th they will be joined by DL2SWW and DG2TM. The four plan to operate from NA-073 on the 21st through the 23rd of February. QSL direct to each operators home call. (DL2VFR)

And K9YNF reports that he will be active as K9YNF slash HR9 from Roatan Island. This, from January 11th to the 18th. He will operate SSB only on 14.260, 18.128, 24.950, 28.460 and 28.560 Mhz. This, plus or minus a kew kilohertz to compensate for any Q-R-M. QSL via his home call -- either direct or via the bureau. (425 DX)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: DOGGIE TALK AND THE IG NOBEL AWARDS

And finally this week, word that an inter-species communications device has received special recognition. Amateur Radio Newsline’s producer Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, has more:

--
No, we are not kidding. An inter-species communications apparatus -- as in a dog-to-person translator -- is one of the winners of the 2002 Ig Nobel Awards.

What are the Ig Noble awards you ask? They are a spoof of the famed Nobel Awards ceremony and are given annually at Harvard University to recognize achievements that cannot or should not ever be reproduced.

Winners are selected by a secret committee from thousands of nominations. Actual Nobel Laureates present the Ig Nobel’s at a
ceremony where the winners are hailed with cheers and a flurry of paper airplanes. And if a recipient feels insulted or slighted by the award, it is withdrawn.

For 2002 those victorious included the people behind the definitive study on bellybutton lint and an inquiry into what arouses ostriches. But by far the dog to person translator was one of the most popular. Its works by listening to the tone of a dog's bark converting that data into an interpretation of the dogs mood.

The device is already on the market in Japan. An English language version called Bow-Wow-Lingual -- nope -- we are now kidding -- Bow-Wow-Lingual -- It may be on the market here in the U-S-A in about a year. And we thought that you’d want to know.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, with my dog Daisy, I’m Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF.

--

Hmmmm. If it happens, we wonder what breed will be honored with an Ig Nobel for being the first to dog to get a ham radio license and make DXCC.

More about the Ig Nobel awards is in cyberspace at http://www.improb.com/ig/ig-top.html (Science Frontiers)

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, Amateur News Weekly, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline @arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I’m Don Wilbanks, KC5MFA, saying 73 and we thank you for listening." Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2002. All rights reserved.

**

Terminal Break

**

RAIN Promo

482. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-14 18:21:19 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E24551F.60403@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 59569

WA8ULX wrote:
>>It is for you, that's the only way you could make extra.
>>
>
>
> Spoken like a true CBer that you are. Lets see, QRZ says your still a
> CBplusser. I know you just cant handle that really tough Dumb Down General.

And just what call sign did you look up to find that bit of
misinformation? I got my Advanced Class long before the dumbed
down ones like you came along.

483. Re: No more usernet for AOL'rs ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-14 18:38:40 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301141038.6223e1ab@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59564

"K HB" <k hb@arrl.DOTORG> wrote in message
news:<waWU9.9388$Dq.982775@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>...
> "Joe" <joe.amp@NOSPAMverizon.net> wrote
>
> :
> : AOL users can read newsgroups, but any posts they make will be
> : seen ONLY by other AOL members.
> :
>
> Finally an effective K4YZ/Len Anderson filter.
>
> Sunuvagun! Life is good!
>
> Hey, N0iMD, I hear AOL is giving away 1,000 free hours to new subscribers.
> Check it out. Please!
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB

I should have joined the class action suit years ago, but I figured
they'd go out of business all by themselves.

484. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-14 18:40:31 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301141040.5b02fd98@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59565

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030114092848.10348.00001218@mb-ba.aol.com>...
> >I'm glad to finally see the Holy Extras policing their own.
>
> When are the CBers going to start policing you CBplussers

I have no idea what you're talking about, and neither do you.

485. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-14 18:57:28 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030114135728.06053.00000653@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 59566

>I have no idea what you're talking about, and neither do you.

Oh yes you do. Hows your Daddy Karl?

486. Re: ARNewsline 1326 - Jan 10 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-14 19:04:12 UTC
From: Big Al <BigAl@HeadHoncho.net>
Message-ID: <b01mv0$a85$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 59567

Pasternak continues to SPAM Usenet with his worthless Spew.
Weekly Pasternak SPAM follows:

"Radionews" <radionews@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030114131035.16998.00000881@mb-cf.aol.com...
> Amateur Radio NewslineT Report 1326 - January 10, 2003
>
> Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1326 with a release date of Friday,
> January 10, 2003 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.
>
> The following is a Q-S-T. Ham radio gets two new satellites and the F-C-C
> tells a radio club that it wont get involved in an internal club dispute.
The
> details on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1326 coming your way right
now.
>
>
> (Billboard Cart Here)
>
> **
> HAM RADIO IN SPACE: RUBIN-2 / SAFIR-M IN ORBIT
>
> Two new ham radio satellites are in space. One is from Germany and the
other
> from Saudi Arabia. Q-News Graham Kemp, VK4BB, has the details has the
details
> on a German payload called SAFIR-M:
>
> --
> Audio Only Report. No text available. Hear it in MP3 at
> http://www.arnewsline.org
> --
>
> More information is available i on the SAFIR-M website
http://amend.gmxhome.de
> But be advised that it is in the German language. There is no English
> translation provided. (ANS, Q-News)
>
> **
>
> HAM RADIO IN SPACE: SAUDISAT 1C ALSO IN ORBIT
>
> The other new satellite is called SaudiSat 3. Its also known as SaudiSat
One C

> and now as SO-50 - its ham radio designation.
>
> As it name implies, this is the third in the unique SaudiSat series. It
was
> also on board the same Russian launcher that orbited SAFIR-M.
>
> Accordiing to AMSAT North America, this latest bird in the SaudiSat series
> comes by way of the Space Research Institute of the King Abdulaziz City
for
> Science and Technology. For ham radio operation it carries what amounts
to
> closed but available on-demand cross-band F-M repeater. The input uplink
is on
> 145.85 MHz. The output channel is 436.775 at 250 milliwats into a quarter
wave
> antenna.
>
> And like a growing number of terrestrial repeaters, this orbital one
requitres
> use of an access tone. In the case of SaudiSat, that tone frequency is
67.0
> Hertz.
>
> And there is one other similarity to closed terrestrial repeaters.
SaudiSat-1C
> also requires that a designated control operator activate it on each pass
so
> that it can be used by the general ham radio community. (ANS)
>
> **
>
> THE 5 MEGS EXPERIMENT: ARRL SAYS ITS WAITING FOR A NEW BAND
>
> The ARRL is out of the 5 Mhz experiment and is now hoping for for the
creation
> of a new ham band. Amateur Radio Nerwsline's Norm Seeley, KI7UP, has the
> rest of the story:
>
> --
> The ARRL has permitted its WA2XSY experimental license for 5 Mhz to expire
on
> January 1st. The League says that it is now pinning its hopes on the FCC
to
> establish a new ham band in that spectrum but admits that it is facing
some
> stiff opposition.
>
> An ARRL bulletin says that starting in January 1999, 15 Amateur Radio
clubs and
> individual hams took part in the 5-Mhz experimental operation that

basically
> concluded in 2002. Through these operations the ARRL says that it
obtained
> sufficient information to justify its petition for creation of the new
band.
>
> Last May, the FCC proposed going along with the ARRL's request to create a
new
> domestic secondary High Frequency allocation from 5.25 to 5.4 Mhz. But
in
> August the National Telecommunications and Information Administration
requested
> that the Commission not go forward with the proposal. The NTIA says that
> several government agencies with allocations in the proposed spectrum had
> expressed reservations about sharing the spectrum with hams.
>
> But the ARRL is still very hopeful the new band can be created. In fact,
it
> has been working with the government to resolve the impasse. Meantime,
the FCC
> has yet to act on the 5 Mhz request.
>
> For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm, Norm Seeley, KI7UP.
>
> --
>
> The ARRL says that the new allocation at 5 MHz is an urgent priority for
> Amateur Radfo. It says such an allocation would enhance emergency
> communication activities by filling a propagation gap that exists between
the
> 80 and 40 meter bands. In the meantime, experimental operations on 5 MHz
> continue on a limited basis in the United Kingdom and in Canada. (ARRL)
>
> **
>
> RESCUE RADIO FOLLOW-UP: THE GUAM SUPER TYPHOON
>
> Guam continues to recover from the super typhoon which hit last month.
Amateur
> Radio Newsline's David Black, KB4KCH, has the latest:
>
> --
> By far, the best source of information during and after the December 8th
super
> typhoon that hit Guam has been Duncan Campbell, KF6ILA. Campbell lived
through
> the storm and reported on it and the welfare of Guam's ham radio community
> through his postings to the QRZ.om website. In his latest report Campbell
says
> that the focus has shifted to recovery from the giant storm.

>
> Campbell says that utility services are slowly being restored. As his
report
> was filed about 30 percent of the island had both electricity and water.
He
> says that the electrical restoration is hampered by a lack of transformers
on
> the island. A shipment is expected shortly.
>
> More signs of recovery Schools were slated to re-open on January 6th.
Three
> schools which are too damaged to reopen. These students will be bused to
other
> schools which are open.
>
> As to ham radio on the island. As reported earlier all of Guam's radio
> amateurs are safe. There was s damage to some homes due to windows being
blown
> out but no homes were destroyed. And two members of the Marianas Amateur
Radio
> Club radio reportedly rode out the storm in their boat moored in the
harbor.
>
> Campbell says that a pair of Guam's more senior hams were not able to get
> their antennas down in time. He explains that the younger operators
usually
> take care of them before a typhoon when there is notice. This time the
typhoon
> was being reported as missing Guam by 100 miles up to 12 hours prior to
> landfall. So their antennas were still up when the typhoon hit. Needless
to
> say the antennas and towers were destroyed.
>
> Having talked to these two, Campbell reports that they do not know when,
if
> ever, they will be able to replace their antennas. But help may be on the
way.
> The Marianas Amateur Radio Club is already in discussions to install some
wire
> dipoles for the high frequencies and some copper J-Poles for 2 meters at
their
> homes.
>
> Finally, Campbell says that the Red Cross, Salvation Army and FEMA are
doing an
> outstanding job here on the island. Though he hears that the national
news
> outlets are not covering this disaster, he wants the world of Amateur
Radio to
> know that Guam is not being neglected..

>
>
> For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm David Black, KB4KCH.
>
> --
>
> According to Campbell, the Army field hospitals he reported having been
flown
> in have now shut down and the medical professionals have now returned
home.
> The hospitals have been stabilized with power and water, and the damage
> occurred has been patched, though final repairs are still months away.
> (KF6ILA, ARNewslineT)
>
> **
>
> Break 1
>
> From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline,
heard on
> bulletin stations around the world including the W5MCC New Orleans VHF
Club 2
> meter net heard Monday nights on their 146.86 MHz repeater.
>
> (5 sec pause here)
>
>
> **
> ENFORCEMENT: ITS NOT OUR BUSINESS
>
> If you are having a personal disagreement with a member of your radio
club,
> don't bring it to the FCC. That's the message sent by the regulatory
> agency to a Texas group where it says that it will not iget involved. The
> agency's Daryl Duckworth, N-N-Zero-W, explains:
>
> --
> Duckworth:"The complaint of the Texas Soputhmost Amateur Radio Club
> concerning actions by a former trustee was dismissed. The club was told
that
> the matter was Civil and best handled by the local courts."
> --
>
> By way of background in January of 2002 the San Benito, Texas, based filed
a
> complaint with the FCC. It requested that the Commission issue a Cease
and
> Desist Order to Thomas A. Tanner directing him to stop unauthorized
operation
> of the club repeater. It also wanted him to remove his personal equipment

from
> club property and discontinue unauthorized use of other club equipment.
>
> But says the FCC says that setteling what amounts to interpersonal
disputes is
> not within is jurisdiction or purview. Rather its a civil matter and not
one
> that the Commission does not plan to pursue any further. (FCC, RAIN)
>
> **
>
> ENFORCEMENT: NO MUSIC ON 2 METERS
>
> The FCC has told an California ham that he could face some strong punitive
> action. This, following allegations that he transmitted music in the two
meter
> band.
>
> The warning comes in a December 12th letter to Mark T. Sprague, KF6WAF of
> Antioch. In it the regulatory agency says that monitoring information
> indicates that on numerous occasions in October and November of 2002 that
> Sprague transmitted music on 146.415 MHz simplex and also failed to
properly
> identify his station. The FCC says that direction finding bearings led
them
> directly to Sprague's home.
>
> The agency tells Sprague that these charges are violations of Sections
97.113
> and 97.119 of the Amateur Service Rules. It adds that he could be subject
to
> license revocation and suspension proceedings, as well as a monetary
forfeiture
> or fine. (FCC)
>
> **
>
> ENFORCEMENT: STAY OFF 20 METERS
>
> One last chance to straighten out your act or we we act against your ham
> license. Thats the jist of a warning from the FCC to a Michigan ham.
Amateur
> Radio Newsline's Mert Garlick, N6AWE, takes an in-deoth look:
>
> --
> The threat of stern enforcement action comes in the form of a letter to to
> Michael E. Guernsey Sr., ND8V, of Parchment Michigan. Its from FCC rules
> enforcer Riley Hollingsworth, K4ZDH. In it, Hollingsworth says that his
agency
> continues to receive complaints of Guernsey's alleged appropriation of

> certain frequencies and interference to certain operators who attempt to
use
> them. Among the frequencies mentioned in Hollingsworth's letter are
14.262
> and 14.275 Mhz - both in the 20 meter band.
>
> And the FCC notes that this is not the first time that it has taken up
> enforcement issues to Guernsey. Hollingsworth letter reminds ND8V that
the
> agency has contacted him before regarding such incidents. Specifically on
> November 14, 2000 and May 20, 2002. And after the November 2000 incident
> Guernsey's authority to operate below 30 MHz was removed for a period of
nine
> months.
>
> And says Hollingsworth, he is not going to warn Guernsey again. He tells
ND8V
> that if it writes to him another time it will be to notify him that the
FCC is
> taking punitive action. Hollingsworth says that future incidents of such
> operation -- even a single incident -- will result in a fine being issued
and
> revocation proceedings against Guernsey's ham radio license being
initiated.
> That says the FCC, is the way that it is.
>
> For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Mert Garlick, N6AWE.
>
> --
>
> Meantime, Hollingsworth has taken one step to defuse the overall problem.
He
> has told Guernsey to stay off of the 20 Meter Amateur Band until the
issues
> surrounding the allegations of his operation are resolved. (FCC)
>
> **
>
> ENFORCEMENT: HAM JAILED FOR SPYING STILL HOLDS HAM TICKET
>
> A ham who is serving a life sentence for espionage still has his ticket.
This
> even though he will probably never be permitted near a piece of ham gear
again.
> Amateur Radio Newsline's Kenn Locke, N8PJN, tells us why:
>
> --
> Remember Robert Hanssen the former F-B-I agent convicted last year of
spying?
> If you do, you will also recall that he held the Amateur Radio service

call
> sign K-9-Q-V-L.
>
> Well guess what. He still does.
>
> Contrary to what many hams thought would happen, the FCC has not acted to
> revoke his Amateur Service licenses. The reason? Most likely nobody has
> bothered to ask it to.
>
> While Hanssen may have been one of the highest profile cases in 2002, the
> charges against him did not involve prosecution by the FCC. It was a
matter
> for the Department of Justice and Federal Prosecutors. As such, its very
> unlikely that anyone in either agency sat down to write a letter to their
> counterparts at the FCC asking them to cancel Hanssen's ham radio license.
>
> The bottom line: Unless someone files a formal request, the chances are
that
> Robert P. Hanssen will remain as K9QVL until his ticket expires. Maybe
longer
> if he decides to try to renew it from his cell in the Federal Penitentiary
> where he will probably live out the rest of his natural life.
>
> For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Ken Locke, N8PJN.
>
> --
>
> Thanks Ken. (ARNewslineT)
>
>
> **
>
> REPEATER LISTINGS: ARRL SEEKS REPEATER LISTINGS FROM COORDINATORS
>
> This note to frequency coordinators. The deadline for this year's
submissions
> of listing for the 2003 ARRL Repeater Directory is Friday, February 7,
2003.
> As has been the case for many years, the ARRL only accepts listings from
> recognized frequency coordinators unless no coordinator exists in a
specific
> region. For more information on how to list repeaters please contact
Brennan
> Price, N4QX, at ARRL headquarters. His e-mail is n4qx@arrl.org.
(Repeater
> Owners Remailer)
>
> **
>
> ARRL: LICENSE RENEWAL AND OTHER SERVICES TO NONMEMBERS

>
> The ARRL is now providing F-C-C Amateur Radio license renewals, address
changes
> and other license modification services to nonmembers. For a $12 fee, the
> League will renew a nonmember's Amateur Radio ticket within 90 days of
> expiration, file an application to change address or name or request
issuance
> of a new sequential call sign.
>
> For several years, the ARRL has been handling renewals, address and name
> changes and modifications free of charge for members. Nommembers were
directed
> to the FCC's free Internet or hard-copy application options or to other
> providers of such services. (ARRL)
>
> **
>
> GOOD INFORMATION SOURCE: NEW RFR WEB SITE
>
> Our friends over at the CGC Communicator report that RF Safety Solutions
has a
> new web site dealing with that very subject.
>
> As its name implies, RF Safety Solutions is a company that provides
consulting
> for those concerned with human exposure to RF signals. It was founded in
2002
> by Richard Strickland who is a well-known expert in the field of RF safety
and
> who has developed RF safety programs and conducted training for a number
of
> major wireless communications companies and broadcasters
>
> The RF Safety Solutions web site covers RF safety reporting, safety
programs
> and training. There is also a good overview of what RF radiation really
is.
> Its really one of the best thought out places to learn about R-F safety.
Look
> for it in cyberspace at www.rfsafetysolutions.com. (CGC)
>
> **
>
> NAMES IN THE NEWS: CHANGES AT THE CGC COMMUNICATOR
>
> And speaking about the CGC Communicator, word of a major change at that
> broadcast industry publication. Editor - Publisher Bob Gonsett, W6VR, has
> announced that Steve Blodgett, W7RNA,
> has assumed the helm as Letters Editor.
>

> Formerlly WA7GFV, Steve Blodgett is well known to broadcasters nationwide.
He
> holds an Adcanced class Amateur Radio license and has been actively
engaged in
> broadcasting operations and engineering for nearly 35 years, with stations
in
> Montana, Arizona, and California. For 14 years he worked as the Chief
Engineer
> and Radio Engineering Manager with the late Gene Autry's Golden West
> Broadcasters in Los Angeles. He also used to operate an on-line bullrtin
board
> for Chapter 47 of the Society of Broadcast Engineers and served as
chairman of
> the Southern California Frequency Coordinating Committe. Thats the group
which
> handles broasdcast remote pick-up recommendations.
>
> In making the announcement, Gonsett says that having Blodgett on board
will
> allow him more time to concentrate on CGC's consultant radio engineering
> practice along with frequency and spectral monitoring services. It will
also
> permit W6VR time to to pursue a number of new opportunities as well.
(CGC)
>
> **
>
> FREE STUFF: WABA DIRECTORY ON THWE WEB
>
> The Diamond DX Club reports that the new WABA or Worked Antarctic Bases
Award
> Directory for 2003 is now available for free downloading. Its in Portable
> Document Format on the club's web site at www.ddxc.net. The new version
> includes a 12-page revised Antarctic bases listing with the latest
corrections
> and a new column for Islands on the Air reference numbers. It also sports
a a
> new section containing historical notes. Again that URL is www.ddxc.net.
> (Diamond DX Club)
>
> **
>
> BREAK 2
>
> This is ham radio news for today's radio amateur. From the United States
of
> America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from
our
> only official website at www.arnewsline.org and being relayed by the
volunteer

> services of the following radio amateur:
>
> (5 sec pause here)
>
> **
>
> CHANGING OF THE GUARD: GRONK RADIO NETWORK FOUNDEER - SK
>
> One of the pioneers of repeater interlinking has died. This, with word
that
> Gary Belda, K6ENS, has become a silent key
>
> According to a report from Bruce and Melanie Forestal -- thats WB6ARE and
K5QQA
> -- Gary Belda was one of the principals behind the Gronk Radio Network.
Gronk
> is one of the oldest 440 intertied remote base systems in the South-Westen
> United States and stretches the most of the Calidornia coastline.
>
> As one of its archetects, Gary Belda among the berst liked hams in the
world of
> F-M and repeaters. He worked in the two-way radio industry for Advanced
> Electronics for many years before leaving to join the field of traffic
control
> systems. He was an expert in the aera of two-way radio and always willing
to
> lend a hand on a ham radio repeater project.
>
> Belda died in whats described as an unfortunate accident possibly related
to
> antenna work. No other details are available at this time. A memorial
service
> was held for him on Thursday, January 9th, at the First United Methodist
Church
> in Redondo Beach California. (W6KGB)
>
> **
>
> ON THE AIR: COMMEMORATING HISTORY
>
> History is coming to the ham bands. This, with word from UT5UKY that
special
> event station EM60USB will be active from January 23rd through February
2nd to
> commemorate the 60th anniversary of the Battle of Stalingrad.
>
> The Battle of Stalingrad was one of the decisive World War II Russian
> victories. It stopped the German army's southern advance and turned the
tide
> of the war.

>
> Now, 60 years later, ham radio will be an integral part of the
commemoration of
> that historic event. And if you get to work EM6-0USB you are advised to
QSL to
> UT5UKY either direct, or through the bureau. (UT5UKY)
>
> **
>
> INTERNATIONAL-CHINA: RADIO MAG LIFT TRAIN RUNS JAN 1
>
> The world's first magnetic levitation or mag-lift passenger train began
running
> in Shanghai China on January 1st. The radio controlled train reached 312
miles
> per hour in testing. In regular service it will carry passengers and
freight
> at a top speed above 250 miles per hour between Pudong International
Airport
> and Shanghai's financial district. The distance is 30 miles an the trip
will
> take mere 7 minutes -- not even enough time to make a quick cell phone
call.
> (Technology Online)
>
> **
>
> PROPAGATON ASSISTANCE: C6AFP BEACON MOVING
>
> Steve Rutledge, N4JQQ, says that he plans to move the C6AFP beacon on
50.062
> Mhz in the near future. It is currently located at Treasure Cay, Great
Abaco,
> Bahamas in grid FL-16. It will be going to a new home on Green Turtle
Cay,
> Bahamas which is about five miles away. This is another island, same
grid.
> C6AGN has agreed to let Steve put the beacon up at his QTH. (VHF
Reflector)
>
> **
>
> CONTESTING: LINDHOLM TO CQ WWW VHF CONTEST
>
> Turning to on the air operations. Word that John Lindholm, W1XX is the
new
> Director for the CQ World Wide VHF Contest. Lindholm replaces Gene
Zimmerman,
> W3ZZ, who left to take over writing the World Above 50 Mhz column for QST
> magazine. (VHF Reflector)

>
> **
>
> DX
>
> In DX, DK9GG and DJ4KW will be active as V31GW and V31YN from Belize until
> February 25th. On February 8th they will be joined by DL2SWW and DG2TM.
The
> four plan to operate from NA-073 on the 21st through the 23rd of February.
QSL
> direct to each operators home call. (DL2VFR)
>
> And K9YNF reports that he will be active as K9YNF slash HR9 from Roatan
Island.
> This, from January 11th to the 18th. He will operate SSB only on 14.260,
> 18.128, 24.950, 28.460 and 28.560 Mhz. This, plus or minus a kew
kilohertz to
> compensate for any Q-R-M. QSL via his home call -- either direct or via
the
> bureau. (425 DX)
>
> **
>
> THAT FINAL ITEM: DOGGIE TALK AND THE IG NOBEL AWARDS
>
> And finally this week, word that an inter-species communications device
has
> received special recognition. Amateur Radio Newsline's producer Bill
> Pasternak, WA6ITF, has more:
>
> --
> No, we are not kidding. An inter-species communications apparatus -- as
in a
> dog-to-person translator -- is one of the winners of the 2002 Ig Nobel
Awards.
>
> What are the Ig Noble awards you ask? They are a spoof of the famed Nobel
> Awards ceremony and are given annually at Harvard University to recognize
> achievements that cannot or should not ever be reproduced.
>
> Winners are selected by a secret committee from thousands of nominations.
> Actual Nobel Laureates present the Ig Nobel's at a
> ceremony where the winners are hailed with cheers and a flurry of paper
> airplanes. And if a recipient feels insulted or slighted by the award, it
is
> withdrawn.
>
> For 2002 those victorious included the people behind the definitive study
on
> bellybutton lint and an inquiry into what arouses ostriches. But by far

the
> dog to person translator was one of the most popular. Its works by
listening
> to the tone of a dog's bark converting that data into an interpretation of
the
> dogs mood.
>
> The device is already on the market in Japan. An English language version
> called Bow-Wow-Lingual -- nope -- we are now kidding -- Bow-Wow-Lingual --
It
> may be on the market here in the U-S-A in about a year. And we thought
that
> you'd want to know.
>
> For the Amateur Radio Newsline, with my dog Daisy, I'm Bill Pasternak,
> WA6ITF.
>
> --
>
> Hmmmm. If it happens, we wonder what breed will be honored with an Ig
Nobel
> for being the first to dog to get a ham radio license and make DXCC.
>
> More about the Ig Nobel awards is in cyberspace at
> http://www.improb.com/ig/ig-top.html (Science Frontiers)
>
> **
>
> NEWSCAST CLOSE
>
> With thanks to Alan Labs, Amateur News Weekly, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC
> Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio
> Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the
Amateur
> Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline @arnewsline.org. More
> information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official
website
> located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at
> Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.
>
> For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I'm Don
Wilbanks,
> KC5MFA, saying 73 and we thank you for listening." Amateur Radio
Newsline(tm)
> is Copyright 2002. All rights reserved.
>
> **
>
> Terminal Break
>

> **
>
> RAIN Promo
>

487. Re: Just One More Example

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-14 20:56:32 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030114155632.10800.00000001@mb-fb.aol.com>
Source record: 59568

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.h8nzo89.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 08 Jan 2003 20:47:14 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>> No. The entire US administration is bound by agreement to the
>> terms of the United Nations charter. The International
>> Telecommunications Union is a UN organization.
>>
>> There is NO "international treaty" in regards to amateur radio.
>> There is only the agreement of the United States of America
>> to meet the terms of the United Nations charter. That includes
>> all UN organizations in which the USA is a member.
>
> The International Telecommunications Convention is a separate
> treaty that the US is a signatory to, and requires specific
> ratification by the Senate to be effective. The International
> Radio Regulations is a separate treaty that the US is a
> signatory to, and requires specific ratifivation by the
> Senate to be effective.

Phil, the US of A is a member of the United Nations. The ITU
is a UN body. Yes, it's possible to be a signatory to the ITU
and not be part of the UN and vice-versa, but hardly the case
in reality.

There still isn't any "international law" that exists as LAW in
any other country, complete with police and courts and such.
"International law" boils down to a common-agreement on the
part of members, an honor system. If someone doesn't want
to be part of the honor system, they can't be prosecuted in a
real court...they are "prosecuted" (part way) by other means.

If the US Congress has to ratify certain honor system
agreements, then that LAW applies to the US of A and its
citizens and all those who fall under that jurisdiction. It does
NOT apply to the rest of the world, therefore it isn't - per se -
"international law."

> I'm still POed at (now ex-) Senator John Glenn who held up
> Senate ratification of the 1979 WARC Radio Regs (published as
> the 1980 Edition) for several months. As an "astronaut" the rest
> of the Senate looked up to him on things scientific or technical,
> while the real reason for his antics was because of some ego
> pizzing contest he was having with the head of NASA over budget
> and expenditures - nothing to do with the content of the treaty.

Well, you take that up with the administration and legislature of the state of Ohio. We've all been a party to your remarks on the pizza contests you personally have or had. Part of that party is the "explanations" of law delivered in the long-timer's "that's the way it IS" tone.

Pizzing or not, WARC-79 was TWENTY-FOUR YEARS AGO.
The dispute between SW BC folks and hams on the 40m band HASN'T BEEN RESOLVED YET. Why not? Having too much fun tossing pizza back and forth? The IARU hasn't helped hams much, ARRL hasn't helped hams much on that 40m issue.

24 years. Enough time to sire a child and have them graduate college. Long time. ITU-R hasn't solved the problem, IARU hasn't solved the problem, ARRL hasn't solved the problem, "international law" hasn't solved the problem. Everyone is seemingly too righteous to negotiate...each side is "superior" to the other.

Sort of like it is in here... :-)

"Beep, beep..." - the Book of Pokemon

488. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-14 21:42:21 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030114164221.06330.00001062@mb-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 59570

>And just what call sign did you look up to find that bit of
>misinformation? I got my Advanced Class long before the dumbed
>down ones like you came along.
>

Oh, maybe I got the wrong guy, I thought you were Dumb A$$ Andy

489. Re: ARNewsline 1326 - Jan 10 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-15 00:00:17 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030114190017.22983.00000625@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 59571

> Pasternak continues to SPAM Usenet with his worthless Spew.

News, while useful, is not policy. It should not be here..

490. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-15 00:12:30 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0301141612.732be1b5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59572

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message news:<20030114063631.02538.00000992@mb-da.aol.com>...
> In article <G9IU9.58076$GF.17879716@twister.columbus.rr.com>, "Mike H. KC8UBH"
> <mhaas@nospam.insight.rr.com> writes:
>
> >Most of the No-Code Techs I know do more for the hobby on their feet and
> >with their hands, heads, and hearts in Emergency and other Community Service
> >Organizations than Extra's like you who sit on your asses in the shack,
> >probably pissing other HAMS off by sarcastically announcing that the
> >frequency you're camping out on (but not using) "is in use" and doing
> >absolutely NOTHING to further the hobby.
> >
> >Next time you go to Hamvention in Dayton, thank all those No-Code Techs who
> >did *MOST* of the legwork setting up the entire event, you thankless slob.
> >Next time you go to your next field day with a whole bunch of Extra class
> >HAMS standing around looking important and being jerks, thank the No-Code
> >Techs who did the *real* work setting THAT event up.
>
> Better yet, Mike, don't repeat the mistake of license-class bigotry evidenced
> by someone who is simply trying to get you steamed. That's exactly what he
> wants.

True enough but that ain't no FUN . .

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Extra class since 1970 (no big deal, really)

w3rv

491. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-15 00:20:22 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0301141620.5e889058@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59573

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message news:<20030113210548.01791.00000391@mb-cb.aol.com>...

>
> >they are only 1 Step Above a cber, and its
> >really a pretty tiny step, actually you really cant tell much difference
>
> Maybe YOU can't, but I sure can. No such thing as a cb licnese, for one thing.

'Scuse me here but I have a Class D Citizens Radio Service station &
operator's license issued to me by the FCC, callsign is KLK1937.

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

492. Re: ARNewsline 1326 - Jan 10 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-15 00:20:30 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.51.0301150018290.13935@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 59574

On Tue, 14 Jan 2003, Big Al wrote:
> Pasternak continues to SPAM Usenet with his worthless Spew.
> Weekly Pasternak SPAM follows:
>
>"Radionews" <radionews@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030114131035.16998.00000881@mb-cf.aol.com...
>> Amateur Radio NewslineT Report 1326 - January 10, 2003
>> ...

So, what exactly did you do about it? Besides quoting the entire message here in your bitch response, did you manage to send a complaint to his ISP? I did.

493. Re: ARNewsline 1326 - Jan 10 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-15 00:22:11 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.51.0301150021100.13935@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 59575

On Wed, 15 Jan 2003, Vshah101 wrote:
>> Pasternak continues to SPAM Usenet with his worthless Spew.
>
>News, while useful, is not policy. It should not be here..

...And the "rec.radio" newsgroup hierarchy charter spells out specifically in which group this belongs: rec.radio.info.

494. Re: Just One More Example

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-15 00:22:52 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030114192252.13920.00000668@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 59576

>Subject: Re: Just One More Example
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 1/14/03 2:56 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030114155632.10800.00000001@mb-fb.aol.com>

>There still isn't any "international law" that exists as LAW in
> any other country, complete with police and courts and such.

Ratification of the rules of the ITU makes them law in the United States,
subject to changes and modifications made by our administration.

No new courts and police necessary.

>"International law" boils down to a common-agreement on the
> part of members, an honor system. If someone doesn't want
> to be part of the honor system, they can't be prosecuted in a
> real court...they are "prosecuted" (part way) by other means

Sure they can. The United States is presently the subject of several
suits in The Hague.

>Well, you take that up with the administration and legislature of
> the state of Ohio.

The administration and legislature of the State of Ohio have nothing to do
with Congressional panels or committees that members of thier bodies may be
party to.

>Pizzing or not, WARC-79 was TWENTY-FOUR YEARS AGO.
> The dispute between SW BC folks and hams on the 40m band
> HASN'T BEEN RESOLVED YET. Why not?

Because all those "radio professionals" can't get their collective heads
out of thier rectums long enough to make up their minds.

>24 years. Enough time to sire a child and have them graduate
> college.

How would you know? How many do YOU have, Lennie?

>"Beep, beep..." - the Book of Pokemon

"Error Will Robinson, ERROR!"

That's the Book of Road Runner.

Sheesh. If you had kids ya wudda known.

Steve

495. Re: ARNewsline 1326 - Jan 10 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-15 00:28:16 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030114192816.13920.00000669@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 59577

>Subject: Re: ARNewsline 1326 - Jan 10 2003
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 1/14/03 6:00 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030114190017.22983.00000625@mb-mf.aol.com>

>
>News, while useful, is not policy. It should not be here.

Sheesh!

Vipul, news AFFECTS policy and reflects CHANGES in policies. Do you think changes occur in a vacuum?

No...Not every Newsline post reflects policy matters, but who are YOU or anyone else to edit or censor ANY news release in ANY media to decide what is or isn't policy related?

It should be here. I for one am glad that it is. It belongs in this forum more than most of the posts (and yes, many of my own) do.

Steve, K4YZ

496. Re: ARNewsline 1326 - Jan 10 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-15 00:30:32 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030114193032.13920.00000670@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 59578

>Subject: Re: ARNewsline 1326 - Jan 10 2003
>From: "Big Al" BigAl@HeadHoncho.net
>Date: 1/14/03 1:04 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <b01mv0$a85$0@pita.alt.net>
>
> Pasternak continues to SPAM Usenet with his worthless Spew.
> Weekly Pasternak SPAM follows:

First you whine about Bill Pasernak's posting of his Newsline release here,
then you re-quote it in it's entirety.

His post was not spam. Your's was. Anonymous Putz.

Steve. K4YZ

497. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-15 00:37:46 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b02ah3$1v1$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 59579

Why do you say that Jim? (no big deal, really).

I took mine in 75 or 76 and it was probably a similar test.
I was/am quite proud to have passed it. And I know this will piss off some folks...but.....that is when it meant something.

So be proud.

Just don't be a bragard like some are.

Dan/W4NTI

> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> > Extra class since 1970 (no big deal, really)
>
> w3rv

498. Re: ARNewsline 1326 - Jan 10 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-15 01:41:23 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <7%2V9.10734$Qr4.1050633@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 59580

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> flashed his Knet Kop badge and announced:

:
: News, while useful, is not policy. It should not be here..
:
..and
:
: The newsgroup has degenerated into a personal playground.
:
..and
:
: Very little discussion of amateur radio policy occurs here.
:

Sri, Mr. Shah, but I missed the announcement where your appointment to Knet
Kontent Kontrol was announced.

QSL? QRU?

73, de Hans, K0HB
Grand Exhalted Keeper of the Codes of Q

499. Re: ARNewsline 1326 - Jan 10 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-15 02:28:33 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.51.0301150226400.14111@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 59581

On Wed, 15 Jan 2003, Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>>Subject: Re: ARNewsline 1326 - Jan 10 2003
>>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>>Date: 1/14/03 6:00 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20030114190017.22983.00000625@mb-mf.aol.com>
>
>>
>>News, while useful, is not policy. It should not be here.
>
> Sheesh!
>
> Vipul, news AFFECTS policy and reflects CHANGES in policies. Do you think
>changes occur in a vacuum?
>
> No...Not every Newsline post reflects policy matters, but who are YOU or
>anyone else to edit or censor ANY news release in ANY media to decide what is
>or isn't policy related?
>
> It should be here. I for one am glad that it is. It belongs in this forum
>more than most of the posts (and yes, many of my own) do.

No, it shouldn't. The "rec.radio" newsgroups unified charter indicates that
this type of message belongs in "rec.radio.info", not here.

Agreed that there is and has been alot of TRASH in this newsgroup (and in
"rec.radio.amateur.misc"), but that still doesn't make it proper for the
Newsline SPAM to be here in violation of charter.

500. Re: ARNewsline 1326 - Jan 10 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-15 02:33:13 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030114213313.22983.00000629@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 59582

We seem to forget the meaning of words.
Policy and news do not mean the same thing.
A dictionary may help, but i'm sure you know what these words mean.

Just as when a news item was posted about Hams doing a service. It is news.
News is an event. An event without opinion is not policy. It later became
policy when it was discussed, but the original news story is not policy.

So, whats the harm? Information can be useful. But when you want information
about one topic (policy), you don't want to sort through another topic (such as
news). I'm not saying news is bad. I read news. I should get news when I am
looking for news, not when looking for policy.

Also, the name calling and personal battles cut down on policy information.

501. Re: ARNewsline 1326 - Jan 10 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-15 02:40:53 UTC
From: Lloyd <Lloyd@HerbIsMyLeader14313.net>
Message-ID: <b02hn6$3bt$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 59583

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in

> First you whine about Bill Pasernak's posting of his Newsline release
here,
> then you re-quote it in it's entirety.
>
> His post was not spam. Your's was. Anonymous Putz.
>
> Steve. K4YZ

YAAAAAWWWWWWN! You are soooooo predictable!

Lloyd

502. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-15 02:59:27 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030114215927.22983.00000630@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 59584

From: wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX)
>Just like when you key the Mic on your 2 Meter CB

I didn't know they had 2 meter CBs! When a ham puts a 2 meter rig in his car is it a 2 meter CB? Just curious.

WA8ULX makes one and only one point: that ALL hams that have not passed the code test are CBplussers.

Does WA8ULX have any proof that ALL no code techs are CBplussers? Do any studies, polling, etc indicate this?

Also, how do we know ALL Hams that passed the code test is not a CBplusser? Upon passing the code test, does one instantly gain the technical knowledge to be a better operator?

WA8ULX , lets see some information backing up your accusations.

503. Re: Another Morse Code Opinion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-15 03:36:50 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030114223650.25350.00000002@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 59588

In article <v1abac6jt0kv22@corp.supernews.com>, "KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com>
writes:

>"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030102214556.22983.00000376@mb-mf.aol.com...
><SNIP>
>> From KB9TMP
>> >Have a "Hammy" New Year!
>> Cute alterations of the word "ham" do not endear everyone. Just like
>regularly
>> in QST when people see the word "ham" in various signs. It's weird.
>
>Are you out to rain on everyone's parade?

You finally figured out his game, huh?

>If you don't like
>ham radio the way it is. If you don't like ham radio operators
>the way they are. Why are you a ham at all?

Excellent question!

>It seems like you
>are trying to change everyone to your version of radio.

The funny thing is, we don't see very much about what that version is. Only
what it isn't. Sort of a Zen thing.

>I started
>doing the "Hammy" line because everyone else was saying
>Happy New Year, and I thought I'd be a little different.

It's cute, it's funny, it's appropriate for ham coversations. I'm gonna steal
it next season.

>If you
>got your way my daughter when she was 2 years old would
>have been chastised for saying "Happy Two Ears"!

Codewords?
>
>V why don't you just chill out. You are the ONLY one in
>here that has said anything about my little tag line. Even Bruce
>who hates everyone and everything didn't say a word about
>it, JUST YOU!

Don't let him get ya, some folks can't stand to see others have fun.

73 de Jim, N2EY

504. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-15 03:36:51 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030114223651.25350.00000003@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 59589

In article <d22b54c3.0301140711.1ce3df85@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20030114063630.02538.00000991@mb-da.aol.com>...
>> In article <d22b54c3.0301132025.4f924b5d@posting.google.com>,
>kelly@dvol.com
>> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>>
>> >"Mike H. KC8UBH" <mhaas@nospam.insight.rr.com> wrote in message
>> >news:<G9IU9.58076$GF.17879716@twister.columbus.rr.com>...
>> >
>> >> Next time you go to your next field day with a whole bunch of Extra
>class
>> >> HAMS standing around looking important and being jerks, thank the
>No-Code
>> >> Techs who did the *real* work setting THAT event up.
>> >
>> >Yeah, right, tell that to the horde of nocode rubberneckers who stood
>> >around watching the last time I bothered opearating FD with them. When
>> >3 or so of us beeped our way to two thirds of "their" score.
>>
>> Hey! I was one of those 3 or so!
>>
>> We had clueless newbie rubberneckers of all license classes. And clueless
>OTs,
>> too. Lotsa fun anyhow. Like listening to the 40 SSB bandleader loudly
>proclaim
>> how "his" station had peaked at something like 30 QSOs/hr for 40 minutes,
>then
>> quietly pointing out how the 80 CW station had done a run 60 QSOs/hr for
>twice
>> that long.....
>>
>> Or the really funny looks when I pulled out the ARC-5-and-dynamotor setup
>to
>> copy the W1AW message at 10 AM on Saturday. First 100 points of the event,
>> earned in about ten minutes.
>>
>> >We haven't been back since, we don't need them to "set up the event"
>> >or cook our hot dogs for us.
>>
>> Actually the guy in charge of food was a General, as I recall.
>

>Eric & Joey are both 20wpm Extras.

Well, there you have it. Funny as all get out. This FD I got to cook some.

>> But the best was
>> the homemade hummus and pita brought by an Extra.
>>
>> Six and a half months to the next one...
>
>Yeah, but you're not gonna put up with that bunch any more than I will huh?

All depends on the situation then. Lotta folks out this way have big backyards
with tall trees, and with the K2 and a big battery one can have quite a time.
Or glom a quiet Honda EU series genset and a 100W rig.

Main problem I have with FD these days is too many good ideas!

73 de Jim, N2EY

>
>w3rv
>
>

505. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-15 03:36:52 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030114223652.25350.00000004@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 59587

In article <b02ah3$1v1$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:

>Why do you say that Jim? (no big deal, really).

'Cause it's only one accomplishment in a ham career of over 35 years.
>
>I took mine in 75 or 76 and it was probably a similar test.

Yup. FCC office, the whole deal. From another era.

>I was/am quite proud to have passed it.

Yeah, me too. But there's no point in making a big deal of it.

>And I know this will piss off some
>folks...but.....that is when it meant something.
>
Still does!

>So be proud.
>
>Just don't be a bragard like some are.
>
Good points, Dan, but the way I see it is this: The license test was just the beginning. What's most important is what is done with the license. Rigs built, QSOs, skills developed, friendships made, equipment destroyed, antennas raised, 807s consumed, articles written, beginners Elmered, SKN, FD, SS, DX tests, club meetings, hamfests, etc., etc.

That's the stuff what's a big deal.

73 de Jim, N2EY

Extra class since 1970 (no big deal, really)

506. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-15 03:36:53 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030114223653.25350.00000006@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 59585

In article <d22b54c3.0301141620.5e889058@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>Subject: Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade
>From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)
>Date: 14 Jan 2003 16:20:22 -0800
>
>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20030113210548.01791.00000391@mb-cb.aol.com>...
>
>>
>> >they are only 1 Step Above a cber, and its
>> >really a pretty tiny step, actually you really cant tell much difference
>>
>> Maybe YOU can't, but I sure can. No such thing as a cb licnese, for one
>thing.
>
>'Scuse me here but I have a Class D Citizens Radio Service station &
>operator's license issued to me by the FCC, callsign is KLK1937.

And it expired when?

73 de Jim, N2EY

507. Re: No more usernet for AOL'rs ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-15 03:36:53 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030114223653.25350.00000005@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 59586

In article <waWU9.9388$Dq.982775@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
<kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG> writes:

>Subject: Re: No more usernet for AOL'rs ?
>From: "Kï¿½HB" <kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG>
>Date: Tue, 14 Jan 2003 15:39:08 GMT
>
>"Joe" <joe.amp@NOSPAMverizon.net> wrote
>
>:
>: AOL users can read newsgroups, but any posts they make will be
>: seen ONLY by other AOL members.
>:
>
>Finally an effective K4YZ/Len Anderson filter.

If you are reading this and you're not on AOL, the filter doesn't work.
>
>Sunuvagun! Life is good!

This mud is happy.
>
>Hey, N0iMD, I hear AOL is giving away 1,000 free hours to new subscribers.
>Check it out. Please!

1025, to be exact.
>
Trouble is, that story is just another urban legend.

73 de Jim, N2EY

508. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-15 03:38:23 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030114223823.18004.00001245@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 59590

>I didn't know they had 2 meter CBs! When a ham puts a 2 meter rig in his car
>is
>it a 2 meter CB?

Of course

>WA8ULX makes one and only one point: that ALL hams that have not passed the
>code test are CBplussers.
>

True again

>Upon passing the code test, does one instantly gain the technical knowledge
>to
>be a better operator?

By passing the Dumb Down written does that prove you know the material, of course not. Most new Hams have know Idea what was on the test.

>WA8ULX , lets see some information backing up your accusations.

Well thats easy, just turn on your 2 Meter CB, and listen for 2 minutes, by then you will understand.

509. Re: ARNewsline 1326 - Jan 10 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-15 03:41:07 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030114224107.18004.00001246@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 59591

>Also, the name calling and personal battles cut down on policy information.
>

WIMP

510. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-15 04:17:11 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030114231711.17987.00001093@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 59592

>'Scuse me here but I have a Class D Citizens Radio Service station &
>>operator's license issued to me by the FCC, callsign is KLK1937.
>
>And it expired when?
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

His never expired, hes still a CBer

511. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-15 04:18:38 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3E24E11D.C38237E3@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 59593

WA8ULX wrote:

>
> Well thats easy, just turn on your 2 Meter CB, and listen for 2 minutes, by
> then you will understand.

Doesn't sound like the CB band at all. No echo boxes, music, people jaw
boneing to nobody in particular. 2M is well behaved around these parts
in NNJ. Besides, code wasn't that good of a lid filter, as witness 14313
back before reconstruction.

512. Re: ARNewsline 1326 - Jan 10 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-15 10:00:30 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030115050030.01819.00000312@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 59594

>Subject: Re: ARNewsline 1326 - Jan 10 2003
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 1/14/03 8:33 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030114213313.22983.00000629@mb-mf.aol.com>

>We seem to forget the meaning of words.
>Policy and news do not mean the same thing.
>A dictionary may help, but i'm sure you know what these words mean.

No, YOU seem to have missed the point, Vipul. Policy cannot be made in a vacuum. It requires that all participants be knowledgeable and INFORMED. To be informed one requires INFORMATION. Information is procured from deveral sources, the NEWS being one of them.

>Just as when a news item was posted about Hams doing a service. It is news.
>News is an event. An event without opinion is not policy. It later became
>policy when it was discussed, but the original news story is not policy.

And without NEWS of the event being promulgated how do you being it to a discussion, Vipul?

>I'm not saying news is bad. I read news. I should get news when I am
>looking for news, not when looking for policy.

So you'd rather have to go to several places to get the information you need for "policy" discussions..?!?!

If you are so offended by the Newsline posts, skip over them. The posts are CLEARLY captioned as such. Just don't read it.

Steve, K4YZ

513. Re: ARNewsline 1326 - Jan 10 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-15 10:01:13 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030115050113.01819.00000313@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 59595

>Subject: Re: ARNewsline 1326 - Jan 10 2003
>From: "Lloyd" Lloyd@HerbIsMyLeader14313.net
>Date: 1/14/03 8:40 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <b02hn6$3bt$0@pita.alt.net>

>YAAAAAWWWWWWN! You are soooooo predictable!

And you're an idiot. Your point is?

514. Re: ARNewsline 1326 - Jan 10 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-15 10:02:18 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030115050218.01819.00000314@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 59596

>Subject: Re: ARNewsline 1326 - Jan 10 2003
>From: "Kï¿½HB" kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG
>Date: 1/14/03 7:41 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <7%2V9.10734$Qr4.1050633@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>

>Sri, Mr. Shah, but I missed the announcement where your appointment to Knet
>Kontent Kontrol was announced.
>
>QSL? QRU?

LOL! WTG! ROTFLMMFAO!

73 de K4YZ AR

515. Re: ARNewsline 1326 - Jan 10 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-15 10:06:57 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030115050657.01819.00000315@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 59597

>Subject: Re: ARNewsline 1326 - Jan 10 2003
>From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org
>Date: 1/14/03 8:28 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <Pine.LNX.4.51.0301150226400.14111@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>

>No, it shouldn't. The "rec.radio" newsgroups unified charter indicates that
>this type of message belongs in "rec.radio.info", not here.

Dieter, if it's that much of a problem for you, then just skip over his
posts when you see them in the newsreader.

>Agreed that there is and has been alot of TRASH in this newsgroup (and in
>"rec.radio.amateur.misc"), but that still doesn't make it proper for the
>Newsline SPAM to be here in violation of charter

It's not spam. You may not LIKE it, but it's not spam.

73

Steve, K4YZ

516. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-15 10:12:54 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030115051254.01819.00000316@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 59598

>Subject: Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 1/14/03 8:59 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030114215927.22983.00000630@mb-mf.aol.com>

>Does WA8ULX have any proof that ALL no code techs are CBplussers? Do any
>studies, polling, etc indicate this?

Vipul, you only feed his rants. That's why the putz is in my killfile.

>Also, how do we know ALL Hams that passed the code test is not a CBplusser?

There is no such thing as a "CBplusser".

>Upon passing the code test, does one instantly gain the technical knowledge
>to
>be a better operator?

No, one does not gain "technical knowledge", however learning (and at
least occassionally using) Morse Code makes one a more functional operator.

>WA8ULX , lets see some information backing up your accusations.

Whew...Seems I heard something like that being asked of someone who kept
insisting that Amateur Radio was somehow rife with "code words". That person
hasn't answered the questions put to him yet.

Steve, K4YZ

517. Re: No more usernet for AOL'rs ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-15 10:21:07 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030115052107.01819.00000317@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 59599

>Subject: Re: No more usernet for AOL'rs ?
>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>Date: 1/14/03 9:36 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030114223653.25350.00000005@mb-mj.aol.com>

>>Hey, N0iMD, I hear AOL is giving away 1,000 free hours to new subscribers.
>>Check it out. Please!
>
>1025, to be exact.

My question is are they going to pay a death benefit to the family or
medical benefits to anyone who survived trying to rack up all 1025 hours in the
45 day period...?!?!

>Trouble is, that story is just another urban legend.

Yep..right up there with the "They're gonna take away out Instant
Messenger!" petition that makes it around every 6 months or so...

=)

73

Steve, K4YZ

518. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-15 13:14:28 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0301150514.6d38c533@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59600

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:<3E24E11D.C38237E3@ix.netcom.com>...
> WA8ULX wrote:
>
> >
> > Well thats easy, just turn on your 2 Meter CB, and listen for 2 minutes, by
> > then you will understand.
>
> Doesn't sound like the CB band at all.

Agreed.

> No echo boxes, music, people jaw
> boneing to nobody in particular.

No illegal power amps, no "keydowns", no hiding one's real identity
through use of "handles".

> 2M is well behaved around these parts
> in NNJ.

Same here in EPA. Lots of nice people, though. Friends 'n' neighbors.
Watta concept, huh?

> Besides, code wasn't that good of a lid filter, as witness 14313
> back before reconstruction.

What mode did those folks use on 14313? Sure wasn't code!

73 de Jim, N2EY

519. Re: ARNewsline 1326 - Jan 10 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-15 13:15:43 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b03n1g$4ga$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 59651

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030114190017.22983.00000625@mb-mf.aol.com...
> > Pasternak continues to SPAM Usenet with his worthless Spew.
>
> News, while useful, is not policy. It should not be here..

I disagree...much of the news is and always has been a foundation
for either supporting existing policy or as a catalyst for change in policy.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

520. Re: Just One More Example

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-15 13:46:00 UTC
From: NoName <user@computer.net>
Message-ID: <pcpa2v4cv4tkkfacskpod0u12q75gleb3d@4ax.com>
Source record: 59652

Robeson why are you so obsessed. Lennie doesn't love you
try to learn to live with it. This is how most domestic violence
tragedies begin. Please try to get professional help.

You friend,

On 15 Jan 2003 00:22:52 GMT, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote:

>>Subject: Re: Just One More Example
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 1/14/03 2:56 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20030114155632.10800.00000001@mb-fb.aol.com>
>
>>There still isn't any "international law" that exists as LAW in
>> any other country, complete with police and courts and such.
>
> Ratification of the rules of the ITU makes them law in the United States,
>subject to changes and modifications made by our administration.
>
> No new courts and police necessary.
>
>>"International law" boils down to a common-agreement on the
>> part of members, an honor system. If someone doesn't want
>> to be part of the honor system, they can't be prosecuted in a
>> real court...they are "prosecuted" (part way) by other means
>
> Sure they can. The United States is presently the subject of several
>suits in The Hague.
>
>>Well, you take that up with the administration and legislature of
>> the state of Ohio.
>
> The administration and legislature of the State of Ohio have nothing to do
>with Congressional panels or committees that members of thier bodies may be
>party to.
>
>>Pizzing or not, WARC-79 was TWENTY-FOUR YEARS AGO.
>> The dispute between SW BC folks and hams on the 40m band
>> HASN'T BEEN RESOLVED YET. Why not?
>
> Because all those "radio professionals" can't get their collective heads
>out of thier rectums long enough to make up their minds.
>
>>24 years. Enough time to sire a child and have them graduate
>> college.

>
> How would you know? How many do YOU have, Lennie?
>
>>"Beep, beep..." - the Book of Pokemon
>
> "Error Will Robinson, ERROR!"
>
> That's the Book of Road Runner.
>
> Sheesh. If you had kids ya wudda known.
>
>Steve
>
>
>

521. Re: Just One More Example

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-15 14:05:24 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030115090524.05773.00000001@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 59653

>Subject: Re: Just One More Example
>From: NoName user@computer.net
>Date: 1/15/03 7:46 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <pcpa2v4cv4tkkfacskpod0u12q75gleb3d@4ax.com>

>Robeson why are you so obsessed. Lennie doesn't love you
>try to learn to live with it. This is how most domestic violence
>tragedies begin. Please try to get professional help.
>
> You friend,

Anonymous, functionally illiterate, and most likely unlicensed.

Creep.

522. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-15 14:33:51 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030115093351.11342.00000003@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 59654

>Doesn't sound like the CB band at all.

Thats because your use to CB and cant tell the difference.

523. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-15 14:36:46 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030115093646.11342.00000004@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 59655

> Vipul, you only feed his rants. That's why the putz is in my killfile.
>

Then stop reading my stuff.

>There is no such thing as a "CBplusser".

Spoken like a true CBplusser

524. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-15 14:44:09 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0301150644.8acc294@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59656

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message news:<20030114223653.25350.00000006@mb-mj.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0301141620.5e889058@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >Subject: Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade
> >From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)
> >Date: 14 Jan 2003 16:20:22 -0800
> >
> >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> >news:<20030113210548.01791.00000391@mb-cb.aol.com>...
> >
> >>
> >> >they are only 1 Step Above a cber, and its
> >> >really a pretty tiny step, actually you really cant tell much difference
> >>
> >> Maybe YOU can't, but I sure can. No such thing as a cb licnese, for one
> >thing.
> >
> >'Scuse me here but I have a Class D Citizens Radio Service station &
> >operator's license issued to me by the FCC, callsign is KLK1937.
>
> And it expired when?

I think they were issued "for the duration". There is such a thing and
I do have one, expired or not.

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

525. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-15 14:47:32 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0301150647.3fccc806@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59657

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030114231711.17987.00001093@mb-mv.aol.com>...
> >'Scuse me here but I have a Class D Citizens Radio Service station &
> >>operator's license issued to me by the FCC, callsign is KLK1937.
> >
> >And it expired when?
> >
> >73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> His never expired, hes still a CBer

I'll outbeep you Sweetums and I got that CB ticket years after I
passed the 20wpm thing.

w3rv

526. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-15 15:10:39 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030115101039.13448.00000004@mb-fe.aol.com>
Source record: 59658

>I think they were issued "for the duration". There is such a thing and
>I do have one, expired or not.
>

Even if the were not issued for the duration you sure are proud of it. Now go back on channel 11 or 14 or what ever channel you use. Your just another CBer with a give away Ham License.

527. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-15 15:11:27 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030115101127.13448.00000005@mb-fe.aol.com>
Source record: 59659

>I'll outbeep you Sweetums and I got that CB ticket years after I
>passed the 20wpm thing.
>
>w3rv

Beep on big boy.

528. Re: ARNewsline 1326 - Jan 10 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-15 16:16:13 UTC
From: "Paul W. Schleck" <pschleck@novia.net>
Message-ID: <3e25889a$0$446$45beb828@newscene.com>
Source record: 59660

In <b03n1g$4ga$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030114190017.22983.00000625@mb-mf.aol.com...
>> > Pasternak continues to SPAM Usenet with his worthless Spew.
>>
>> News, while useful, is not policy. It should not be here..

>I disagree...much of the news is and always has been a foundation
>for either supporting existing policy or as a catalyst for change in policy.

>Cheers,
>Bill K2UNK

Simultaneously crossposting these to rec.radio.info would help resolve
such long-standing debates about the appropriateness of FAQ and bulletin
documents in the discussion newsgroups. See:

http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=3c3fb961%240%2459826%2445beb828%40newscene.com

Please E-mail me if you have any questions, or require assistance in
properly formatting your bulletin or FAQ for simultaneous cross-posting
to rec.radio.info.

--
73, Paul W. Schleck, K3FU
pschleck@novia.net
http://www.novia.net/~pschleck/
Finger pschleck@novia.net for PGP Public Key

529. Re: No more usernet for AOL'rs ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-15 16:17:26 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0301150817.439b18ae@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59661

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030115052107.01819.00000317@mb-bh.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: No more usernet for AOL'rs ?
> >From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> >Date: 1/14/03 9:36 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20030114223653.25350.00000005@mb-mj.aol.com>
>
> >>Hey, N0iMD, I hear AOL is giving away 1,000 free hours to new subscribers.
> >>Check it out. Please!
> >
> >1025, to be exact.
>
> My question is are they going to pay a death benefit to the family or
> medical benefits to anyone who survived trying to rack up all 1025 hours in the
> 45 day period...?!?!

Hope springs eternal.

24 x 45 = 1080
>
> >Trouble is, that story is just another urban legend.
>
> Yep..right up there with the "They're gonna take away out Instant
> Messenger!" petition that makes it around every 6 months or so...
>
> =)
>
'zactly.

73 de Jim, N2EY

530. Re: Another Morse Code Opinion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-15 16:26:31 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v2b2tk15qbpu3d@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 59662

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030114223650.25350.00000002@mb-mj.aol.com...
> In article <v1abac6jt0kv22@corp.supernews.com>, "KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com>
> writes:
>
> >"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20030102214556.22983.00000376@mb-mf.aol.com...
> ><SNIP>
> >> From KB9TMP
> >> >Have a "Hammy" New Year!
> >> Cute alterations of the word "ham" do not endear everyone. Just like
> >regularly
> >> in QST when people see the word "ham" in various signs. It's weird.
> >>
> >Are you out to rain on everyone's parade?
>
> You finally figured out his game, huh?

Yea I just didn't want to believe it!
You know hoping for the turnaround
like Scrooge had on Christmas morning.

>
> >If you don't like
> >ham radio the way it is. If you don't like ham radio operators
> >the way they are. Why are you a ham at all?
>
> Excellent question!
>
> >It seems like you
> >are trying to change everyone to your version of radio.
>
> The funny thing is, we don't see very much about what that version is.
Only
> what it isn't. Sort of a Zen thing.
>
> >I started
> >doing the "Hammy" line because everyone else was saying
> >Happy New Year, and I thought I'd be a little different.
>
> It's cute, it's funny, it's appropriate for ham coversations. I'm gonna
steal
> it next season.
>

Please do so, the line is not copyrighted, but I will be using
it also (I saved it in my newsreader program) :^)

> >If you
> >got your way my daughter when she was 2 years old would
> >have been chastised for saying "Happy Two Ears"!
>
> Codewords?

I'm not sure, but at that age a lot of what they say
sounds like codewords. :^)

> >
> >V why don't you just chill out. You are the ONLY one in
> >here that has said anything about my little tag line. Even Bruce
> >who hates everyone and everything didn't say a word about
> >it, JUST YOU!
>
> Don't let him get ya, some folks can't stand to see others have fun.

I'm thinking about getting a puppy and naming it Vipul
that way whenever he starts in I can kick the dog and
yell Vipul will you shut up!!! I won't do anything for
Vipul but it'll make me feel LOTS BETTER! ;^)

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

I wonder if Vipul will gripe about using Groucho as
a signature, some sort of a "secret code" between
Marx Bro's fans no doubt!
--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx

531. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-15 17:26:56 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0301150926.221b9c49@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59663

vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030114215927.22983.00000630@mb-mf.aol.com>...
> From: wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX)
> >Just like when you key the Mic on your 2 Meter CB
>
> I didn't know they had 2 meter CBs!

Nor me!

> When a ham puts a 2 meter rig in his car is
> it a 2 meter CB? Just curious.
>
cb hasn't needed a license since the mid-1970s. A ham license is
needed to operate a 2 meter rig. Therefore, a 2 meter rig cannot be a
cb, by definition.

Simple logic - which escapes some people.
> ---
> WA8ULX makes one and only one point: that ALL hams that have not passed the
> code test are CBplussers.

Not a point. Just a put-down.

And one cannot tell from the license class whether someone has passed
a code test. Any given Tech may have passed the code test but not the
written (yet). And for almost 3 years the FCC has been renewing Tech
Pluses as Techs.

> Does WA8ULX have any proof that ALL no code techs are CBplussers?

No such proof can exist, as shown above. The license simply says
"Technician".

> Do any studies, polling, etc indicate this?
>
> Also, how do we know ALL Hams that passed the code test is not a CBplusser?

First you have to prove such a thing even exists.

> Upon passing the code test, does one instantly gain the technical knowledge to
> be a better operator?

What "technical knowledge" is needed to be a better operator that is
not covered by the Tech written?

Operating better requires SKILL. Code skill is one of the skills that
makes someone a better operator.
> ---

>
> WA8ULX , lets see some information backing up your accusations.

Don't hold yer breath while waiting...

73 de Jim, N2EY

who was a Technician class ham back in 1968....

532. Re: No more usernet for AOL'rs ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-15 18:28:27 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <fLhV9.11844$Qr4.1151830@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 59664

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

:
: If you are reading this and you're not on AOL, the filter doesn't work.
:

Chit!

K0HB

533. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-15 18:38:35 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030115133835.18646.00000004@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 59665

>A ham license is
>needed to operate a 2 meter rig. Therefore, a 2 meter rig cannot be a
>cb, by definition.

Better tell that to the Trucker Drivers on 10, oh thats right it cant happen, because you have to have a License

>Not a point. Just a put-down.

Just the facts

>The license simply says
>"Technician".

Thats just a fell good term to make the Cbers think they have done something.

>First you have to prove such a thing even exists.

Easy turn on your 2 meter CB, and you will find all the facts you need

>who was a Technician class ham back in 1968....

I was, but I was all so a Novice at the same time, and shortly there after a General, and shortly there after an Advanced, so whats your point?

534. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-15 19:03:34 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0301151103.4c4032d5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59666

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030115101039.13448.00000004@mb-fe.aol.com>...
> >I think they were issued "for the duration". There is such a thing and
> >I do have one, expired or not.
> >
>
> Even if the were not issued for the duration you sure are proud of it.

I said I have one, read whatever ya want into that, I could care less.

> Now go
> back on channel 11 or 14 or what ever channel you use. Your just another CBer
> with a give away Ham License.

Not quite. I headed up a volunteer municipal security patrol operation
which used CB radio when it got started so I got the license. I later
moved the operation to VHF FM ~25 years ago which was the last time I
had any interest at all in CB.

w3rv

535. ECFS Express

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-15 19:37:40 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <8MiV9.11927$Qr4.1181724@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 59667

SB QST @ ARL $ARLB005
ARLB005 FCC Launches Consumer-Oriented Electronic Comment Filing
System

ZCZC AG05
QST de W1AW
ARRL Bulletin 5 ARLB005
From ARRL Headquarters
Newington CT January 15, 2003
To all radio amateurs

SB QST ARL ARLB005
ARLB005 FCC Launches Consumer-Oriented Electronic Comment Filing
System

The FCC has launched ECFS Express, an updated electronic system that the Commission says will make it easier for some members of the public to file comments on FCC proceedings. ECFS Express is a simplified version of the popular Electronic Comment Filing System (ECFS), but it is not available for all FCC proceedings.

ECFS Express focuses on topics rather than docket numbers, and requires minimal input by consumers seeking to participate in the Commission's public rulemaking process. ECFS Express is accessible from the FCC home page at http://www.fcc.gov. Users click on the "File Comments" logo. Anyone who wants to comment just has to click on a topic, fill in their personal information, write their comments and hit "SEND."

The FCC said the downside is that if the particular issue you want to comment upon is not listed among the ECFS Express topics, you'll have to use the full version of ECFS, located at http://www.fcc.gov/e-file/ecfs.html, to comment on proceedings not listed. At the moment, the EFCS Express list includes no Amateur Radio-related proceedings.

FCC Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau Chief K. Dane Snowden said, "By making the process more intuitive and less technical, all those interested in what we are doing at the FCC can have their voices heard. Our goal is to have as much of the public as possible participate in our rulemaking processes."
NNNN
/EX

536. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-15 20:38:19 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030115153819.21495.00000009@mb-mu.aol.com>
Source record: 59668

```
>I later
>moved the operation to VHF FM ~25 years ago which was the last time I
>had any interest at all in CB.
>
>w3rv

Not true if you still operate 2 Meter CB
```

537. Re: A Website for all 75M & 20M wankers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-15 21:47:57 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <hGkV9.12096$Qr4.1197577@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 59669
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"6-fingers man" <pgastinkear@hotmail.com> wrote
:
: ***** Wankers Over 50 is YOUR Home on the Web!! *****
:

Six Fingers, CLICK HERE: http://www.acsu.buffalo.edu/~kinho/youare.swf

or here: http://www.amishrakefight.org/gfy

538. Re: ECFS Express

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-15 22:44:20 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030115174420.05807.00000021@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 59670

>Subject: ECFS Express
>From: "Kï¿½HB" kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG
>Date: 1/15/03 1:37 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <8MiV9.11927$Qr4.1181724@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
>
>SB QST @ ARL $ARLB005
>ARLB005 FCC Launches Consumer-Oriented Electronic Comment Filing
>System
>
>ZCZC AG05
>QST de W1AW
>ARRL Bulletin 5 ARLB005
>From ARRL Headquarters
>Newington CT January 15, 2003
>To all radio amateurs
>
>SB QST ARL ARLB005
>ARLB005 FCC Launches Consumer-Oriented Electronic Comment Filing
>System
>
>The FCC has launched...(SNIP)

NO, HANS! DON'T DO IT ! ! !

IT'S NEWS, NOT P-O-L-I-C-Y ! ! ! ! ! !

=0

73

Steve, K4YZ

539. Re: Just One More Example

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-15 23:52:22 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.h8rw0td.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 59671

On 15 Jan 2003 00:22:52 GMT, Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:

>>Pizzing or not, WARC-79 was TWENTY-FOUR YEARS AGO.
>> The dispute between SW BC folks and hams on the 40m band
>> HASN'T BEEN RESOLVED YET. Why not?
>
> Because all those "radio professionals" can't get their collective
>heads out of thier rectums long enough to make up their minds.

Not really - it's because the Region I broadcasters say "screw you,
buddy - I got mine" to anyone who wants to displace them, just as
the US military through the NTIA said to the amateurs about 6.9-7.0
MHz here.

Shows you the REAL view of "the needs of amateur radio" in the
larger scheme of things. We're lucky to keep what we have at 7 MHz.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

540. Re: ARNewsline 1326 - Jan 10 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-15 23:55:43 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.51.0301152353560.14669@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 59672

On Wed, 15 Jan 2003, Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>>Subject: Re: ARNewsline 1326 - Jan 10 2003
>>From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org
>>Date: 1/14/03 8:28 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <Pine.LNX.4.51.0301150226400.14111@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
>
>>No, it shouldn't. The "rec.radio" newsgroups unified charter indicates that
>>this type of message belongs in "rec.radio.info", not here.
>
> Dieter, if it's that much of a problem for you, then just skip over his
>posts when you see them in the newsreader.
>
>>Agreed that there is and has been alot of TRASH in this newsgroup (and in
>>"rec.radio.amateur.misc"), but that still doesn't make it proper for the
>>Newsline SPAM to be here in violation of charter
>
> It's not spam. You may not LIKE it, but it's not spam.

Spam or not, it's in violation of the charter for this newsgroup, and there's
no way that such could ever be considered appropriate.

I have told them that the appropriate group is "rec.radio.info" and that it is
inappropriate here. Now, I'm telling their provider (and have been doing so
for the past 2 months).

541. Re: ARNewsline 1326 - Jan 10 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-15 23:57:37 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.51.0301152356090.14669@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 59673

On Wed, 15 Jan 2003, Paul W. Schleck wrote:
>In <b03n1g$4ga$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>>"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
>>news:20030114190017.22983.00000625@mb-mf.aol.com...
>>> > Pasternak continues to SPAM Usenet with his worthless Spew.
>>>
>>> News, while useful, is not policy. It should not be here..
>
>>I disagree...much of the news is and always has been a foundation
>>for either supporting existing policy or as a catalyst for change in policy.
>
>>Cheers,
>>Bill K2UNK
>
>Simultaneously crossposting these to rec.radio.info would help resolve
>such long-standing debates about the appropriateness of FAQ and bulletin
>documents in the discussion newsgroups. See:
>
>http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=3c3fb961%240%2459826%2445beb828%40newscene.com
>
>Please E-mail me if you have any questions, or require assistance in
>properly formatting your bulletin or FAQ for simultaneous cross-posting
>to rec.radio.info.

Not exactly. The way I read the "rec.radio" newsgroups charter, cross-posting
this to "rec.radio.info" AND any other group in the hierarchy is still against
charter policy.

It should be posted to "rec.radio.info" ONLY and NO OTHER "rec.radio.*" group.

542. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-16 00:03:07 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b04srl$km6$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 59674

Well of course thats the important stuff.

Dan/W4NTI

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030114223652.25350.00000004@mb-mj.aol.com...
> In article <b02ah3$1v1$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
> <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:
>
> >Why do you say that Jim? (no big deal, really).
>
> 'Cause it's only one accomplishment in a ham career of over 35 years.
> >
> >I took mine in 75 or 76 and it was probably a similar test.
>
> Yup. FCC office, the whole deal. From another era.
>
> >I was/am quite proud to have passed it.
>
> Yeah, me too. But there's no point in making a big deal of it.
>
> >And I know this will piss off some
> >folks...but.....that is when it meant something.
> >
> Still does!
>
> >So be proud.
> >
> >Just don't be a bragard like some are.
> >
> Good points, Dan, but the way I see it is this: The license test was just
the
> beginning. What's most important is what is done with the license. Rigs
built,
> QSOs, skills developed, friendships made, equipment destroyed, antennas
raised,
> 807s consumed, articles written, beginners Elmered, SKN, FD, SS, DX tests,
club
> meetings, hamfests, etc., etc.
>
> That's the stuff what's a big deal.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Extra class since 1970 (no big deal, really)

>

543. Re: ARNewsline 1326 - Jan 10 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-16 00:24:18 UTC
From: "Paul W. Schleck" <pschleck@novia.net>
Message-ID: <3e25fb03$0$450$45beb828@newscene.com>
Source record: 59675

In <Pine.LNX.4.51.0301152356090.14669@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org> "D. Stussy"
<kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> writes:

>On Wed, 15 Jan 2003, Paul W. Schleck wrote:
>>In <b03n1g$4ga$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>>>"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
>>>news:20030114190017.22983.00000625@mb-mf.aol.com...
>>>> > Pasternak continues to SPAM Usenet with his worthless Spew.
>>>>
>>>> News, while useful, is not policy. It should not be here..
>>
>>>I disagree...much of the news is and always has been a foundation
>>>for either supporting existing policy or as a catalyst for change in policy.
>>
>>>Cheers,
>>>Bill K2UNK
>>
>>Simultaneously crossposting these to rec.radio.info would help resolve
>>such long-standing debates about the appropriateness of FAQ and bulletin
>>documents in the discussion newsgroups. See:
>>
>>http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=3c3fb961%240%2459826%2445beb828%40newscene.com
>>
>>Please E-mail me if you have any questions, or require assistance in
>>properly formatting your bulletin or FAQ for simultaneous cross-posting
>>to rec.radio.info.

>Not exactly. The way I read the "rec.radio" newsgroups charter, cross-posting
>this to "rec.radio.info" AND any other group in the hierarchy is still against
>charter policy.

>It should be posted to "rec.radio.info" ONLY and NO OTHER "rec.radio.*" group.

Could you quote specific passages of the charters that support your
position above? My understanding from reading the charters:

ftp://ftp.uu.net/usenet/news.announce.newgroups/rec/rec.radio.info
ftp://ftp.uu.net/usenet/news.announce.newgroups/rec/rec.radio.amateur-reorg
ftp://ftp.uu.net/usenet/news.announce.newgroups/rec/rec.radio.amateur.dx
ftp://ftp.uu.net/usenet/news.announce.newgroups/rec/rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors

both in terms of what they say and what they DON'T say, is that
cross-posting between groups is permitted (provided that the posts are
reasonably on-topic, and a reasonable number of groups are chosen). If
cross-posting is not specifically prohibited, then larger Usenet
guidelines, like those posted to news.announce.newusers:

ftp://rtfm.mit.edu/pub/usenet/news.answers/news/

apply. Furthermore, rec.radio.info was specifically intended from the get-go (I worked with VE6MGS to create the newsgroup in 1992/1993) as a cross-posting target like rec.music.info or news.answers.

Cross-posting is also discussed further in the "Guide to the Personal Radio Newsgroups" at:

ftp://rtfm.mit.edu/pub/usenet/news.answers/radio/personal-intro

--
73, Paul W. Schleck, K3FU
pschleck@novia.net
http://www.novia.net/~pschleck/
Finger pschleck@novia.net for PGP Public Key

544. Re: No more usernet for AOL'rs ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-16 01:57:00 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030115205700.27673.00000006@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 59676

In article <20030114223653.25350.00000005@mb-mj.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>>: AOL users can read newsgroups, but any posts they make will be
>>: seen ONLY by other AOL members.

Great! Now I can call Kim a !@#$%^&*@@!!!itch any time I want to and
she won't see it!

Now -- if only I could figure out what a "!@#$%^&*@@!!!itch" is!

Oh well, never mind. Kim won't see this, so it won't raise her blood pressure
any!

73 de Larry, K3LT

The above posting is humor. If anyone out there doesn't get the joke,
shame on you!

545. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-16 02:12:28 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E26150C.5070607@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 59689

Jackie wrote:
> "Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030115222359.04059.00000004@mb-fr.aol.com...
>
>>From K4YZ:
>>
>>>There is no such thing as a "CBplusser".
>>
>>A CBplusser is a poor operator, a tiny step above a CBer. WA8ULX claims
>
> that
>
>>ALL no-code techs are CBplussers and ALL that passed code are not
>
> CBplusser.
>
> And we all know how much ULX's opinions are worth... *phhfft* I don't listen
> to the opinions of trolls.
>
> Jackie

And he is an extra light, he would have never gotten the extra
except they dumbed down the test.

546. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-16 02:14:38 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E26158E.5030806@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 59690

WA8ULX extra lite wrote:

>
> The written is a complete JOKE
>

If it were not, you would never have passed it.

>

547. Re: ARNewsline 1326 - Jan 10 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-16 02:19:49 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b054vi$3i1$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 59677

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.51.0301152356090.14669@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
> On Wed, 15 Jan 2003, Paul W. Schleck wrote:
> >In <b03n1g$4ga$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net> "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> >>"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
> >>news:20030114190017.22983.00000625@mb-mf.aol.com...
> >>> > Pasternak continues to SPAM Usenet with his worthless Spew.
> >>>
> >>> News, while useful, is not policy. It should not be here..
> >
> >>I disagree...much of the news is and always has been a foundation
> >>for either supporting existing policy or as a catalyst for change in
policy.
> >
> >>Cheers,
> >>Bill K2UNK
> >
> >Simultaneously crossposting these to rec.radio.info would help resolve
> >such long-standing debates about the appropriateness of FAQ and bulletin
> >documents in the discussion newsgroups. See:
> >
>
>http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=3c3fb961%240%2459826%2445beb828%40news
cene.com
> >
> >Please E-mail me if you have any questions, or require assistance in
> >properly formatting your bulletin or FAQ for simultaneous cross-posting
> >to rec.radio.info.
>
> Not exactly. The way I read the "rec.radio" newsgroups charter,
cross-posting
> this to "rec.radio.info" AND any other group in the hierarchy is still
against
> charter policy.
>
> It should be posted to "rec.radio.info" ONLY and NO OTHER "rec.radio.*"
group.

Again I disagree. The rec.radio.info group is for ALL radio, not just
amateur.
The ARNewsline is devoted almost totally to amateur. I have no desire to
have to peruse a non-amateur newsgroup to find the postings related to
amateur newsline.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

548. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-16 03:16:34 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0301151916.359739fc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59678

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030115153819.21495.00000009@mb-mu.aol.com>...
> >I later
> >moved the operation to VHF FM ~25 years ago which was the last time I
> >had any interest at all in CB.
> >
> >w3rv
>
> Not true if you still operate 2 Meter CB

Yeah, right: I have three operable 2m FM xcvrs and I use 'em. Like I
oughta clutter up 75 to yak the guy down the street or what? Going
'way back I ran 2m AM "simplex" for the same reasons. Not that you
were ever there of course.

w3rv

549. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-16 03:23:59 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030115222359.04059.00000004@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 59679

From K4YZ:
> There is no such thing as a "CBplusser".

A CBplusser is a poor operator, a tiny step above a CBer. WA8ULX claims that ALL no-code techs are CBplussers and ALL that passed code are not CBplusser.

>>WA8ULX , lets see some information backing up your accusations.
> Whew...Seems I heard something like that being asked of someone who kept
>insisting that Amateur Radio was somehow rife with "code words". That person
>hasn't answered the questions put to him yet.

I have answered this plenty.

I will add this additional method. Invite someone that is unware of Ham radio. (Don't know what "Ham" radio is, didn't know Hams etc.). Take this person to a Hamfest and/or a couple meetings

Lets see if the average non-Ham agrees that Hams don't use codewords when they are not needed.

Also, ask if the person notices certain demographics. Also, lets see if the average non-Ham does not find Hams strange.

550. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-16 03:35:07 UTC
From: Jackie <no@address.given.com>
Message-ID: <LLpV9.573719$GR5.366473@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 59680

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030115222359.04059.00000004@mb-fr.aol.com...
> From K4YZ:
> > There is no such thing as a "CBplusser".
>
> A CBplusser is a poor operator, a tiny step above a CBer. WA8ULX claims
that
> ALL no-code techs are CBplussers and ALL that passed code are not
CBplusser.

And we all know how much ULX's opinions are worth... *phhfft* I don't listen
to the opinions of trolls.

Jackie

551. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-16 03:40:25 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030115224025.21580.00000025@mb-mu.aol.com>
Source record: 59681

>Going
>'way back I ran 2m AM "simplex" for the same reasons. Not that you
>were ever there of course.
>
>w3rv

Yea right

552. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-16 03:44:17 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030115224417.21580.00000026@mb-mu.aol.com>
Source record: 59682

>And we all know how much ULX's opinions are worth... *phhfft* I don't listen
>to the opinions of trolls.
>
>Jackie
>

TROLLS, you got to be kidding, you guys just refuse to accept the facts.

553. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-16 03:45:30 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030115224530.04059.00000005@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 59683

From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)

>cb hasn't needed a license since the mid-1970s. A ham license is
>needed to operate a 2 meter rig. Therefore, a 2 meter rig cannot be a
>cb, by definition.

Lets face it, even I agree that 2 meters is CB with repeaters, hence it is a 2 meter CB.

>And one cannot tell from the license class whether someone has passed
>a code test.

Irrelevant.

>First you have to prove such a thing even exists.

CBplusser is a definition. Its a tiny step above CB.

WA8ULX claims ALL no code techs are CBplussers and all that passed code are not CBplussers. Apparently this term is applied whether or not the person used a CB prior to getting a no code Ham license.

>What "technical knowledge" is needed to be a better operator that is
>not covered by the Tech written?

The material is covered in the written. However, you don't have to understand the written material to pass the written test. I agree on that point.

>Operating better requires SKILL.
>Code skill is one of the skills that
>makes someone a better operator.

Picking up signals by ear in presense of noise is also a skill. Tuning receivers by ear is also a skill.
Adjusting for SWR is also skill.
There are many more useful skills.

Code skill is a skill, but only one of the skills, and a [less] useful one that is made [most] important.

>> WA8ULX , lets see some information backing up your accusations.
>
>Don't hold yer breath while waiting...

I haven't heard proof yet.

Listening to 2 meter doesn't prove anything. No difference between 2 meter and Hams that passed code at meetings. Although, I learned more about the typical HAM.

554. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-16 04:31:05 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <dAqV9.12682$Qr4.1258249@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 59684

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote

: A CBplusser is a poor operator, a tiny step above a CBer.

Are CBer's bad operators?

:
: Also, ask if the person notices certain demographics. Also, lets see if
the
: average non-Ham does not find Hams strange.
:

You seem to enjoy talking in riddles, Vipul. Would you mind expanding on
those oddly worded requests?

You see, you are something of a puzzlement to many of us. You seem
moderately intelligent, so I'm assuming you weren't tricked or coerced into
passing your license examination, thinking perhaps that there would be 17
anxious and willing virgins waiting after you'd passed through the ritual,
or some other similar inducement.

You are a ham, presumably because you wish to be one. With that in mind,
your crusade of denigration of the Amateur Radio Service just doesn't ring
true. What are we missing here?

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

555. Re: Totally pissed at ARRL!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-16 04:50:16 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <cSqV9.12700$Qr4.1261128@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 59686
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Lloyd, N0VFP" <brother_lloyd_99@yahoo.com> wrote

: I got this message on my echolink e-list. If I was not totally opposed to
: ARRL yesterday, I am totally pissed at them NOW!

Brother Lloyd,

ARRL didn't make up those rules, the FCC did. Why be mad at ARRL?

Do you think K1MAN will fix it?

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

556. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-16 04:50:21 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030115235021.17355.00000039@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 59685

>Lets face it, even I agree that 2 meters is CB with repeaters, hence it is a
>2
>meter CB.

The problem is most dont wont to admit it.

>WA8ULX claims ALL no code techs are CBplussers and all that passed code are
>not
>CBplussers.

Well not all true, some who have passed the code are still CBplussers.

>Apparently this term is applied whether or not the person used a CB
>prior to getting a no code Ham license.

Exactly

>The material is covered in the written. However, you don't have to understand
>the written material to pass the written test. I agree on that point.

The written is a complete JOKE

557. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-16 04:53:05 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030115235305.17355.00000040@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 59687

>passing your license examination, thinking perhaps that there would be 17
>anxious and willing virgins waiting after you'd passed through the ritual,

Man, I think I will take the test over again, wait a minute, where did you find
17 Virgins?

558. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-16 04:58:29 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E263BA8.DE8D2FC8@earthlink.net>
Source record: 59688

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From K4YZ:
> > There is no such thing as a "CBplusser".
>
> A CBplusser is a poor operator, a tiny step above a CBer. WA8ULX claims that
> ALL no-code techs are CBplussers and ALL that passed code are not CBplusser.
>
> >>WA8ULX , lets see some information backing up your accusations.
> > Whew...Seems I heard something like that being asked of someone who kept
> >insisting that Amateur Radio was somehow rife with "code words". That person
> >hasn't answered the questions put to him yet.
>
> I have answered this plenty.
>
> I will add this additional method. Invite someone that is unware of Ham radio.
> (Don't know what "Ham" radio is, didn't know Hams etc.). Take this person to a
> Hamfest and/or a couple meetings
>
> Lets see if the average non-Ham agrees that Hams don't use codewords when they
> are not needed.

I don't know of any hams who use "code words" in speaking with non-hams.

> Also, ask if the person notices certain demographics. Also, lets see if the
> average non-Ham does not find Hams strange.

Let's do another one. Let's see if the average ham finds you strange.

Dave K8MN

559. Re: ARNewsline 1326 - Jan 10 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-16 05:32:19 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.51.0301160531170.14895@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 59691

On Wed, 15 Jan 2003, Bill Sohl wrote:
>"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
>news:Pine.LNX.4.51.0301152356090.14669@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
>> On Wed, 15 Jan 2003, Paul W. Schleck wrote:
>> >In <b03n1g$4ga$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net> "Bill Sohl"
><billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>> >>"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
>> >>news:20030114190017.22983.00000625@mb-mf.aol.com...
>> >>> > Pasternak continues to SPAM Usenet with his worthless Spew.
>> >>>
>> >>> News, while useful, is not policy. It should not be here..
>> >>
>> >>I disagree...much of the news is and always has been a foundation
>> >>for either supporting existing policy or as a catalyst for change in
>policy.
>> >>
>> >>Cheers,
>> >>Bill K2UNK
>> >>
>> >Simultaneously crossposting these to rec.radio.info would help resolve
>> >such long-standing debates about the appropriateness of FAQ and bulletin
>> >documents in the discussion newsgroups. See:
>> >
>>
>>http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=3c3fb961%240%2459826%2445beb828%40news
>cene.com
>> >
>> >Please E-mail me if you have any questions, or require assistance in
>> >properly formatting your bulletin or FAQ for simultaneous cross-posting
>> >to rec.radio.info.
>>
>> Not exactly. The way I read the "rec.radio" newsgroups charter,
>cross-posting
>> this to "rec.radio.info" AND any other group in the hierarchy is still
>against
>> charter policy.
>>
>> It should be posted to "rec.radio.info" ONLY and NO OTHER "rec.radio.*"
>group.
>
>Again I disagree. The rec.radio.info group is for ALL radio, not just
>amateur.
>The ARNewsline is devoted almost totally to amateur. I have no desire to
>have to peruse a non-amateur newsgroup to find the postings related to

>amateur newsline.

There is very little non-amateur stuff posted to rec.radio.info, and when it is, it's generally generic stuff like for SWL (which kind of overlaps anyway).

560. Re: Totally pissed at ARRL!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-16 05:34:55 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <3wrV9.12768$Qr4.1266732@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 59692
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Lloyd, N0VFP" <brother_lloyd_99@yahoo.com> wrote

: ARRL does not have authority to make a legal decison.

We all have the authority to make legal decisions. I decide every day whether I can legally drive a certain speed, or legally make a left turn at a certain light, or can I legally operate my radio on a certain frequency using a certain mode, or whether it's legal for me to keep a certain length of walleye that I catch, or whether it would be legal for me to bitch-slap some idiot who just made a pass at my sweetheart. We make those legal decisions by reviewing the applicable laws, and act accordingly. As an incorporated entity, I'm sure ARRL has not only the authority but also the obligation to make legal decisions every day.

Sunuvagun!

Please refer to the following web site for further detail:
http://www.acsu.buffalo.edu/~kinho/youare.swf

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

They have money
: reasons for stabbing echolink in the back. Besides, It's the only way I
can
: work a 8 lander.....
:
:
:
:

561. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-16 05:36:52 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030116003652.04059.00000009@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 59693

From: "Kï¿½HB" kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG
>: Also, ask if the person notices certain demographics. Also, lets see if
>the
>: average non-Ham does not find Hams strange.
>:
>
>You seem to enjoy talking in riddles, Vipul. Would you mind expanding on
>those oddly worded requests?

Sorry, I should explain more.

Referring to demographics, Ham radio is 95% male, large percentage are old, large percentage (visibly higher than general population) are overweight. This should not matter except that the hobby must attract/create these types of people to have such high percentages.

Examples of strange include using codewords in ordinary conversation, putting call-sign on car license plate, wanting to learn Morse code, hating CBers, Wuoff Hong, and other cult like beliefs.

>You are a ham, presumably because you wish to be one.

License means band access. So, there is some benefit.

>With that in mind,
>your crusade of denigration of the Amateur Radio Service just doesn't ring
>true. What are we missing here?

I do not denigrate Ham radio to non Hams. I say that I am in Ham Radio and praise/defend it. I invited non-Ham to Hamfest, gave copy of ARRL handbook, mentioned I am Ham in social situation. It is in my benefit to improve the image of Ham Radio.

"Ham" radio is different than Amateur radio. "Ham" radio is very much a cult. Although technically FCC licenses are given for "Amateur Radio" operation, the amateur radio operators like to be called "Ham" Radio operators. A big sub-cult of Ham Radio operators learns a skill called Morse code. Being a cult is not necessarily bad in itself. Ham cult does not fit my interests. I am interested in the "other" technical aspects most Hams are not interested in.

562. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-16 05:50:19 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030116005019.10015.00000080@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 59694

>And he is an extra light, he would have never gotten the extra
>except they dumbed down the test.

Not true, I didnt want the Extra could have carried less about being an EXTRA. The only reason I got it was some Dumb CBplussers bet me $250 that I couldnt pass it. As a matter of fact I still have not used the Extra Privilages and probably never will.

563. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-16 05:52:42 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030116005242.10015.00000081@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 59695

>If it were not, you would never have passed it.
>

Your an Idiot, I passed it with no studying, didnt even look at the Stupid Question Pool, took me 7 Minutes to pass it, and collected $250 in the process.

564. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-16 05:55:35 UTC
From: Jackie <no@address.given.com>
Message-ID: <rPrV9.697689$%m4.3402245@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 59696

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030116003652.04059.00000009@mb-fr.aol.com...

> Referring to demographics, Ham radio is 95% male, large percentage are
old,
> large percentage (visibly higher than general population) are overweight.
This
> should not matter except that the hobby must attract/create these types of
> people to have such high percentages.

Scratching head Gee, let's see... I don't answer to *any* of the above traits, so it must've been something else that attracted me to the hobby. It was the Spirit of the Radio that brought me in (being a longtime SW listener and having ham friends who were also SW listeners, mostly). I think the hobby attracts technical types, for sure. But I have met enough hams now that don't fit your description that I don't feel like the odd person out. I'm female, (relatively) young and not overweight. I am a geek, however, and I think that's almost a prerequisite to get into any technical hobby- and I think of the term "geek" as a compliment. :-)

> Examples of strange include using codewords in ordinary conversation,

I don't use code words in general conversation when talking with non-hams. Or with most hams either- the crew I talk to generally doesn't either. So what.

> putting call-sign on car license plate,

haven't done that either.

>wanting to learn Morse code

Well, it wasn't so much a matter of *wanting* to learn it as needing to for me, since I wanted HF privileges. Gee, Vipul, you're 0-for-3 so far.

>hating CBers

I have never listened to any of the CB channels, so I can't hate any CBers.

> Wuoff Hong, and other cult like beliefs.

Oh, that is SO 1930's...

> I do not denigrate Ham radio to non Hams. I say that I am in Ham Radio and
> praise/defend it.

Sure Vipul. Just like you do in your posts to rec.radio.cb.

> "Ham" radio is different than Amateur radio. "Ham" radio is very much a cult.

Well, maybe I'd best get my sorry behind to a "deprogramming center" ASAP.

> I am interested in the "other" technical aspects most Hams are not interested in.

There are lots of aspects of AR to get into, certainly. If you prefer to go off on your own to enjoy them, then so be it. Just don't insinuate that the rest of us are aimless, blind Ham-sheep that're lured in by the siren-song of some cult leader. Which is simply ridiculous, if that's what you believe.

Jackie
KC0ODY

565. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-16 05:55:39 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030116005539.10015.00000082@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 59697

PS the Test Was a Joke, it was even easier than the Novice I took many years ago.

566. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-16 05:59:27 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030116005927.09975.00000107@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 59698

>I have never listened to any of the CB channels, so I can't hate any CBers.

If you have a 2 meter CB you have

567. Re: Just One More Example

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-16 07:48:37 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030116024837.05555.00000015@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 59699

>Subject: Re: Just One More Example
>From: "Phil Kane" Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop
>Date: 1/15/03 5:52 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <cuvyxnansvbet.h8rw0td.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>

>> Because all those "radio professionals" can't get their collective
>>heads out of thier rectums long enough to make up their minds.
>
> Not really - it's because the Region I broadcasters say "screw you,
> buddy - I got mine" to anyone who wants to displace them, just as
> the US military through the NTIA said to the amateurs about 6.9-7.0
> MHz here.

Phil, if "screw you-I got mine" isn't the symptom of a person suffering a craniorectal inversion, what is? And aren't "broadcasters" "radio professionals"...?!?!

>Shows you the REAL view of "the needs of amateur radio" in the
> larger scheme of things. We're lucky to keep what we have at 7 MHz

It's ironic that they won't move since it really is a win-win-situation all the way around.

73

Steve, K4YZ

568. Re: ARNewsline 1326 - Jan 10 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-16 07:50:14 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030116025014.05555.00000016@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 59700

>Subject: Re: ARNewsline 1326 - Jan 10 2003
>From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org
>Date: 1/15/03 5:57 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <Pine.LNX.4.51.0301152356090.14669@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>

>It should be posted to "rec.radio.info" ONLY and NO OTHER "rec.radio.*"
>group.

Great. Now we have a group moderator. Sure glad we're safe now.

73

Steve, K4YZ

569. Re: ARNewsline 1326 - Jan 10 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-16 07:51:45 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030116025145.05555.00000017@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 59601

>Subject: Re: ARNewsline 1326 - Jan 10 2003
>From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
>Date: 1/15/03 8:19 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <b054vi$3i1$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>

>Again I disagree. The rec.radio.info group is for ALL radio, not just
>amateur.
>The ARNewsline is devoted almost totally to amateur. I have no desire to
>have to peruse a non-amateur newsgroup to find the postings related to
>amateur newsline.

Ditto.

73
Steve, K4YZ

570. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-16 08:18:09 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030116031809.05555.00000018@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 59602

>Subject: Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 1/15/03 9:23 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030115222359.04059.00000004@mb-fr.aol.com>

>From K4YZ:
>> There is no such thing as a "CBplusser".
>
>A CBplusser is a poor operator, a tiny step above a CBer. WA8ULX claims that
>ALL no-code techs are CBplussers and ALL that passed code are not CBplusser.

No, Vipul, a >>LID<< is a poor operator.

There are a great many CB operators who are themselves fine operators. A LID is a LID, regardless of WHICH service in which they are found.

>> Whew...Seems I heard something like that being asked of someone who kept
>>insisting that Amateur Radio was somehow rife with "code words". That
>person
>>hasn't answered the questions put to him yet.
>
>I have answered this plenty.

No you have not. You have yet to explain to me or anyone else why Amateur Radio should be the least bit different than any other sport, hobby, passtime, occupation or avocation when it comes to the use of subject-specific "lingo" for it's activites.

>Lets see if the average non-Ham agrees that Hams don't use codewords when
>they
>are not needed.

How can the "non-Ham" make any such judgement, Vipul? Without some frame of mutual reference from which to make an informed opinion, all they can do is shrug their shoulders. In hang gliding we call those folks "wuffos". Wanna know what a "wuffo" is, Vipul?

Your "suggestion" says "average non-Ham". This means a person with no radio background at any level other than using a TV remote or microwave oven.

>Also, ask if the person notices certain demographics. Also, lets see if the
>average non-Ham does not find Hams strange.

You mean like the guys who go bare-chested in January to a football game with thier team's logo painted on them? Or perhaps you mean like teenage girls who dress in all-black, use black lipstick and fingernail polish and don't shave their armpits? Or perhaps you meant like middle aged or early senior men

who haven't shaved for 10 years, wear frayed out Levi's with a beerbelly and ride Harley's..

You mean THAT kind of strange, Vipul?

Or do you just mean a group of guys and gals who like to swap stories about working Lower Slobovia at 3AM on a dipole and 10 watts, or how they busted 1M points in the DXWW contest last year?

That kinda strange?

Someone here is strange, alright, Vipul. It's a guy in Mass who has a Ham Radio license, hangs out in Ham Radio USENET groups, but hates Ham Radio! Ya wanna know his name and callsign?

73

Steve, K4YZ

571. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-16 08:20:13 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030116032013.05555.00000019@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 59603

>Subject: Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 1/15/03 10:58 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3E263BA8.DE8D2FC8@earthlink.net>

>Let's do another one. Let's see if the average ham finds you strange.

NO BRAINER! He's strange!

73

Steve, K4YZ

572. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-16 08:30:50 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030116033050.05555.00000020@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 59604

>Subject: Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 1/15/03 9:45 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030115224530.04059.00000005@mb-fr.aol.com>

>>cb hasn't needed a license since the mid-1970s. A ham license is
>>needed to operate a 2 meter rig. Therefore, a 2 meter rig cannot be a
>>cb, by definition.
>
>Lets face it, even I agree that 2 meters is CB with repeaters, hence it is a
>2
>meter CB.

Hmmmm.....Just read through Part 95. I cannot find ANY allocation for
Citizen's Band operators in the 144-148mHz Amateru allocation.

And with the RARE exception of repeaters like the W6NUT machine in LA and
few others, there are precious few examples of CB-like operation on 2 meters.

Yes, the occassional new operator slips and says "10-4", "negatory" or
referes to him or herself as "the personal here is...". Thankfully those folks
learn very quickly that that language is bst left on 11 meters.

>>First you have to prove such a thing even exists.
>
>CBplusser is a definition.

WHOA! >>THIS<< from a guy who claims "putz" and "creep" are not in the
dictionary!

VIPUL! P-L-E-A-S-E provide the name and publisher of the dictionary that
defines "CBplusser"... ! ! !

>WA8ULX claims ALL no code techs are CBplussers and all that passed code are
>not
>CBplussers.

Bruce, WA8ULX, is a functionally illiterate, irresponsible and mean-mouthed
idiot. You will not find his name in contest scores, DXCC rolls, nor will you
find him proctoring VE tests or mentoring new Amateurs.

>Apparently this term is applied whether or not the person used a CB
>prior to getting a no code Ham license.

What term? "CBplusser"..?!?! There is NO such term.

>Listening to 2 meter doesn't prove anything. No difference between 2 meter
>and

>Hams that passed code at meetings. Although, I learned more about the typical
>HAM.

Judging from what you post here, Vipul, you haven't learned much of
anything at all, least-of-all Amateur Radio.

Steve, K4YZ

573. Re: ARNewsline 1326 - Jan 10 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-16 08:37:27 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030116033727.05555.00000021@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 59605

>Subject: Re: ARNewsline 1326 - Jan 10 2003
>From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org
>Date: 1/15/03 11:32 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <Pine.LNX.4.51.0301160531170.14895@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>

>There is very little non-amateur stuff posted to rec.radio.info, and when it
>is, it's generally generic stuff like for SWL (which kind of overlaps
>anyway).

Oh...I SEE! It's >>OK<< to have to go to a NON-Amateur specific NG to get Newsline because it "overlaps" with the generic "info", but it's NOT >>OK<< to have Bill post Newsline, a "news" service specifically FOR Amateur Radio even though it definitely "overlaps", in content with the Amateur Radio policy group?

Suuuuure! THAT makes sense!

73

Steve, K4YZ

574. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-16 08:46:55 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030116034655.05555.00000022@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 59606

>Subject: Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade
>From: "Jackie" no@address.given.com
>Date: 1/15/03 11:55 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <rPrV9.697689$%m4.3402245@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net>

>> Examples of strange include using codewords in ordinary conversation,
putting call-sign on car license plate,
>
>haven't done that either.

And what is "strange" about this? People put thier cat's name, overt and
covert sexual innuendo and family names on license plates.

What is strange about putting an Amateur Radio callsign on a tag? My tag
in CA used to read "RSQ EMT". Was it strange to be proud of being an EMT
involved in rescue operations? If not, why would it be "strange" to be proud
of being a licensed Amateur Radio operator?

>>wanting to learn Morse code
>
>Well, it wasn't so much a matter of *wanting* to learn it as needing to for
>me, since I wanted HF privileges. Gee, Vipul, you're 0-for-3 so far.

He's really 0-4...He hasn't figured out that being an Amateur Radio
operator means being able to do almost anything you want to do "in radio" ,
including being different.

Vipul is different. Does that make him strange?

>> "Ham" radio is different than Amateur radio. "Ham" radio is very much a
>cult.
>
>Well, maybe I'd best get my sorry behind to a "deprogramming center" ASAP.

Move over, Jackie! There'll be about 600,000 more next to you!

>There are lots of aspects of AR to get into, certainly. If you prefer to go
>off on your own to enjoy them, then so be it. Just don't insinuate that the
>rest of us are aimless, blind Ham-sheep that're lured in by the siren-song
>of some cult leader. Which is simply ridiculous, if that's what you believe.

Him and Lennie...What a pair!

73

Steve, K4YZ

575. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-16 13:30:21 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0301160530.415dd51e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59607

vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030115224530.04059.00000005@mb-fr.aol.com>...
> From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
>
> >cb hasn't needed a license since the mid-1970s. A ham license is
> >needed to operate a 2 meter rig. Therefore, a 2 meter rig cannot be a
> >cb, by definition.
>
> Lets face it, even I agree that 2 meters is CB with repeaters,

You're simply mistaken, Vipul old chap.

cb is a form of land mobile radio that requires no test or license,
but requires the use of type-accepted equipment. Its basis and purpose
is completely different than that of amateur radio.

> hence it is a 2 meter CB.

Simply not true.
>
> >And one cannot tell from the license class whether someone has passed
> >a code test.
>
> Irrelevant.

It's a fact. Why is it irrelevant?

Also, one cannot tell what written tests a Technician has passed
merely by the license class.
>
> >First you have to prove such a thing even exists.
>
> CBplusser is a definition. Its a tiny step above CB.

That's your definition.

Which leaves out all classes of ham license.
>
> WA8ULX claims ALL no code techs are CBplussers and all that passed code are
> not CBplussers.

Really? I thought he was complaining about the written tests. Though
it is hard to tell.

Fun fact: The license doesn't specify whether someone took a code
test, or what speed.

> Apparently this term is applied whether or not the person used a CB
> prior to getting a no code Ham license.

It's just a put down. End of story.
>
> >What "technical knowledge" is needed to be a better operator that is
> >not covered by the Tech written?
>
> The material is covered in the written.

Which written? Tech, General, or Extra? How does taking a written test
improve operating skill?

> However, you don't have to understand
> the written material to pass the written test. I agree on that point.

In my experience, most new hams want to understand the material.
Understanding comes at many levels, too.
>
> >Operating better requires SKILL.
> >Code skill is one of the skills that
> >makes someone a better operator.
>
> Picking up signals by ear in presense of noise is also a skill.

Agreed.

> Tuning receivers by ear is also a skill.

It's a lot easier to tune them by hand!

> Adjusting for SWR is also skill.
> There are many more useful skills.

Some time back, I posted a whole list of desirable operating skills.
Perhaps I should post it again.

How does a written test of TECHNICAL KNOWLEDGE improve anyone's
OPERATING SKILL?
>
> Code skill is a skill, but only one of the skills,

That's true. It's tested because ITU S25.5 requires it. FCC says so.
That may change soon.

> and a [less] useful one that is made [most] important.

Less useful than what?

Have you ever actually LISTENED to the HF amateur bands?
>
> >> WA8ULX , lets see some information backing up your accusations.
> >
> >Don't hold yer breath while waiting...
>
> I haven't heard proof yet.

We haven't seen proof of your accusations either.
>
> Listening to 2 meter doesn't prove anything.

Sure it does. At least around here, it's very different from cb.

> No difference between 2 meter and Hams that passed code at meetings.

Nor additional WRITTEN tests of TECHNICAL KNOWLEDGE.

> Although, I learned more about the typical HAM.

From sampling how many of the ~685,000 US hams?

Here's a clue, Vipul: What you have seen at the few ham club meetings and hamfests you have attended is not the entirety of ham radio. Not by a long shot. Same for your Field Day experience.

73 de Jim, N2EY

576. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-16 14:28:35 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030116092835.10160.00000052@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 59608

>Really? I thought he was complaining about the written tests.

I am, but what the hell I will jump on the CW also for laughs.

577. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-16 14:35:04 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030116093504.10160.00000053@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 59609

>This means a person with no
>radio background at any level other than using a TV remote or microwave oven.

Sounds like a definition of most No-Code CBplussers

>Or do you just mean a group of guys and gals who like to swap stories
>about working Lower Slobovia at 3AM on a dipole and 10 watts, or how they
>busted 1M points in the DXWW contest last year?

This really sounds BORRRRRING

>Someone here is strange, alright, Vipul. It's a guy in TENN who has a Ham
>Radio license, hangs out in Ham Radio USENET groups, but hates Ham Radio! Ya
>wanna know his name and callsign?
>
>73
>
>Steve, K4YZ

Let me guess, is it" Little Stevie Wonder, the BED PAN QUEEN from TENN"
STERVIE

578. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-16 15:03:20 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E26C9B8.8030605@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 59613

WA8ULX wrote:
>>And he is an extra light, he would have never gotten the extra
>>except they dumbed down the test.
>
>
> Not true, I didnt want the Extra could have carried less about being an EXTRA.
> The only reason I got it was some Dumb CBplussers bet me $250 that I couldnt
> pass it. As a matter of fact I still have not used the Extra Privilages and
> probably never will.

Yea right.

579. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-16 15:03:49 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E26C9D5.60105@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 59614

WA8ULX wrote:
>>If it were not, you would never have passed it.
>>
>
>
> Your an Idiot, I passed it with no studying, didnt even look at the Stupid
> Question Pool, took me 7 Minutes to pass it, and collected $250 in the process.

Yea right.

580. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-16 15:04:26 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E26C9FA.4070109@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 59615

WA8ULX wrote:
> PS the Test Was a Joke, it was even easier than the Novice I took many years
> ago.

Otherwise you would never have passed it.

581. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-16 15:25:13 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030116102513.08329.00000015@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 59610

>Subject: Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade
>From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
>Date: 1/16/03 7:30 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <c2356669.0301160530.415dd51e@posting.google.com>

>> Tuning receivers by ear is also a skill.
>
>It's a lot easier to tune them by hand!

And all this time I've been saying "Look, Ma, No hands!".....

73

Steve, K4YZ

582. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-16 15:51:35 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0301160751.411c305b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59611

vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030116003652.04059.00000009@mb-fr.aol.com>...
> From: "Kï¿½HB" kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG
> >: Also, ask if the person notices certain demographics. Also, lets see if
> >: the average non-Ham does not find Hams strange.

> >You seem to enjoy talking in riddles, Vipul. Would you mind expanding on
> >those oddly worded requests?
>
> Sorry, I should explain more.

AGREED!!
>
> Referring to demographics, Ham radio is 95% male,

How do you know? What is the source of your demographics?

> large percentage are old,

What's your definition of "large percentage" and "old"? I'm 48 - to an
8 year old, that's old. To a 78 year old, that's young. To me, it
depends;-)

> large percentage (visibly higher than general population) are overweight.

Again, what's your source of demographics? The US population as a
whole is pretty chubby (and getting worse), not just hams. Whole bunch
of reasons for that. But I'm only responsible for me. For the record,
I'm 6' 3" and about 225 pounds right now. And working on getting down
below 200.

Fact is, many Americans these days live relatively sedentary
lifestyles and eat too much of the wrong things. Me included. Has
nothing to do with ham radio.

> This
> should not matter except that the hobby must attract/create these types of
> people to have such high percentages.

Your demographics source, please? Or are these just observations from
a few ham club meetings and Field Day?

Here's a clue: Those things are not a representative sampling.
>
> Examples of strange include using codewords in ordinary conversation,

I don't know any ham who does that. A little jargon where appropriate
does the trick.

> putting call-sign on car license plate,

Never had one of those - but WHY would doing that be "strange"?

> wanting to learn Morse code,

Let's see:

- A mode used by hundreds of thousands of hams all over the world
every day
- Uses very little spectrum space
- Gets through better than any analog voice mode
- Allows use of simple and inexpensive equipment
- Has a unique human-machine interface that many find enjoyable to use
- Users report it to be a lot of fun, often to the point of being
their favorite choice

Yet you say it's "strange" to want to learn the skills to use this
mode. Why is it strange?

Do you tell people who go running, skiing, swimming, sailboating or
bicycling that wanting to do those things are "strange"? How about
people who go fishing but toss the fish back after catching it?

> hating CBers,

Regrettably, some hams do dislike cbers. Do you know why?

> Wuoff Hong,

it's "Wouff Hong", and it's a nice old tradition. Do you dislike
traditions?

> and other cult like beliefs.

Hardly.

> >You are a ham, presumably because you wish to be one.
>
> License means band access. So, there is some benefit.

You can always send it back to the FCC and they will cancel it.
>
> >With that in mind,
> >your crusade of denigration of the Amateur Radio Service just doesn't ring
> >true. What are we missing here?
>
> I do not denigrate Ham radio to non Hams.

But you DO denigrate it to anyone who reads your posts. Why all the
put-downs? What is wrong with live and let live?

> I say that I am in Ham Radio and
> praise/defend it.

Somehow I find that difficult to believe.

> I invited non-Ham to Hamfest, gave copy of ARRL handbook,
> mentioned I am Ham in social situation. It is in my benefit to improve the
> image of Ham Radio.

Do you ever actually get on the air, or build/experiment with radio?
>
> "Ham" radio is different than Amateur radio.

You are mistaken. The two terms mean the same thing.

>"Ham" radio is very much a cult.

Who is the leader, then?

> Although technically FCC licenses are given for "Amateur Radio" operation, the
> amateur radio operators like to be called "Ham" Radio operators.

Just a nickname. Quicker and easier to say and write. Means the exact
same thing. Like "truck driver" and "driver of trucks". Or "medical
doctor" and "physician".

What IS your problem, Vipul?

> A big sub-cult
> of Ham Radio operators learns a skill called Morse code.

Not just learn - they USE it. Lots of fun, too.

> Being a cult is not
> necessarily bad in itself. Ham cult does not fit my interests. I am interested
> in the "other" technical aspects most Hams are not interested in.

Then why do you denigrate what other hams do?

And what are YOU doing with those "technical aspects"? Build any
radios lately? Antennas? Other projects?

Our licenses are for operating ham rigs, so don't put down hams for
wanting to do just that.

73 de Jim, N2EY

583. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-16 16:02:21 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030116110221.03730.00000054@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 59612

```
>>"Ham" radio is very much a cult.
>
>Who is the leader, then?
>

I am
```

584. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-16 16:09:50 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030116110950.03730.00000056@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 59616

>Yea right.

Hey CBplusser I could care less you think

585. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-16 16:12:31 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030116111231.03730.00000057@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 59617

>Otherwise you would never have passed it.

Doesnt that make you fell good that anybody can be an EXTRA now with no effort or knowledge required.

586. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-16 16:59:41 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0301160859.1f03d0c0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59618

Here are the number of unexpired FCC ARS licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:

As of May 14, 2000:

Novice - 49,329
Tech - 205,394
Tech Plus - 128,860
General - 112,677
Advanced - 99,782
Extra - 78,750
Total - 674,792

As of January 15, 2003:

Novice - 35,736 (decrease of 13,593)
Tech - 248,599 (increase of 43,205)
Tech Plus - 72,892 (decrease of 55,968)
General - 139,802 (increase of 27,125)
Advanced - 84,236 (decrease of 15,546)
Extra - 103,276 (increase of 24,526)
Total - 684,541 (increase of 9,749)

73 de Jim, N2EY

587. Re: Another Morse Code Opinion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-16 17:04:45 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0301160904.4192546d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59619

"KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com> wrote in message news:<v2b2tk15qbpu3d@corp.supernews.com>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030114223650.25350.00000002@mb-mj.aol.com...
> > In article <v1abac6jt0kv22@corp.supernews.com>, "KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com>
> > writes:
> >
> > >"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
> > >news:20030102214556.22983.00000376@mb-mf.aol.com...
> > ><SNIP>
> > >> From KB9TMP
> > >> >Have a "Hammy" New Year!
> > >> Cute alterations of the word "ham" do not endear everyone. Just like
> regularly
> > >> in QST when people see the word "ham" in various signs. It's weird.
> > >
> > >Are you out to rain on everyone's parade?
> >
> > You finally figured out his game, huh?
>
> Yea I just didn't want to believe it!
> You know hoping for the turnaround
> like Scrooge had on Christmas morning.

That would require him to have some experiences.

> > >If you don't like
> > >ham radio the way it is. If you don't like ham radio operators
> > >the way they are. Why are you a ham at all?
> >
> > Excellent question!
> >
> > >It seems like you
> > >are trying to change everyone to your version of radio.
> >
> > The funny thing is, we don't see very much about what that version is.
> > Only what it isn't. Sort of a Zen thing.

He's not the only one who does that trick. Tells you what a thing
should not be but never what it should be. That way, no work is
required of the critic.
> >
> > >I started
> > >doing the "Hammy" line because everyone else was saying
> > >Happy New Year, and I thought I'd be a little different.
> >

> > It's cute, it's funny, it's appropriate for ham coversations. I'm gonna
> > steal it next season.
>
> Please do so, the line is not copyrighted, but I will be using
> it also (I saved it in my newsreader program) :^)
>
Whole buncha levels to it, too.

> > >If you
> > >got your way my daughter when she was 2 years old would
> > >have been chastised for saying "Happy Two Ears"!
> >
> > Codewords?
>
> I'm not sure, but at that age a lot of what they say
> sounds like codewords. :^)
>
Yer tellin' me! Then they become teenagers and do it all over again.

> > >V why don't you just chill out. You are the ONLY one in
> > >here that has said anything about my little tag line. Even Bruce
> > >who hates everyone and everything didn't say a word about
> > >it, JUST YOU!
> >
> > Don't let him get ya, some folks can't stand to see others have fun.
>
> I'm thinking about getting a puppy and naming it Vipul
> that way whenever he starts in I can kick the dog and
> yell Vipul will you shut up!!! I won't do anything for
> Vipul but it'll make me feel LOTS BETTER! ;^)

Sounds like another good idea!

73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> I wonder if Vipul will gripe about using Groucho as
> a signature, some sort of a "secret code" between
> Marx Bro's fans no doubt!

Perhaps a visit to The Argument Clinic would help.

588. Re: Brian vs Dave

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-16 17:13:02 UTC
From: Sleeping Vayu - Vayu Anonymous Remailer <noreply@cyberjunkiez.de>
Message-ID: <W9V60QQO37637.7590509259@anonymous.remailer.cyberjunkiez.de>
Source record: 59620

In article <3E19E2D7.8040803@psu.edu>
Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:
>
>
> Here is the new thread in which Brian and Dave (hopefully) will continue
> their personal battle.
>
> Let's see what happens.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Heil is an ASSHOLE of the first magnitude......he wears wrinkled clothes
that look like he's worn a week or more to ham meetings and tries to cover
his stench up with cheap cologne.

589. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-16 20:41:00 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E2718DC.2040200@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 59621

WA8ULX wrote:
>>Yea right.
>
>
> Hey CBplusser I could care less you think

Hey CBer you can't even get that right, the phrase is, "I
couldn't care less *what* you think."

590. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-16 20:41:52 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E271910.4070706@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 59622

WA8ULX wrote:
>>Otherwise you would never have passed it.
>
>
> Doesnt that make you fell good that anybody can be an EXTRA now with no effort
> or knowledge required.

You're living proof.

591. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-16 22:06:31 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0301161406.58594d15@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59623

"Jackie" <no@address.given.com> wrote in message
news:<rPrV9.697689$%m4.3402245@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net>...
> "Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030116003652.04059.00000009@mb-fr.aol.com...
>
> > Referring to demographics, Ham radio is 95% male, large percentage are
> > old,
> > large percentage (visibly higher than general population) are overweight.
> > This
> > should not matter except that the hobby must attract/create these types of
> > people to have such high percentages.
>
> *Scratching head* Gee, let's see... I don't answer to *any* of the above
> traits, so it must've been something else that attracted me to the hobby.
> It was the Spirit of the Radio that brought me in (being a longtime SW
> listener and having ham friends who were also SW listeners, mostly). I think
> the hobby attracts technical types, for sure. But I have met enough hams now
> that don't fit your description that I don't feel like the odd person out.

Also, there's not much that can be done about some of the
characteristics Vipul names. Most us are stuck with our gender and
age, f'rinstance.

> I'm female, (relatively) young and not overweight. I am a geek, however, and
> I think that's almost a prerequisite to get into any technical hobby- and I
> think of the term "geek" as a compliment. :-)

Works for me!
>
> > I do not denigrate Ham radio to non Hams. I say that I am in Ham Radio and
> > praise/defend it.
>
> Sure Vipul. Just like you do in your posts to rec.radio.cb.

You just outed him, Jackie!
>
> > "Ham" radio is different than Amateur radio. "Ham" radio is very much a
> cult.
>
> Well, maybe I'd best get my sorry behind to a "deprogramming center" ASAP.

There's one on Main Street in Newington, CT. I've actually been there.
Nice folks.
>
> > I am interested in the "other" technical aspects most Hams are not
> interested in.

>
> There are lots of aspects of AR to get into, certainly. If you prefer to go
> off on your own to enjoy them, then so be it.

Isn't that pretty much what most of us do? We find the parts we like
and ignore the parts we don't. Heck, I wish I had the time, resources
and longevity to do all the things in ham radio that interest me!

> Just don't insinuate that the
> rest of us are aimless, blind Ham-sheep that're lured in by the siren-song
> of some cult leader. Which is simply ridiculous, if that's what you believe.

Well said!

Reading those rrcb posts confirmed my suspicions. Vipul and 'ULX are
basically saying the same things. And share the same lack of facts and
logic. Neither's worth the time.

73 de Jim, N2EY

baa bit baa bit baa baa bit baaaaaa

592. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-16 22:26:46 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <GkGV9.13875$Qr4.1361041@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 59624

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote

: Referring to demographics, Ham radio is 95% male-

Certainly a large percentage is male, just like a large percentage of deer hunters are male, a large percentage of machine knitters are female, a large percentage of flower gardeners are female, and many other situations where the participants in a particular hobby are skewed towards one gender or the other. I don't see that as "strange".

: large percentage are old,

I suppose that depends on what you define as "old". A few years ago, before the FCC stopped pubilishing the birthdate in their data, it was calculated that the average age of licensed hams was 54 years old. Just coincidentally, the state of Minnesota in the same year had stated that the average age of a licensed driver in Minnesota was 52 years old. When you think about it, that coincidence isn't surprising, since both licenses are most often first obtained in late teen/early adult years, and generally kept in force over the life of the licensee. The largest body of licensees then fall in the group from 16 to perhaps 80. The "mean" age of that group falls at 48, but the "average" age is skewed somewhat higher by the bubble of baby boomers which is moving through. Thus an average age in the low-mid 50's seems reasonable.

: large percentage (visibly higher than general population) are overweight.

Subjective opinion at best.

: Examples of strange include using codewords in ordinary conversation,

I agree that amateurs use language which contains "insider lingo" in their conversations with each other. So do members of almost any interest group/age group/profession that you'd like to name. Nothing strange about that.

: putting call-sign on car license plate

Nothing strange about that. In my home state their are all sorts of "special" license plates ..... veterans have them, college alumni have them, environmentalists have them, firemen have them, and any citizen can personalize their car license plates (for a fee). A very common thing, and not at all "strange".

: wanting to learn Morse code

Since it's part of the licensing requirements for two or the three license classes, what is strange about persons wanting to learn it? If you don't

learn it, you'd be restricted to only the Technician license class.

: hating CBers

Except for a few like WA8ULX, I don't think I personally know a single ham
who "hates" CB operators. Do you hate CB operators?

: Wuoff Hong, and other cult like beliefs.

You need to examine the definition of "cult". You are out to lunch on that!

73, de Hans, K0HB

593. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-16 22:45:38 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030116174538.11413.00000068@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 59625

>You're living proof.
>
>

So you ought to be Happy.

594. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-16 22:46:49 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030116174649.11413.00000069@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 59626

>Except for a few like WA8ULX, I don't think I personally know a single ham
>who "hates" CB operators. Do you hate CB operators?

You most not know many Hams then.

595. Space Shuttle Rebroadcast now on 3.860 LSB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-16 22:51:21 UTC
From: too many raydeos <catoongeah@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3e2737a5@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 59627
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

```
WA3NAN - The Goddard Space Flight Centre
ARC in Greenbelt Maryland will be re-broadcasting
Space Shuttle Mission Control Audio 24/7 on
this frequency. Broadcast is on the air now.
```

596. Re: Another Morse Code Opinion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-16 23:55:53 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E27468D.2060003@adelphia.net>
Source record: 59628

N2EY wrote:

>>I'm not sure, but at that age a lot of what they say
>>sounds like codewords. :^)
>>
>>
> Yer tellin' me! Then they become teenagers and do it all over again.
>

Word up!

- Mike KB3EIA -

597. Re: Another Morse Code Opinion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-17 00:47:01 UTC
From: Jackie <no@address.given.com>
Message-ID: <9oIV9.707692$WL3.726937@rwcrnsc54>
Source record: 59629

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0301160904.4192546d@posting.google.com...

> Perhaps a visit to The Argument Clinic would help.

OH, oh, I'm sorry, but this is Abuse. I think he wants room 12A, down the
hall.

:-)

Jackie
Python Forever!!

598. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-17 01:17:48 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030116201748.03252.00000035@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 59630

From: "Kï¿½HB" kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG

>: large percentage (visibly higher than general population) are overweight.
>
>Subjective opinion at best.

Just go to a random Hamfest and you will see that this is true. And e-ham poll agrees that large percentage of Hams are overweight.

>Do you hate CB operators?

No, I don't. To me its another frequency, not another culture.

Also, without CBers (AND their vehical demographics), the economy would collapse. Hams are just icing on the cake, not as needed as CBers. Hams can be replaced with public servants, CBers cannot. This claim seems reasonable, but don't hold me to it - I just came up with this.

>: Wuoff Hong, and other cult like beliefs.

So, Wuoff Hong is not an example of a cult? How about pointing out the word Ham in highway signs, regularly in QST?

599. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-17 01:30:43 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030116203043.03252.00000036@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 59631

From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)

> > "Ham" radio is different than Amateur radio. "Ham" radio is very much a
> cult.
>
> Well, maybe I'd best get my sorry behind to a "deprogramming center" ASAP.

--> There's one on Main Street in Newington, CT. I've actually been there.

Are you kidding?, the folks there are into the cult as much as anyone.

Speaking of deprogramming, once you learn Morse code above a certain speed, you CANNOT forget it (even if you tried). You will automatically translate code from movies or whereever else you might hear code.

>"Ham" radio is very much a cult.
Who is the leader, then?

A cult does not have to have a leader, just a unified belief system. However, not all unified belief systems are cults.

-->Reading those rrcb posts confirmed my suspicions. Vipul and 'ULX -->are basically saying the same things.

WA8ULX is a pro-coder, possibly an only-coder. I am not.

-->We haven't seen proof of your accusations either.

Go to a Hamfest. Take a non-Ham so you have some reference to compare. See what non-Ham's impression is and you will know.

600. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-17 01:45:07 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <DeJV9.13852$Dq.1380672@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 59632

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote

:
: Also, without CBers (AND their vehical demographics), the economy would
: collapse. Hams are just icing on the cake, not as needed as CBers. Hams
can be
: replaced with public servants, CBers cannot.
:

Yesterday I commented that you seem moderately intelligent. I take it back.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

601. Re: Space Shuttle Rebroadcast now on 3.860 LSB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-17 01:58:44 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b07o0hsts1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 59633
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

That is gonna piss off the refugees from the Lib Net.

Dan/W4NTI

"too many raydeos" <catoongeah@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:3e2737a5@snipnews.snip.net...
> WA3NAN - The Goddard Space Flight Centre
> ARC in Greenbelt Maryland will be re-broadcasting
> Space Shuttle Mission Control Audio 24/7 on
> this frequency. Broadcast is on the air now.
>
>

602. Re: ARNewsline 1326 - Jan 10 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-17 02:02:49 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.51.0301170158550.172@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 59634

On Thu, 16 Jan 2003, Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>>Subject: Re: ARNewsline 1326 - Jan 10 2003
>>From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org
>>Date: 1/15/03 11:32 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <Pine.LNX.4.51.0301160531170.14895@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
>
>>There is very little non-amateur stuff posted to rec.radio.info, and when it
>>is, it's generally generic stuff like for SWL (which kind of overlaps
>>anyway).
>
> Oh...I SEE! It's >>OK<< to have to go to a NON-Amateur specific NG to get
>Newsline because it "overlaps" with the generic "info", but it's NOT >>OK<< to
>have Bill post Newsline, a "news" service specifically FOR Amateur Radio even
>though it definitely "overlaps", in content with the Amateur Radio policy
>group?
>
> Suuuuure! THAT makes sense!

NO, it's not that "rec.radio.info" is non-amateur specific (it is). It's that "rec.radio.info" is SPECIFICALLY DESIGNATED AS THE PLACE TO POST "BULLETIN-TYPE" MESSAGES, of which these Newsline posts are. There are so few of these that there need not be an amateur specific version of the group. If Newsline were to post there, it's monthly traffic would double.

It's not OK to post it here because by the unified charter, it is supposed to be posted elsewhere, thus meaning that it is NOT appropriate for the policy group.

603. Re: Space Shuttle Rebroadcast now on 3.860 LSB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-17 02:25:30 UTC
From: Harry <hgk@centurytel.net>
Message-ID: <3E27699A.926F5851@centurytel.net>
Source record: 59635
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

That's also one of the freqs. for Special event station KM1CC
Additional details are on the Marconi Radio Club Web site at
http://personal.tmlp.com/k1vv/w1aa
Look on page 7

Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> That is gonna piss off the refugees from the Lib Net.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>

604. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-17 03:04:47 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030116220447.11085.00000041@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 59636

>WA8ULX is a pro-coder, possibly an only-coder. I am not.
>

Wrong WA8ULX is a REAL HAM, the rest of you wanna Bs are just CBplussers

605. Re: ARNewsline 1326 - Jan 10 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-17 04:04:34 UTC
From: "Paul W. Schleck" <pschleck@novia.net>
Message-ID: <3e278020$0$444$45beb828@newscene.com>
Source record: 59637

In <Pine.LNX.4.51.0301170158550.172@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org> "D. Stussy"
<kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> writes:

>On Thu, 16 Jan 2003, Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>>>Subject: Re: ARNewsline 1326 - Jan 10 2003
>>>From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org
>>>Date: 1/15/03 11:32 PM Central Standard Time
>>>Message-id: <Pine.LNX.4.51.0301160531170.14895@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
>>
>>>There is very little non-amateur stuff posted to rec.radio.info, and when it
>>>is, it's generally generic stuff like for SWL (which kind of overlaps
>>>anyway).
>>
>> Oh...I SEE! It's >>OK<< to have to go to a NON-Amateur specific NG to get
>>Newsline because it "overlaps" with the generic "info", but it's NOT >>OK<< to
>>have Bill post Newsline, a "news" service specifically FOR Amateur Radio even
>>though it definitely "overlaps", in content with the Amateur Radio policy
>>group?
>>
>> Suuuuure! THAT makes sense!

>NO, it's not that "rec.radio.info" is non-amateur specific (it is). It's that
>"rec.radio.info" is SPECIFICALLY DESIGNATED AS THE PLACE TO POST
>"BULLETIN-TYPE" MESSAGES, of which these Newsline posts are. There are so few
>of these that there need not be an amateur specific version of the group. If
>Newsline were to post there, it's monthly traffic would double.

>It's not OK to post it here because by the unified charter, it is supposed to
>be posted elsewhere, thus meaning that it is NOT appropriate for the policy
>group.

You keep bringing up this mythical "unified charter" that's supposed to
exist and support your position. In order to have a credible argument,
you must now:

- describe what this "unified charter" is

- specify where its complete text can be found

- quote specific passages from this document that support your position

The only documents that I have found that could *possibly* be this
"unified charter" are the following:

ftp://ftp.uu.net/usenet/news.announce.newgroups/rec/rec.radio.info
ftp://ftp.uu.net/usenet/news.announce.newgroups/rec/rec.radio.amateur-reorg
ftp://ftp.uu.net/usenet/news.announce.newgroups/rec/rec.radio.amateur.dx

ftp://ftp.uu.net/usenet/news.announce.newgroups/rec/rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors

ftp://rtfm.mit.edu/pub/usenet/news.answers/news/

http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=3dead0eb%240%24202%2445beb828%40newscene.com

http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=3c3fb961%240%2459826%2445beb828%40newscene.com

and all of them allow (or do not prohibit) a reasonable amount of
cross-posting of information that is reasonably topical to all target
newsgroups. Furthermore, rec.radio.info was *SPECIFICALLY CREATED AS A
CROSS-POSTING TARGET* like rec.music.info or news.answers. I know this
because I helped create the newsgroup (with Mark Salyzyn, VE6MGS) in
late 1992/early 1993.

--
73, Paul W. Schleck, K3FU
pschleck@novia.net
http://www.novia.net/~pschleck/
Finger pschleck@novia.net for PGP Public Key

606. Re: ARNewsline 1326 - Jan 10 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-17 04:19:31 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <nvLV9.14116$Dq.1403284@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 59638

"Paul W. Schleck" <pschleck@novia.net> wrote

: and all of them allow (or do not prohibit) a reasonable amount of
: cross-posting of information that is reasonably topical to all target
: newsgroups. Furthermore, rec.radio.info was *SPECIFICALLY CREATED AS A
: CROSS-POSTING TARGET* like rec.music.info or news.answers. I know this
: because I helped create the newsgroup (with Mark Salyzyn, VE6MGS) in
: late 1992/early 1993.

Hi Paul,

Great to see you posting again. Most of the old timers are gone, so it's a
real treat to see a friendly name here.

Regarding Mr. Robeson, he's kind of a newcomer so you may not have picked up
on his motto of "Everything not specifically prohibited is mandatory." (or
maybe it's the reverse of that -- he keeps forgetting.)

73, Hans, K0HB

607. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-17 05:43:10 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v2f5v9db7v4f87@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 59639

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030116201748.03252.00000035@mb-cr.aol.com...
> From: "K�HB" k�hb@arrl.DOTORG
>
>
> >: large percentage (visibly higher than general population) are
overweight.
> >
> >Subjective opinion at best.
>
> Just go to a random Hamfest and you will see that this is true. And e-ham
poll
> agrees that large percentage of Hams are overweight.

I've got bad news for you Vipul just take a random walk
down the street. The U.S. population has shifted to a
higher percentage of overweight people, why would the
ham population be ANY different?

>
> >Do you hate CB operators?
>
> No, I don't. To me its another frequency, not another culture.

If you listen to both on the radio they are totally different,
except on a few 80 & 20 meter frequencies.

>
> Also, without CBers (AND their vehical demographics), the economy would
> collapse.

Just what are you smoking?

> Hams are just icing on the cake, not as needed as CBers.

You should really consider drug rehab!

> Hams can be
> replaced with public servants, CBers cannot.

WHAT?!?!?!

>This claim seems reasonable, but
> don't hold me to it - I just came up with this.
>

Vipul your village just called, their idiot is missing!

> >: Wuoff Hong, and other cult like beliefs.
>
> So, Wuoff Hong is not an example of a cult?

No, I've never seen one in an airport trying
to sell me flowers, and chanting Hare Krishna.

> How about pointing out the word Ham
> in highway signs, regularly in QST?

OK here goes, drive down I-65 in Indiana and
look for the exit sign for HAMburg, or drive
in Ohio and find the sign for HAMilton.
In the Northern part of Indiana we have
signs directing you to HAMmond

Vipul just give it up, write the FCC and
tell them you don't want your license
any more and go away! Leave us cult
loving, fat, code word speaking HAMs alone!
--
WW - KB9TMP
Beware of the man who works hard to learn something,
learns it, and finds himself no wiser than before. He is
full of murderous resentment of people who are ignorant
without having come by their ignorance the hard way.
-Peer's Law

608. Re: Another Morse Code Opinion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-17 11:36:34 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030117063634.00690.00000012@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 59640

In article <9oIV9.707692$WL3.726937@rwcrnsc54>, "Jackie" <no@address.given.com>
writes:

>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM>

"Bruce"

>wrote in message
>news:c2356669.0301160904.4192546d@posting.google.com...
>
>> Perhaps a visit to The Argument Clinic would help.
>
>OH, oh, I'm sorry, but this is Abuse. I think he wants room 12A, down the
>hall.

Well, I wasn't expecting the Spanish Inquisition.

Crunchy Frog, anyone?

73 de Jim "Mrs. Conclusion", N2EY

609. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-17 12:22:19 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030117072219.20835.00000011@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 59641

In article <20030116201748.03252.00000035@mb-cr.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>>Do you hate CB operators?
>
>No, I don't. To me its another frequency, not another culture.

Never listened to the HF ham bands, have you?
>
>Also, without CBers (AND their vehical demographics), the economy would
>collapse.

How?

>Hams are just icing on the cake, not as needed as CBers.

Just the opposite. In these parts, cb antennas on houses and cars are rarer than ham antennas.

How many cbers are there in the USA, anyhow?

>Hams can be
>replaced with public servants, CBers cannot.

HAW - that's a rip-snorter! You must be into the good stuff, Vipul!

>This claim seems reasonable, but
>don't hold me to it - I just came up with this.

It's not reasonable at all, and we'll hold you to it.

N2EY

610. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-17 12:22:20 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030117072220.20835.00000012@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 59642

In article <20030116203043.03252.00000036@mb-cr.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)

....who is still waiting for the electrician, or someone like him.....
>
>> > "Ham" radio is different than Amateur radio. "Ham" radio is very much a
>> > cult.
>>
>> Well, maybe I'd best get my sorry behind to a "deprogramming center" ASAP.
>
>--> There's one on Main Street in Newington, CT. I've actually been there.
>
>Are you kidding?,

Nope. I've really been there. Operated the amateur station there, too.

Have you been there?

225 Main Street, Newington, CT 06111.

>the folks there are into the cult as much as anyone.

No cult in evidence anywhere. Just a lot of hard working dedicated folks trying to support the amateur radio service. Some really sharp technical folks, admin folks, etc.

Perhaps Vipul is jealous.
>
>Speaking of deprogramming, once you learn Morse code above a certain
>speed, you CANNOT forget it (even if you tried).

How do you know? And if this is true, what is the magic speed?

>You will automatically translate code
>from movies or whereever else you might hear code.

Sounds like a good thing.
>
>>"Ham" radio is very much a cult.

Naw, just a lot of fun for a lot of folks.

>Who is the leader, then?
>
>A cult does not have to have a leader, just a unified belief system. However,
>not all unified belief systems are cults.

Hams don't have a unified belief system. Therefore, it cannot be a cult, by
your own definition.

There! I've run rings around you logically!
>
>-->Reading those rrcb posts confirmed my suspicions. Vipul and 'ULX -->are
>basically saying the same things.
>
>WA8ULX is a pro-coder, possibly an only-coder. I am not.

Irrelevant. Both of you are basically saying the same things. Both of you are
into illogical rants against anything that does not fit your narrow, biased
definitions of what the ARS should be. In other words, intolerant trolls that
are immune to the ravages of common sense.
>
>-->We haven't seen proof of your accusations either.
>
>Go to a Hamfest.

I've been to many.

>Take a non-Ham so you have some reference to compare. See
>what non-Ham's impression is and you will know.

So the impression of a single unlicensed person supersedes my own observations,
demographic facts and simple logic? Sorry, I'm not buying into that!

Here's a clue, Vipul:

- Not everyone at a hamfest is a ham.
- hamfest attendance is not a representative sample of the amateur population
- the US population, in general, is overweight

Are cbers overweight?

N2EY

611. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-17 13:34:52 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030117083452.18414.00000081@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 59643

>Irrelevant. Both of you are basically saying the same things. Both of you are
>into illogical rants against anything that does not fit your narrow, biased
>definitions of what the ARS should be. In other words, intolerant trolls that

Sounds like you are giving a definition of the New CBplusser Demands for Ham
Radio

612. A Special Post For Vipul

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-17 13:59:10 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030117085910.03098.00000059@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 59644

.....Not one single thing relevent to Amateur Radio policy, but hey...It's a snow day and I thought I'd share some profound thoughts:

1. Give a person a fish and you feed them for a day.

Teach that person to use the Internet and they won't bother you for weeks.

2. You read about all these terrorists--most of them came here legally, but they hung around on these expired visas, some for as long as 10-15 years.

Now, compare that to Blockbuster: you're two days late with a video and those people are all over you. Let's put Blockbuster in charge of immigration.

3. How is it one careless match can start a forest fire, but it takes a whole box to start a campfire?

4. Health nuts are going to feel stupid someday..... lying in hospitals dying of nothing.

5. The other night I ate at a real family restaurant. Every table had an argument going.

6. Have you noticed since everyone has a camcorder these days, no one talks about seeing UFOs like they used to.

7. According to a recent survey, men say the first thing they notice about a woman is their eyes, and women say the first thing they notice about men is they're a bunch of liars.

8. Whenever I feel blue, I start breathing again.

9. All of us could take a lesson from the weather. It pays no attention to criticism.

10. Have you noticed that a slight tax increase costs you two hundred dollars, and a substantial tax cut saves you thirty cents?

11. In the 60's people took acid to make the world weird. Now the world is weird and people take Prozac to make it normal.

12. Politics is supposed to be the second oldest profession. I have come to realize that it bears a very close resemblance to the first.

13. There is a theory which states that if ever anybody discovers exactly what the Universe is for and why it is here, it will instantly disappear and be replaced by something even more bizarre and inexplicable. There is another theory which states that this has already happened.

14. I read recipes the same way I read science fiction. I get to the end and I think, "Well, that's not going to happen."

15. Some people are like Slinkies . . . not really good for anything, but you still can't help but smile when you see one tumble down the stairs.

613. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-17 14:15:57 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030117091557.03098.00000060@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 59645

>Subject: Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 1/16/03 7:30 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030116203043.03252.00000036@mb-cr.aol.com>

>Speaking of deprogramming, once you learn Morse code above a certain speed,
>you
>CANNOT forget it (even if you tried). You will automatically translate code
>from movies or whereever else you might hear code.

I also "decode" Spanish and German. So what?

>A cult does not have to have a leader, just a unified belief system. However,
>not all unified belief systems are cults

The you do not understand what a cult it, how it is created or
promulgated.

>WA8ULX is a pro-coder, possibly an only-coder. I am not.

As it is impossible to hold ANY class of Amateur Radio license in teh
United States based solely upon the passing of Morse Code test, WHAT is an
"only coder"...?!?!

Or is this another one of those definitions we CAN'T find in
Webster's...?!?!

>Go to a Hamfest. Take a non-Ham so you have some reference to compare. See
>what
>non-Ham's impression is and you will know.

Without some common frame of reference, how can a "non-Ham" make ANY
comparison...?!?!

And I find it VERY funny that YOU use the term "Ham" in your posts, yet
you deride the use of the term by anyone else.

If you are going to promote a concept as being the "right" way, Vipul, you
should conduct yourself by your own standards! Ergo I shall expect to no
longer see you using the term "Ham" in any original text from now
on...right???

Also, if Amateurs should not call themselves "Hams", what are you going to
call those events that you suggest we take "non-Hams" to?

I got an idea: "Non-Professional Radio Hobbyist Seminar, Social and
Exhibiton"...

Naaaw...Hamfest it is...

Steve, K4YZ

614. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-17 14:23:33 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030117092333.03098.00000061@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 59646

>Subject: Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade
>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>Date: 1/17/03 6:22 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030117072220.20835.00000012@mb-fy.aol.com>

>>You will automatically translate code
>>from movies or whereever else you might hear code.
>
>Sounds like a good thing.

I am sure it is "radio urban legend", but it reminds me of the story of a bunch of union radio operators playing poker in the union hall while waiting for an announcement for a ship to sail with. Half way through a hand, one of them pauses for a second, then abruptly folds and excuses himself from the table. He returns a few minutes later with sailing orders in hand.

His friends are stunned as they didn't hear any announcement. When asked how HE heard the announcement and they didn't, he said "Simple, they sent a message over the PA in Morse that said "Immediate sailing orders available for the first radio operator to present himself to the clerk with this message" !

My kinda radio operator, fiction or otherwise!

73

Steve, K4YZ

615. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-17 14:29:33 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030117092933.03098.00000062@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 59647

>Subject: Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 1/16/03 7:17 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030116201748.03252.00000035@mb-cr.aol.com>

>>Do you hate CB operators?
>
>No, I don't. To me its another frequency, not another culture.

Then you haven't been listening before you transmit, Vipul.

>Also, without CBers (AND their vehical demographics), the economy would
>collapse. Hams are just icing on the cake, not as needed as CBers. Hams can
>be
>replaced with public servants, CBers cannot. This claim seems reasonable, but
>don't hold me to it - I just came up with this.

BBBbwwwwwaahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahaha ! ! ! !

WHAT DRUNKEN STUPOR DID THIS COME FROM..?!?!?

WHAT do you presume CB radio replaces? And WHERE did you get the idea
that CB radio has ANY impact on the "economy"..?!?!

If not one CB radio was sold in the next six months, I dare say life in
the United States, and indeed the world, would go on... ! ! !

BBBWWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! ! ! !

Just when I thought it couldn't get any stranger!

Thanks, Vipul! What a sense of humor!

Steve, K4YZ

616. Re: ARNewsline 1326 - Jan 10 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-17 14:37:11 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030117093712.03098.00000063@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 59648

>Subject: Re: ARNewsline 1326 - Jan 10 2003
>From: "Kï¿½HB" kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG
>Date: 1/16/03 10:19 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <nvLV9.14116$Dq.1403284@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>

>Regarding Mr. Robeson, he's kind of a newcomer so you may not have picked up
>on his motto of "Everything not specifically prohibited is mandatory." (or
>maybe it's the reverse of that -- he keeps forgetting.)

Hans, you're going to have to show me where anything I said was germane to Paul's comments. I think YOU are once again confused.

I am not the one suggesting what should be prohibited from the NG...Mr. Stussy is.

The only time I make a point of rubbing anyone's nose in "Amateur Specific" suggestions is when Lennie goes off on one of his tirades that is OBVIOUSLY not Amateur Radio related, and then ONLY because he is prone to "redirect" anyone when they dare stray from a topic that HE wants to "discuss".

73

Steve, K4YZ

617. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-17 16:09:37 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <5VVV9.15806$Qr4.1497084@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 59649

"KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com> wrote

: Beware of the man who works hard to learn something,
: learns it, and finds himself no wiser than before. He is
: full of murderous resentment of people who are ignorant
: without having come by their ignorance the hard way.
: -Peer's Law
:

I don't know who "Peer" is, but that quote comes directly from the mouth of the Prophet Bokonon in Vonenegut's book "Cat's Cradle".

The Prophet also tells us "Maturity is a bitter disappointment for which no remedy exists, unless laughter can be said to remedy anything."

73, de Hans, K0HB

618. Re: Total Outrage!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-17 16:30:27 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <DcWV9.15845$Qr4.1499920@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 59650
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"N0VFP 2.0" <brother_lloyd_99@yahoo.com.spma> wrote

:
: I am going to send membership to IARN and AARA - very soon. There is one
: person who can save Ham Radio from sudden destruction - Glenn Baxter
:
: I also support the efforts of Sam Voron, VK2BVS.
:
: At least Glenn wont charge me to look at his website, like Hal Turner will
: soon.......
:

Hey, Lloyd,

We're sorry that someone (was it Raincoat Charlie?) crawled inside your
cranium and rearranged all the furniture. Would you please seek help
getting things put back in proper positions.

With all kind wishes,

Hans, K0HB

619. Re: An interesting article

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-17 20:23:37 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030117152337.06736.00000036@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 59703

>Subject: Re: An interesting article
>From: "KC8PMX" kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net
>Date: 1/13/03 11:11 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <b09lnp224c0@enews4.newsguy.com>

>Now, if all three could somehow merge.....WOW what a mag!

If the editorial staff of "73" could keep WackyWayne stuffed with enuff pablum, you might be right.

73

Steve, K4YZ

620. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-17 20:23:38 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0301171223.13426455@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59702

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030117092333.03098.00000061@mb-cr.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade
> >From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> >Date: 1/17/03 6:22 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20030117072220.20835.00000012@mb-fy.aol.com>
>
> >>You will automatically translate code
> >>from movies or whereever else you might hear code.
> >
> >Sounds like a good thing.
>
> I am sure it is "radio urban legend", but it reminds me of the story of a
> bunch of union radio operators playing poker in the union hall while waiting
> for an announcement for a ship to sail with. Half way through a hand, one of
> them pauses for a second, then abruptly folds and excuses himself from the
> table. He returns a few minutes later with sailing orders in hand.
>
> His friends are stunned as they didn't hear any announcement. When asked
> how HE heard the announcement and they didn't, he said "Simple, they sent a
> message over the PA in Morse that said "Immediate sailing orders available for
> the first radio operator to present himself to the clerk with this message" !
>
> My kinda radio operator, fiction or otherwise!

It's almost certainly an urban legend for the following reason: A
Morse mesage on the PA would have been noticed by everyone.

It's probably a retelling of a much older story, generally accredited
to a railroad superintendent's office in the days when the RRs used
the landline telegraph for communications. The clacking of sounders
was a common-enough background in any RR station or office in those
days.

The story has it that the super advertised a job for an assistant, and
many candidates showed up. Such jobs were coveted because they were
often the starting place to much bigger things.

Secretary had them wait in the outer office, saying the super would
see them when he was available. Took their names, times of arrival,
etc. They all sat around waiting to be called.

Finally a young man walks in, pauses, heads right for the door to the
super's private office and walks in like he owns the place. Comes out
in a few minutes and says the others can leave - job's been filled.
They figure the fix is in and the youngster must be a relative or

something, but the super comes out and tells them what the sounder has been sending all the time they've been waiting:

"if you can read this, come into the office"

Probably an old boomer's tale, but ya never know. Stranger stories have been found to be true.

73 de Jim, N2EY

621. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-17 21:35:15 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3E287713.95E5A207@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 59704

WA8ULX wrote:

> >WA8ULX is a pro-coder, possibly an only-coder. I am not.
> >
>
> Wrong WA8ULX is a REAL HAM, the rest of you wanna Bs are just CBplussers

Then get a REAL ISP then, not aol.

:-)

622. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-17 21:41:08 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3E287873.D368DBDC@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 59705

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:

>
> As it is impossible to hold ANY class of Amateur Radio license in the
> United States based solely upon the passing of Morse Code test, WHAT is an
> "only coder"...?!?!
>

There was the old novice license. Oh, wait, that required a written test.
A simple one, but still required.

Or a ham who prefers to use CW only. Larry for instance. You
can do that if you wish....

623. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-17 21:58:54 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030117165854.18414.00000088@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 59706

>Then get a REAL ISP then, not aol.
>
>:-)
>

I have 1, actually I have 3 of them, just use AOL for laughs

624. Re: ARNewsline 1326 - Jan 10 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-17 23:33:47 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.51.0301172331300.608@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 59707

On Fri, 16 Jan 2003, Paul W. Schleck wrote:
>In <Pine.LNX.4.51.0301170158550.172@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org> "D. Stussy"
<kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> writes:
>>On Thu, 16 Jan 2003, Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>>>>Subject: Re: ARNewsline 1326 - Jan 10 2003
>>>>From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org
>>>>Date: 1/15/03 11:32 PM Central Standard Time
>>>>Message-id: <Pine.LNX.4.51.0301160531170.14895@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
>>>
>>>>There is very little non-amateur stuff posted to rec.radio.info, and when it
>>>>is, it's generally generic stuff like for SWL (which kind of overlaps
>>>>anyway).
>>>
>>> Oh...I SEE! It's >>OK<< to have to go to a NON-Amateur specific NG to get
>>>Newsline because it "overlaps" with the generic "info", but it's NOT >>OK<< to
>>>have Bill post Newsline, a "news" service specifically FOR Amateur Radio even
>>>though it definitely "overlaps", in content with the Amateur Radio policy
>>>group?
>>>
>>> Suuuuure! THAT makes sense!
>
>>NO, it's not that "rec.radio.info" is non-amateur specific (it is). It's that
>>"rec.radio.info" is SPECIFICALLY DESIGNATED AS THE PLACE TO POST
>>"BULLETIN-TYPE" MESSAGES, of which these Newsline posts are. There are so few
>>of these that there need not be an amateur specific version of the group. If
>>Newsline were to post there, it's monthly traffic would double.
>
>>It's not OK to post it here because by the unified charter, it is supposed to
>>be posted elsewhere, thus meaning that it is NOT appropriate for the policy
>>group.
>
>You keep bringing up this mythical "unified charter" that's supposed to
>exist and support your position. In order to have a credible argument,
>you must now:
>
>- describe what this "unified charter" is

The one that is a single charter for the entire rec.radio newsgroup hierarchy.
It has been posted to the groups, although not recently. I think the last time
it was posted was over a year ago. Try looking for it under the domain that
"hosts" (i.e. started) the hierarchy - hawaii.edu.

>- specify where its complete text can be found
>
>- quote specific passages from this document that support your position

>
>The only documents that I have found that could *possibly* be this
>"unified charter" are the following:
>
>ftp://ftp.uu.net/usenet/news.announce.newgroups/rec/rec.radio.info
>ftp://ftp.uu.net/usenet/news.announce.newgroups/rec/rec.radio.amateur-reorg
>ftp://ftp.uu.net/usenet/news.announce.newgroups/rec/rec.radio.amateur.dx
>ftp://ftp.uu.net/usenet/news.announce.newgroups/rec/rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors
>
>ftp://rtfm.mit.edu/pub/usenet/news.answers/news/
>
>http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=3dead0eb%240%24202%2445beb828%40newscene.com
>
>http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=3c3fb961%240%2459826%2445beb828%40newscene.com
>
>and all of them allow (or do not prohibit) a reasonable amount of
>cross-posting of information that is reasonably topical to all target
>newsgroups. Furthermore, rec.radio.info was *SPECIFICALLY CREATED AS A
>CROSS-POSTING TARGET* like rec.music.info or news.answers. I know this
>because I helped create the newsgroup (with Mark Salyzyn, VE6MGS) in
>late 1992/early 1993.

625. Re: ARNewsline 1326 - Jan 10 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-17 23:58:57 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.51.0301172339330.608@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 59708

"Unified Charter": http://www.faqs.org/faqs/radio/personal-intro/

Titled: Guide to the rec.radio Newsgroups.

It is clear that it means that "Newsline's" posts are permitted for rec.radio.info and NOT acceptable for "rec.radio.amateur.policy" (since the majority of its content is not policy related, even if just "one story" is).

Upon re-reading it, I withdraw my comment regarding cross-posting where one group is "rec.radio.info", but that section of the document does indicate that the other area(s) an "rri" post is cross-posted to must be on topic. In this respect, "rrap" is still not an appropriate place for "Newsline" to be posted (cross-posted or not).

Looking at http://www.ibiblio.org/usenet-i/groups-html/rec.radio.info.html, "AR Newsline" is listed as one of the things that is supposed to be posted to "rri" (as of January 1996). Clearly, not all of the items authorized for "rri" (by listing) are still posted regularly, but that doesn't change the fact that they should or shouldn't be (should they reoccur).

626. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-18 00:17:49 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030117191749.01476.00000037@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 59709

>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>How do you know?

Because I know another realtime encoding scheme.

>And if this is true, what is the magic speed?

5 words per minute.

Just kidding. Code class said 13 words per min according to certain studies.

>>>"Ham" radio is very much a cult.
>
>Naw, just a lot of fun for a lot of folks.

Who said it can't be a fun cult?

>So the impression of a single unlicensed person supersedes my own
>observations,
>demographic facts and simple logic? Sorry, I'm not buying into that!

Its a comparison, if Ham radio is normal to the non Ham. Due to codewords, you may have to explain things to the non-Ham. Then after the non-Ham understands, the non-Ham will still think Hams are strange.

>- Not everyone at a hamfest is a ham.

True, spouses and children of Hams attend.

>- hamfest attendance is not a representative sample of the amateur population

Even if this were true, field day is representative, since almost all Hams participate. Field day remarks were similar to Hamfest remarks.

>Are cbers overweight?
They probably are, since most Hams are CBers. I don't know CBers, as I went straight to Ham.

627. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-18 00:25:45 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030117192545.01476.00000038@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 59710

From K4YZ:
> As it is impossible to hold ANY class of Amateur Radio license in teh
>United States based solely upon the passing of Morse Code test, WHAT is an
>"only coder"...?!?!

An only coder like to only use code, but has little grasp of the technical material. Since the written test is so easy, it is very possible to be an only-coder.

>And I find it VERY funny that YOU use the term "Ham" in your posts, yet
>you deride the use of the term by anyone else.

When? I am aware of using Ham vs amateur, but I may slip. Any such usage is a slip, so its not inconsistant.

Also, I didn't say Hams did not exist. The license is for amateur radio operation. Most of those who holds one like to be called "Hams". I can call people Hams if they call themselves Hams.

> Also, if Amateurs should not call themselves "Hams", what are you going
>to
>call those events that you suggest we take "non-Hams" to?

The term Hamfest is correct because it reflects the nature of those that attend - Hams.

628. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-18 00:26:55 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030117192655.01476.00000039@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 59711

From: Robert Casey wa2ise@ix.netcom.com

>WHAT is an
>> "only coder"...?!?!

>Or a ham who prefers to use CW only. Larry for instance. You
>can do that if you wish....

Correct.

629. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-18 00:35:01 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030117193501.01476.00000040@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 59712

>From: "KB9TMP" kb9tmp@juno.com

>> So, Wuoff Hong is not an example of a cult?
>
>No, I've never seen one in an airport trying
>to sell me flowers, and chanting Hare Krishna.

A cult need not be public to be a cult. Actually, it is a sub-cult of Ham radio, just like Morse code is.

At midnight at certain Hamfests you make a secret pledge about operating radio certain way. Then you are a member of Wouff Hong.

Sounds like a cult to me.

>OK here goes, drive down I-65 in Indiana and
>look for the exit sign for HAMburg

Yes, just like that. But in QST these "spottings" are more cute.

630. Re: ARNewsline 1326 - Jan 10 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-18 01:57:00 UTC
From: Shephed <roll1up@smkey.com>
Message-ID: <Mv2W9.16321$i73.3427050@twister.neo.rr.com>
Source record: 59713

The original "SPAM" that the majority really could care less about was 28K, so far you have posted 19K bitching about it, add everyone else's responses and the total far exceeds the original post.

The moral, FUGEDABOUTIT.

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message news:Pine.LNX.4.51.0301150018290.13935@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
> On Tue, 14 Jan 2003, Big Al wrote:
> > Pasternak continues to SPAM Usenet with his worthless Spew.
> > Weekly Pasternak SPAM follows:
> >
> >"Radionews" <radionews@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20030114131035.16998.00000881@mb-cf.aol.com...
> >> Amateur Radio NewslineT Report 1326 - January 10, 2003
> >> ...
>
> So, what exactly did you do about it? Besides quoting the entire message here
> in your bitch response, did you manage to send a complaint to his ISP? I did.

631. Re: ARNewsline 1326 - Jan 10 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-18 02:06:20 UTC
From: mark@bohica.net
Message-ID: <e04a8eee.0301171806.1f15df42@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59714

Paul W. Schleck <pschleck@novia.net> wrote in message
news:<3e278020$0$444$45beb828@newscene.com>...
> The only documents that I have found that could *possibly* be this
> "unified charter" are the following:
>
> ftp://ftp.uu.net/usenet/news.announce.newgroups/rec/rec.radio.info
> ftp://ftp.uu.net/usenet/news.announce.newgroups/rec/rec.radio.amateur-reorg
> ftp://ftp.uu.net/usenet/news.announce.newgroups/rec/rec.radio.amateur.dx
> ftp://ftp.uu.net/usenet/news.announce.newgroups/rec/rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors
>
> ftp://rtfm.mit.edu/pub/usenet/news.answers/news/
>
> http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=3dead0eb%240%24202%2445beb828%40newscene.com
>
> http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=3c3fb961%240%2459826%2445beb828%40newscene.com
>
> and all of them allow (or do not prohibit) a reasonable amount of
> cross-posting of information that is reasonably topical to all target
> newsgroups. Furthermore, rec.radio.info was *SPECIFICALLY CREATED AS A
> CROSS-POSTING TARGET* like rec.music.info or news.answers. I know this
> because I helped create the newsgroup (with Mark Salyzyn, VE6MGS) in
> late 1992/early 1993.

What he sez.

In fact, as I was the first moderator of the group, I actively
supported and demanded for cross-posting for several reasons:

1) info messages were sometimes viewed as `noise' or `volume' in
discussions, all popular newsreaders can deal with filtering out the
info messages by recognizing the cross posting group it belongs to.
This gave a much needed control over content for the readers of the
groups.
2) When in info, one also needs a clue as to which group was pertinent
to the content, so if one saw rec.radio.space, one would know it was a
set of Keplerians.
3) Cross posting good, multiple posting is bad.
4) With the additional expiration and controls a moderator could place
on information postings, one could ensure that the articles remained
persistent on the news servers, always available when they were
timely, rec.radio.info cross posting along with the Moderator's stamps
gave the credentials necessary to maintain this control. Expiry on a
server was very much an issue at the time with the explosive growth of
the usenet.
5) Cross posting also permitted automated archiving of the information

articles that made sense.

Web based posting notwithstanding ...

Sincerely -- Mark Salyzyn ex-VE6MGS :-(

BTW, this is the first posting to USENET in 5 years since my
retirement from moderating rec.radio.info.

632. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-18 02:36:53 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030117213653.13253.00000062@mb-fe.aol.com>
Source record: 59715

In article <3E287873.D368DBDC@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>> As it is impossible to hold ANY class of Amateur Radio license in the
>> United States based solely upon the passing of Morse Code test, WHAT is an
>> "only coder"...?!?!
>>
>
>There was the old novice license. Oh, wait, that required a written test.
>A simple one, but still required.
>
>Or a ham who prefers to use CW only. Larry for instance. You
>can do that if you wish....

Who -- Moi? An "only coder?" Only if you include Baudot and PSK-31
unicode! And ASCII. And a lot of others I don't even know the names of!
I spend more time on the digital modes than I do on CW!

73 de Larry, K3LT

633. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-18 03:36:53 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030117223653.04873.00000013@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 59716

In article <20030117191749.01476.00000037@mb-mk.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>>How do you know?
>
>Because I know another realtime encoding scheme.

What scheme is that?
>
>>And if this is true, what is the magic speed?
>
>5 words per minute.
>
>Just kidding. Code class said 13 words per min according to certain studies.

So you accept that as fact.
>
>>>>"Ham" radio is very much a cult.
>>
>>Naw, just a lot of fun for a lot of folks.
>
>Who said it can't be a fun cult?

It's not a cult, by your own definition of a cult requiring a unified belief system.
>
>>So the impression of a single unlicensed person supersedes my own
>>observations,
>>demographic facts and simple logic? Sorry, I'm not buying into that!
>
>Its a comparison, if Ham radio is normal to the non Ham.

One nonham.

>Due to codewords,
>you
>may have to explain things to the non-Ham. Then after the non-Ham
>understands,
>the non-Ham will still think Hams are strange.

So one nonham gets to decide. That's very strange.
>
>>- Not everyone at a hamfest is a ham.
>
>True, spouses and children of Hams attend.

Also buyers and sellers who are not hams. Computer folks. cbers and others.
>
>>- hamfest attendance is not a representative sample of the amateur
>population
>
>Even if this were true, field day is representative, since almost all Hams
>participate.

"almost all hams participate"?? You are very mistaken. Check out how many participated in FD 2002 and compute the percentage of US hams who participated.

>Field day remarks were similar to Hamfest remarks.

By whom?
>
>>Are cbers overweight?

>They probably are, since most Hams are CBers.

More mistakes. You and 'ULX must be the same person, for all the baseless claims made here.

>I don't know CBers, as I went
>straight to Ham.

Really? Then when did you operate HF, as you claimed in another post? And why all the posts to rec.radio.cb?

N2EY

634. Re: ARNewsline 1326 - Jan 10 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-18 05:39:14 UTC
From: "Paul W. Schleck" <pschleck@novia.net>
Message-ID: <3e28e7c5$0$437$45beb828@newscene.com>
Source record: 59717

In <e04a8eee.0301171806.1f15df42@posting.google.com> mark@bohica.net (Mark Salyzyn) writes:

>Paul W. Schleck <pschleck@novia.net> wrote in message news:<3e278020$0$444$45beb828@newscene.com>...
>> The only documents that I have found that could *possibly* be this
>> "unified charter" are the following:
>>
>> ftp://ftp.uu.net/usenet/news.announce.newgroups/rec/rec.radio.info
>> ftp://ftp.uu.net/usenet/news.announce.newgroups/rec/rec.radio.amateur-reorg
>> ftp://ftp.uu.net/usenet/news.announce.newgroups/rec/rec.radio.amateur.dx
>> ftp://ftp.uu.net/usenet/news.announce.newgroups/rec/rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors
>>
>> ftp://rtfm.mit.edu/pub/usenet/news.answers/news/
>>
>> http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=3dead0eb%240%24202%2445beb828%40newscene.com
>>
>> http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=3c3fb961%240%2459826%2445beb828%40newscene.com
>>
>> and all of them allow (or do not prohibit) a reasonable amount of
>> cross-posting of information that is reasonably topical to all target
>> newsgroups. Furthermore, rec.radio.info was *SPECIFICALLY CREATED AS A
>> CROSS-POSTING TARGET* like rec.music.info or news.answers. I know this
>> because I helped create the newsgroup (with Mark Salyzyn, VE6MGS) in
>> late 1992/early 1993.

>What he sez.

>In fact, as I was the first moderator of the group, I actively
>supported and demanded for cross-posting for several reasons:

Mark!

What a blast from the past! I am *honored* to have our esteemed Charter Moderator of the rec.radio.info newsgroup back in the rec.radio.* newsgroups. One side effect of being around for a long time is that you can detect the historical revisionism starting :-).

>1) info messages were sometimes viewed as `noise' or `volume' in
>discussions, all popular newsreaders can deal with filtering out the
>info messages by recognizing the cross posting group it belongs to.
>This gave a much needed control over content for the readers of the
>groups.

A very good point. There was (and still is) no strict consensus about where bulletin and FAQ postings should be posted. Some wanted them

segregated to their own newsgroup, others were *adamant* that such articles should remain in the newsgroups in which they already appear, and not be "stolen" by by being placed in "yet another newsgroup." Simultaneous cross-posting, combined with use of fully-featured, standards-compliant, newsreaders, would make everyone happy by giving them the power to custom-tailor their reading path to their preferences.

>2) When in info, one also needs a clue as to which group was pertinent
>to the content, so if one saw rec.radio.space, one would know it was a
>set of Keplerians.
>3) Cross posting good, multiple posting is bad.

The America On-Line (AOL) newsreader is notoriously bad in this respect by only permitting articles to be separately posted to one newsgroup at a time. AOL tends to take the attitude that anything that *COULD* be abused needs to be tightly controlled, even if that keeps responsible users from doing the best thing.

Sorry to sound curmudgeonly, but much of today's newsreader software has taken a giant step backwards. The most notorious offenders are those included with web browsers and some on-line services like AOL. The original "rn" newsreader (now about 20 years old) trumped all of them by providing:

- simultaneous cross-posting to at least a reasonable number of newsgroups

- the ability to edit all news article headers, especially Newsgroups and Followup-To

- a warning to the poster about inherited newsgroups on followups, and requiring the poster to review and edit the Newsgroups header before posting those followups

- a famous warning to the poster about the expense borne by all sites carrying Usenet News to store and forward their article, encouraging the poster to think carefully before posting:

"This program posts news to thousands of machines throughout the
entire civilized world. Your message will cost the net hundreds
if not thousands of dollars to send everywhere.

Are you absolutely sure that you want to do this? [yn]"

- a "kill" file to enable the reader to take unwanted articles out of their reading path

>4) With the additional expiration and controls a moderator could place
>on information postings, one could ensure that the articles remained
>persistent on the news servers, always available when they were
>timely, rec.radio.info cross posting along with the Moderator's stamps
>gave the credentials necessary to maintain this control. Expiry on a
>server was very much an issue at the time with the explosive growth of
>the usenet.

>5) Cross posting also permitted automated archiving of the information
>articles that made sense.

Items 4 and 5 were very important in the early days of the net, when
on-line resources like DejaNews (later Google Groups) simply didn't
exist. Even nowadays, it's convenient to go to:

http://groups.google.com

and filter searches by the criteria:

"group:rec.radio.info"

>Web based posting notwithstanding ...

>Sincerely -- Mark Salyzyn ex-VE6MGS :-(

>BTW, this is the first posting to USENET in 5 years since my
>retirement from moderating rec.radio.info.

I hope we can hear from you more often, and that we can look forward to
you recovering an amateur radio license (in the U.S., Canada, or both)
in the near future.

--
73, Paul W. Schleck, K3FU
pschleck@novia.net
http://www.novia.net/~pschleck/
Finger pschleck@novia.net for PGP Public Key

635. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-18 06:32:19 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v2ht79f6qbosb3@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 59718

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030117193501.01476.00000040@mb-mk.aol.com...
> >From: "KB9TMP" kb9tmp@juno.com
>
> >> So, Wuoff Hong is not an example of a cult?
> >
> >No, I've never seen one in an airport trying
> >to sell me flowers, and chanting Hare Krishna.
>
> A cult need not be public to be a cult. Actually, it is a sub-cult of Ham
> radio, just like Morse code is.

Sub-Cult? You need to submit that one to Webster, he missed that word.

>
> At midnight at certain Hamfests you make a secret pledge about operating
radio
> certain way. Then you are a member of Wouff Hong.

Not at any of the red-neck hamfests I've been to.

>
> Sounds like a cult to me.
>
> >OK here goes, drive down I-65 in Indiana and
> >look for the exit sign for HAMburg
>
> Yes, just like that. But in QST these "spottings" are more cute.

You ask for signs I gave you signs and where to look for them.
You didn't say anything about them having to be "cute"!

Admit it Vipul you don't like hams or ham radio!
What you do like is getting on the NG and trying
to start stuff by saying things to get us upset.

You should follow the advice of Groucho Marx
when he made the following statement.

"I don't want to belong to any club
that will accept me as a member."

Think about it Vipul, it's not to late
to get that license of yours cancelled.
--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,

if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx

636. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-18 06:42:22 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v2htq5b2ejstae@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 59719

"K&#65533;HB" <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG> wrote in message
news:5VVV9.15806$Qr4.1497084@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> "KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com> wrote
>
> : Beware of the man who works hard to learn something,
> : learns it, and finds himself no wiser than before. He is
> : full of murderous resentment of people who are ignorant
> : without having come by their ignorance the hard way.
> : -Peer's Law
> :
>
> I don't know who "Peer" is, but that quote comes directly from the mouth
of
> the Prophet Bokonon in Vonenegut's book "Cat's Cradle".
>
> The Prophet also tells us "Maturity is a bitter disappointment for which
no
> remedy exists, unless laughter can be said to remedy anything."
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

```
The quote is from the book "Murphy's Law and 1001
reasons why things go wrong". I don't know who Peer
is either. I've seen some of the postings with "wisdom"
from the Prophet Bokonon in Vonenegut's book
"Cat's Cradle", but I don't think I'll be reading it any
time soon. It sounds kinda dry to me, but on the other
hand I'm sure the stuff I read would boar others to
tears as well.

Life is just like Ham Radio, there are plenty
of things for everyone to enjoy! Poor Vipul
will go nuts if he starts thinking about that statement! ;^)

--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx
```

637. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-18 06:48:51 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v2hu693p16nb10@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 59720

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030117213653.13253.00000062@mb-fe.aol.com...
> In article <3E287873.D368DBDC@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
> <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
>
> >> As it is impossible to hold ANY class of Amateur Radio license in
the
> >> United States based solely upon the passing of Morse Code test, WHAT
is an
> >> "only coder"...?!?!
> >>
> >
> >There was the old novice license. Oh, wait, that required a written
test.
> >A simple one, but still required.
> >
> >Or a ham who prefers to use CW only. Larry for instance. You
> >can do that if you wish....
>
> Who -- Moi? An "only coder?" Only if you include Baudot and PSK-31

PSK31 you say. What bands and when? I'll start looking for you.

> unicode! And ASCII. And a lot of others I don't even know the names of!

Have you tried Hellschriber? It looks interesting to me also.

> I spend more time on the digital modes than I do on CW!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

I spend about 99% of my time just listening
(or watching/reading) and just a little TXing.

--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx

638. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-18 10:42:12 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030118054212.01669.00000033@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 59721

>Subject: Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 1/17/03 6:26 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030117192655.01476.00000039@mb-mk.aol.com>

>
>>Or a ham who prefers to use CW only. Larry for instance. You
>>can do that if you wish....
>
>Correct.

The problem with that, Vipul, is that Larry has made it VERY clear that he does NOT use "only" code.

And your suggestion that Morse Code as an "only" qualification still rings hollow. There is NO Amateur Radio license issued based soley upon passing of a Morse Code test. You are still in error.

Steve, K4YZ

639. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-18 11:23:46 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030118062346.01669.00000034@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 59722

>Subject: Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 1/17/03 6:17 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030117191749.01476.00000037@mb-mk.aol.com>

>Its a comparison, if Ham radio is normal to the non Ham. Due to codewords,
>you
>may have to explain things to the non-Ham. Then after the non-Ham
>understands,
>the non-Ham will still think Hams are strange

So, Vipul...NO other hobby, avocation or occupation has language specific
to it's activities that may not be understood by non-participants...?!?!
NASCAR?...Astronomy?...Knitting?...Rodeo riding?...etc..etc...etc...

And you have yet to define "codewords". The FCC has defined "codes" as
willful attempts to misconvey the actual intent of the message.

There is nothing secret nor sinister about abbreviations or "lingo" used
by Amateur Radio operators. So what codewords are you refering to?

>>- hamfest attendance is not a representative sample of the amateur
>population
>
>Even if this were true, field day is representative, since almost all Hams
>participate. Field day remarks were similar to Hamfest remarks.

"...since almost all Hams participate." Hmmmmmm....To ME. "almost all" is
a large percentage...Better that 75% certainly. Are you going to tell me that
over 425,000 Amateurs participated in last Field Day, Vipul?

I have only seen ONE club that ever mustered more than a fractional part
of it's membership that participated in Field Day, and that was because the
club was specifically organized FOR Field Day.

I have the December 2002 QST in my lap. Although I did not tally up the
numbers, I did run through the "number of participants" column. I am pretty
darned sure you won't come up with 50% of the present Amateur licensee database
as having participated. And please note that says "PARTICIPANTS"...There only
need be ONE FCC licensee presnt to be "legal"...MANY Field Day activities have
several "participants" who are not licensees.

And I see YOU continue to use the term "Ham" even though you villify it's
use by Amateur Radio participants in general. So which way is it to be, Vipul?

"Ham" radio is OK to use by anyone, or JUST you?

>>Are cbers overweight?

>They probably are, since most Hams are CBers. I don't know CBers, as I went
>straight to Ham.

Again, the use of a near-absolute. The use of an adjective like "most", in the context you use it, means a near-total number. Again, using 75% as a milestone, are you telling me that 75% of ALL Amateurs are also active on CB radio?

From where do you get these numbers? What poll was conducted to determine this?

Have you walked through the parking lot of a Hamfest to peer in the cars of Hams to see if they have a CB?

Do you eve's drop on conversations to listen for "codewords" like "10-4" or "good buddy"...?!?!

And how do you know that the car belongs to a "Ham" if the callsign is not on the license plate (which YOU consider strange)...?

Even if there IS a CB in the car, how do you know it is used by the Ham, and not by another driver (spouse, child) of the licensee?

You raise more questions than you answer, Vipul. Not good.

Steve, K4YZ

640. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-18 11:51:19 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030118065119.01669.00000035@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 59723

>Subject: Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 1/17/03 6:25 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030117192545.01476.00000038@mb-mk.aol.com>

>An only coder like to only use code, but has little grasp of the technical
>material. Since the written test is so easy, it is very possible to be an
>only-coder.

And from WHAT source, reference or poll did you acquire this information?

Since you disclaim using Morse Code, how is it that you seem to "know"
what it is they do or don't know?

And on what basis do you assert the test is "easy"..? That it MAY have
been easy for YOU...?

And by the very fact that the (HF) licensee must take a written test, there
can be no such thing as an "only-coder". The test tests for knowledge in other
modes as well. Morse is the only one that PRACTICAL skill is demonstrated.

>>And I find it VERY funny that YOU use the term "Ham" in your posts, yet
>>you deride the use of the term by anyone else.
>
>When? I am aware of using Ham vs amateur, but I may slip. Any such usage is a
>slip, so its not inconsistant.

It's VERY consistant. This very day you have used it numerous times in
this and other threads and posts.

>Also, I didn't say Hams did not exist. The license is for amateur radio
>operation. Most of those who holds one like to be called "Hams". I can call
>people Hams if they call themselves Hams.

So by this Vipullian logic, if a black person uses the "N" word, it's OK
for me to do it?

And then kike, spic, mick, wetback and whatever other derogatroy terms are
OK if I hear someone else use them?

Rags? Camel jockeys? Am I getting a bit close to home?

Are you getting the picture that if you are going to label some term as
offensive, then you yourself should refrain from it's dissemination?

If you are going to label the term "Ham" as somehow demeaning or
derogatory, why do YOU insist on using it?

>The term Hamfest is correct because it reflects the nature of those that
>attend
>- Hams.

So, by virtue of having been to a Hamfest yourself, YOU are a "Ham"...?

I am just trying to unravell the Vipullian logic here. It's very
confusing.

Steve, K4YZ

641. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-18 15:24:20 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v2iscp6k131v7e@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 59724

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030118065119.01669.00000035@mb-mk.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade
> >From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
> >Date: 1/17/03 6:25 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20030117192545.01476.00000038@mb-mk.aol.com>
>

<SNIP>

> If you are going to label the term "Ham" as somehow demeaning or
> derogatory, why do YOU insist on using it?

Good point!!!

>
> >The term Hamfest is correct because it reflects the nature of those that
> >attend
> >- Hams.
>

If the term "Ham" is derogatory then we MUST start using the the new
term Amateurfest. This place is beginnning to sound like George Orwell's
1984, there is more "New Speak" being spoken here than American English.

> So, by virtue of having been to a Hamfest yourself, YOU are a
"Ham"...?

Steve don't even kid around about Vipul being a Ham,
that statement hurts us hams is worse than any of the
bad things he has said about the ARS.

Him having an Amateur Radio license makes him no
more of a ham than going into a McDonalds would
make him a hamburger!

>
> I am just trying to unravell the Vipullian logic here.

"Vipullian logic", the newest of the oxymoron statements
like "Army Intellegance" "friendly IRS" or "Social
Security"!

>It's very
> confusing.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Not anymore to me, he will say anything to argue and
start trouble here. He just doesn't use the personal
attacks that some of the other vultures in here use.
--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx

642. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-18 15:40:47 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <3AeW9.262558$FT6.42479240@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 59725

"KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com> wrote in message
news:v2iscp6k131v7e@corp.supernews.com...
> Steve don't even kid around about Vipul being a Ham,
> that statement hurts us hams is worse than any of the
> bad things he has said about the ARS.

I don't think he's kidding, William. (I didn't wan't to assume whether of not you prefer Bill.) Check out KB1HMW on your favorite call sign server. Take care now.

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

643. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-18 16:04:44 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030118110444.24770.00000066@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 59726

>From: "KB9TMP" kb9tmp@juno.com

>> If you are going to label the term "Ham" as somehow demeaning or
>> derogatory, why do YOU insist on using it?
>
>Good point!!!

That's incorrect. I almost always separate amateur vs Ham. Any time I used the word "Ham" improperly, it must have been a slip.

>> >The term Hamfest is correct because it reflects the nature of those that
>> >attend
>> >- Hams.
>>
>
>If the term "Ham" is derogatory then we MUST start using the the new
>term Amateurfest.

Except, its not an Amateurfest. Its organized by Hams for Hams, and Hams attend. Therefore its a Hamfest.

I didn't say Ham is derogatory. Hams are often very skilled in antennas, contesting, and Morse code. Hams are often into the Ham traditions and culture. It is possible other radio amateurs have the license, do not call themselves "Ham", and are interested into the other aspects, and not into the Ham culture.

644. Re: Space Shuttle Rebroadcast now on 3.860 LSB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-18 17:28:21 UTC
From: "Bruce W.1" <bw1@NOSPAMcore.com>
Message-ID: <3E298EB5.79D1FC3D@NOSPAMcore.com>
Source record: 59727
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

too many raydeos wrote:
>
> WA3NAN - The Goddard Space Flight Centre
> ARC in Greenbelt Maryland will be re-broadcasting
> Space Shuttle Mission Control Audio 24/7 on
> this frequency. Broadcast is on the air now.
==========

If you can't pick it over radio, this is a live internet feed using Real Player:

http://www.chron.com/content/interactive/space/missions/live/live.ram

645. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-18 18:17:40 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v2j6hrtge34m1a@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 59728

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:3AeW9.262558$FT6.42479240@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> "KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:v2iscp6k131v7e@corp.supernews.com...
> > Steve don't even kid around about Vipul being a Ham,
> > that statement hurts us hams is worse than any of the
> > bad things he has said about the ARS.
>
> I don't think he's kidding, William. (I didn't wan't to assume whether of
> not you prefer Bill.) Check out KB1HMW on your favorite call sign server.
> Take care now.

Bert
I know he has an Amateur Radio license, but that don't make him a "Ham".
Just like the statement "anyone can be a father, but it takes someone
special to be a "Dad". If Vipul was a "Ham" he wouldn't be attacking the
ARS with it's traditions, trying to change it into something it's not.

BTW I'm ok with calling me Bill, William, or WW
I just don't want to be called late for supper! ;^)
>
> --
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI
>
>
--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx

646. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-18 18:20:57 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030118132057.12035.00000061@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 59729

In article <v2iscp6k131v7e@corp.supernews.com>, "KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com>
writes:

>> >The term Hamfest is correct because it reflects the nature of those that
>> >attend
>> >- Hams.

Point of clarification here.

Ol' Vipul makes a big point of differentiating "Hams" and "radio amateurs", as
if the two were not one and the same thing. Same for "ham radio" and "amateur
radio".

Nobody else makes this distinction, just Vipul. It seems to suit some purpose
amidst the foma he spouts here.

He sees "Hams" as being generally old, fat, speaking in jargon, technically
ignorant and focused on operating (particularly Morse), while "radio amateurs"
are technical geniuses of some sort who eschew all the other characteristics of
"hams".

The idea that "hams" and "radio amateurs" are the same thing, and that their
interests vary over an enormous range is beyond his grasp.

For example, consider poor ol' broken down me. Been licensed 35 years, but I'm
only 48. Only a few pounds above recommended weight for my height, and that's
changing (ran 3 miles this morning in 9 degree weather, f'r instance). I know
lots of abbreviations and Q signals but only use them when needed. Love to
operate, particularly Morse and contests, but also ragchewing and 2 meter FM.
Also love Hamfests, club meetings and Field Day.

Rigs, test equipment and antennas are all either homebrew, built from kits or
resurrected from basket-case condition. No "appliances" in the N2EY shack!

So am I a "Ham" or a "radio amateur"? To me there's no difference - nor to
anybody but Vipul.
>
>If the term "Ham" is derogatory then we MUST start using the the new
>term Amateurfest. This place is beginnning to sound like George Orwell's
>1984, there is more "New Speak" being spoken here than American English.

The term you seek is "electropolitically correct".

>> So, by virtue of having been to a Hamfest yourself, YOU are a
>"Ham"...?
>
>Steve don't even kid around about Vipul being a Ham,
>that statement hurts us hams is worse than any of the

>bad things he has said about the ARS.

As evidenced by his posts in rec.radio.cb
>
>Him having an Amateur Radio license makes him no
>more of a ham than going into a McDonalds would
>make him a hamburger!
>
HAW! But there's a lot of truth in that...
>>
>> I am just trying to unravell the Vipullian logic here.

>"Vipullian logic", the newest of the oxymoron statements
>like "Army Intellegance" "friendly IRS" or "Social
>Security"!

Ya beat me to it! Also try:

jumbo shrimp
nondairy creamer
tight slacks
feminist humor
>
>>It's very
>> confusing.
>
>Not anymore to me, he will say anything to argue and
>start trouble here. He just doesn't use the personal
>attacks that some of the other vultures in here use.

Instead, he insults and derides all of us. Same game as 'ULX and K4YZ's
nemesis, just played from a different angle.

Note that Vipul never says what he thinks ham radio should be, what he does, or
what he wants. Only what he doesn't like and doesn't want.

btw, it was 16 vestal virgins that he was expecting, but they left for the
coast.

73 de Jim, N2EY

647. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-18 18:40:14 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v2j7s3hc8ls48d@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 59730

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030118110444.24770.00000066@mb-bh.aol.com...
> >From: "KB9TMP" kb9tmp@juno.com
>
> >> If you are going to label the term "Ham" as somehow demeaning or
> >> derogatory, why do YOU insist on using it?
> >
> >Good point!!!
>
> That's incorrect. I almost always separate amateur vs Ham. Any time I used
the
> word "Ham" improperly, it must have been a slip.

Then just what do YOU consider YOURSELF, a ham or an amateur radio op?

>
> >> >The term Hamfest is correct because it reflects the nature of those
that
> >> >attend
> >> >- Hams.

Word Web computer dictionary says the word ham means;
1. Thigh of a hog (usually smoked)
2. An unskilled actor who overacts

Are you saying those who attend a "HamFest" are hogs or unskilled actors?

> >>
> >
> >If the term "Ham" is derogatory then we MUST start using the the new
> >term Amateurfest.
>
> Except, its not an Amateurfest. Its organized by Hams for Hams, and Hams
> attend. Therefore its a Hamfest.

But Vipul we arn't Hams we are Licensed Amateur Radio Operators, so we
can't have a Hamfest they have to be called Licensed Amateur Radio
Operator Festivals because that is who puts them on. Or if you really want
to get picky about it, they would be Local Licensed Amateur Radio Operator
Club/Organization Festivals.

>
> I didn't say Ham is derogatory. Hams are often very skilled in antennas,
> contesting, and Morse code. Hams are often into the Ham traditions and
culture.
> It is possible other radio amateurs have the license, do not call

themselves
> "Ham", and are interested into the other aspects, and not into the Ham
culture.

Amateur Radio = Ham Radio no matter what kind of spin you try to put on it.
If you don't like code words, or Morse code, or any other part of Amateur
(Ham) radio, don't do it. Just enjoy the hobby for what you like of it and
stop trying to tell the rest of us how wrong we are.
--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx

648. ARNewsline 1329 - Jan 17 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-18 18:43:53 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030118134353.19920.00000121@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 59731

Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1327 – January 17, 2003

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1327 with a release date of Friday, January 17, 2003 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T. Australian telecommunications regulators oppose the Amateur Radio fix for 40 meters and hams on Fiji provide aid in the wake of cyclone Ami. These stories are first on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1327 coming your way right now!

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

SPECTRUM ISSUES: AUSTRALIAN REGULATORS FAVOR 40 METER STATUS QUO

A disagreement over the future of the 40 meter band between Australia’s national amateur radio society and that nations telecommunications regulators. The Australian Communications Authority -- the A.C.A. favors the status quo. The Wireless Institute of Australia says its time for a change. From Brisbane, Q-News Graham Kemp, VK4BB, picks up the story:

--

The 7 MHz issue. Currently A.C.A. is against the motion at WRC 2003 -- which is of course at variance with the current allocation in Australia. At present the A.C.A. are steadfast in their opposition to the motion notwithstanding numerous attempts at lobbying them. The WIA position is in support of the IARU motion and WIA will continue to lobby A.C.A. to support the full 300 kHz allocation at 7 MHz on a world wide basis.

WIA President Ernie has asked: "If anyone can think of any additional justification that we can provide to A.C.A. to make them change their minds please let the A.C.A. Liaison Committee know and we will try and push the matter with A.C.A. again".

--

What impact the A.C.A.’s stand will have on the outcome of WRC 2003 cannot be assessed at this time.

**

RESCUE RADIO: CYCLONE AMI HITS FIJI

A Cyclone named Ami has torn across parts of Fiji, destroying homes and unleashing floods across northern islands. And it appears that once aghain, Amateur Radio has come to the rescue, It all happened on January 14th. Amateur Radio Newsline’s Jim Meachen, ZL2BHF, has what we know so far.

--
Packing sustained winds in excess of 90 miles per hour and gusts of 125 miles an hour, the Cyclone Ami whipped up mountainous seas, cut communications and left the tourist hub of Labasa, on the main northern island of Vanua Levu, under four feet of water. All normal lines of communications with Vanua Levu were cut at about 17:00 GMT as the storm approached. Vanua Levu is where a quarter of Fiji's 800,000 people live.

According to news reports, emergency officials did manage to restore partial communications with Labasa and the town of Savusavu late on Tuesday using Amateur Radios circuits. Over them they learned that Labasa was under four feet of water after a nearby river overfload its banks. Also that there had been extensive damage throughout the area.

But even these communications efforts were hampered by extensive flooding. Also, the extent of the involvement of hams is still unclear since news reports did not give the names or call signs of the operators handling the emergency operations.

Here in New Zealand the government has already sent an air force surveillance plane to assess damage. Another aircraft was scheduled to arrive in Fiji the same day and, carrying aid experts and some relief supplies.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I’m Jim Meachen, ZL2BHF, reporting from Auckland, New Zealand.

--

The cyclone is the second to hit the South Pacific in as many weeks. Thousands of inhabitants of a remote part of the Solomon Islands chain northwest of Fiji survived powerful Cyclone Zoe, which hammered the area with 190 mph winds.

**

RESCUE RADIO: HAMS AID IN WAKE OF TYPHOON ZOE

And speaking of Cyclone Zoe, ham radio is helping in recovery efforts following that storm after it hit the Solomon Islands a few weeks ago. Jeramy Boot, G4NJH, is in Nottingham England has more:

--

Students and graduates of the Solomon Islands Amateur Radio Training School have been on the air from the capital Honiara in the wake of Cyclone Zoe.

The storm hit the islands of Tikopia and Anuta in the Solomon's remote Temotu Province last week. The amateurs are volunteers at the National Disaster Management Organisation and are providing assistance to the staff of three at NDMO HQ during the current state of disaster in the Solomons.

Using donated equipment received last year fromoverseas amateurs and CB operators, the first on the air was Moffet, H44MD. He was told that three 100-watt HF transceivers were donated by an American amateur and sent by air mail three weeks before the cyclone.

--

As we go to air, reports say that the Solomon Island radio school graduates are still providing post cyclone aid. (GB2RS)

**

COMMUNICATIONS LAW: BIG BROADCAST TOWER WIN IN NH

Back here in the United States, a big tower case win for a broadcaster could have a trickle-down effedt for ham radio. This, after the New Hampshire Supreme Court has rejectes a city's zoning ordinance limiting the height of new communication towers to 42 feet. It says that regulation conflicts with federal law.

The ruling clears the way for Koor Communication Inc. to obtain local construction permits to begin constructing broadcast towers for WQTH-AM in Lebanon, New Hampshire. According to Radio World Online, Koor Communications first filed for variances to the ordinance in 1999 seeking to construct four antennas to the height of 266 feet in accordance with its FCC license and Construction Permit. The broadcaster's attorneys argued that Lebanon's restrictions effectively prohibited the construction of new radio stations.

Koor Communication lost several lower court decisions. This lead to the appeal to the state's highest court. That court has now said the lower court findings were incorrect and it reversed their rulings. (CGC Commuinicator, RW-ONLINE)

**

Break 1

From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including the K8KZO repeater serving Kalamazoo Michigan.

(5 sec pause here)

**

ARRL: BOARD IS MEETING

The American Radio Relay League’s Board of Directors is holding its first meeting of 2003 as this newscast goes to air. For a full wrap-up on what actions the Diirectors might take, go to the news pages on the ARRL website. Its easy to find at www.arrl.org. (ARRL)

**

ENFORCEMENT: HAM JAILED FOR SPYING FOLLOW-UP

Two interesting follow-ups to last weeks story on convicted spy Robert Hanssen, K9QVL. The first came in a note from the FCC which takes issue with our account.

It says and we quote: “the assertion that we need a complaint to pull Hansen's ticket or anyone else's ticket is dead wrong.” Endquote.

But thats all the spokesman says. No other information was provided.

The other item is even more interesting. After the story ran, we began getting reports that Hanssen's call had been deleted. We went over and checked the FCC's database. It was still there. It was also on the Buckmaster websire, but ther was a surrprise when you inputted the K9QVL call over on QRZ.com. It came back stating that the K9QVL listing was no longer in the QRZed database. (ARNewsline™)

**

ENFORCEMENT: FCC RESCINDS ND8V WARNING LETTER

The FCC has canceled its recent warning letter issued to Michael Gurnsey, ND8V, and has told the Parchment Michigan ham he can resume operation on the 20 meter band.

As reported last week, the agency's Riley Hollingswoth, K4ZDH, had written a very sternly worded letter to Gurnsey. It stated that it would initiate stern punitive action against him if it received any more complaints that he was appropriating certain frequencies on the 20 meter band. It also told him to stay off 2o meters until the issue could be resolved.

But on January 3rd the Hollingsworth wrote to ND8V once again. This time it told Gurnsey that he could disregard the warning letter and resume 20 meter operation. It also went on to thank him for his cooperation in resolving the matter. No further information was provided by the FCC. (FCC)

**

ENFORCEMENT: NY HAM FACING REVOCATION

The FCC has written to a New York city area ham telling him he may face license revocation proceedings. The Commission's Daryl Duckworth, NN0W, explains:

--
Duckworth: "A Warning Notice and Notice of Intention to Designate a Revocation and Suspension Proceeding was issued to Alexander Sandbrand N2NNU for operation outside of his Technician class priveleges on numerous occasions and after warnings."
--

Sandbrand lives in Yonkers New York. That's a few miles due North of Manhattan. Back on August 17th of 2001 the FCC issued Sabndbrand a first Warning Notice regarding operation outside of his license privileges. The Commission says it now has information indicating that at least nine times since his receipt of that initial warning that Sandbrand operated out of band.

And in a related item, the ARRL Letter reports that Sandbrand called FCC rulers enforcer Riley Hollingsworth after receiving the first Warning Notice. He reportedly complained that it wasn't fair that he had to pass additional examination elements to operate on High Frequency phone. Hollingsworth supposedly told Sandbrand that if he wants to operate on H-F, he has to take the test like everybody else. (FCC, ARRL Letter)

**

RADIO LAW: TEEN ARRESTED AND CHARGED IN DIREC TV CASE

A 19-year-old college has been taken into custody on charges that he pilfered information about a new security system used by satellite broadcaster Direc TV and distributed it over the Internet. FBI agents in Los Angeles say that they arrested Igor Serebryany and have charged him with stealing information related to DirecTV's latest access cards. These are the access cards Direc TV uses to regulate what services its subscribers will receive.

According to several news reports, Serebryany who is identified as a University of Chicago student, allegedly took the information from a Los Angeles area law firm that was doing legal work for Direc TV. He ithen is supposed to have distributed it to web sites dedicated to the hacking of DirecTV's security systems.

According to the criminal complaint against Serebryany, DirecTV spent more than $25 million developing the high security "Period 4" card. This, after the three previous versions had been successfully hacked by pirates. Serebryany faces up to 10 years in prison, a fine, or both, if convicted. (Published news reports)

**

RADIO LAW: FCC SIMPLIFIES FILING PROCEEDURES WITH ECFS EXPRESS

The Federal Communications Commission has launched ECFS Express. This is a simplified version of its Electronic Comment Filing System or ECFS.

According to an FCC news release, ECFS Express is designed specifically with the consumer in mind. The FCC claims that it is easy to use, focuses on topics rather than docket numbers, and requires minimal input by consumers seeking to participate in the Commission’s public rulemaking process. People wishing to comment simply click on a topic, fill in their personal information, write their comments and hit “send.”

To access ECFS Express, users need only click on the “File Comments” logo found on the front page of the FCC’s Web site at www.fcc.gov The original version of the Electronic Comment Filing System, which includes all docketed Commission proceedings is still at the FCC website as well. (FCC)

**

COMMUNICATIONS LAW: A WARNING TO DOMAIN NAME SELLERS

A warning to Internet domain-name sellers. Keep better track of your customers or Congress will be forced to step in.

The warning comes from California Representative Howard Berman. He claims that domain-name sellers have an obligation to keep accurate records of their customers to ensure they can be contacted if they are improperly using trademarked names or engaging in other illegal activity.

According to Berman. Internet users must provide a contact name, address and other information when they buy a domain name. But the Congressman says that few name sellers run checks to make sure that the contact information is

accurate. Berman says that this lax oversight allows scam artists and cybersquatters looking to sell domain names to their rightful owners or others to hide their true identities. This he says, provides a barrier for law-enforcement officials investigating such crimes.

Berman says that he would like to see all the top-level domains start to implement these types of checks on their systems. He also warns that if self regulation does not work that Congress may have to step in. (Published news reports)

**

CONVENTIONS AND HAMFESTS: VIENNA VIRGINIA IN FEBRUARY

Turning to the hamfest and convenbtion scene, if you are in or near Vienna Virginia on Sunday, February 23rd, 2003, then plan to stop by the Vienna Wireless Society's 27th annual Winterfest. The venue is the Northern Virginia Community College in Annandale. Look for lots of equipment along with helpful information on how to get started in the hobby. More information is in cyberspace at www.viennawireless.org (KG4OJT)

**

CONVENTIONS AND HAMFESTS: HAM-EX 2003 CANADA IN MARCH

A bit to the North, the Ham-Ex 2003 exposition is slated for March 22nd at the Brampton Fall Fairgrounds in Brampton, Ontario, Canada. Sponsored jointly by the Peel and Mississauga amasteur radio clubs the March 22nd event will feature manufacturers displays, equipment vendors, Canadian ham radio exams and everything that goes into a great hamferst or convention including a gala banquet and lots of prizes. For more information please visit the shows website. Its in cybersace at www.peelarc.org (press release)

**

BREAK 2

This is ham radio news for today's radio amateur. From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org and being relayed by the volunteer services of the following radio amateur:

(5 sec pause here)

**

THE WAR ON TERRORISM: NYC REBUILDS WITH A NEW TV TOWER IN NEW JERSEY

A broadcast tower almost a half mile high to replace the structure lost when terrorists felled New York's World Trade Center could rise across the Hudson river in New Jersey. This, as an alliance made up of eleven broadcasters release a report as to why they favor proposed site in Bayonne over one in Jersey City. Amateur Radio Newsline's Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, has more:

--
In a 17-page letter to New Jersey's environmental commissioner, the broadcasting alliance says the new tower would restore quality television reception for about three quarters of a million people in the metropolitan area. This is especially important to the regions poor and elderly who cannot afford to pay for cable or satellite reception. And the alliance called the Bayonne site far superior in terms of size, security, environmental concerns, cost and construction timetables.

And the groups president, Edward Grebow said the $200 million project would also be a boon to construction workers in the region. He also noted that the city of Bayonne wants to make the tower a central element in plan to transform the location into an area of offices, homes, stores and marinas. In addition to its television antenna system, the alliance suggests that the structure might also be used for scientific studies. This could include long term investigations into weather, climate and air pollution.

If constructed the new tower would not only become the world's tallest free-standing structure. It would also be the worlds tallest broadcast tower built at near sea level. For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I’m Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, reporting.
--

While New Jersey has the support of the regions broadcasts, other locations are still believed to be under consideration by local politicians and community leaders. (ARNewsline™ from listener reports)

**

EMERGING TECHNOLOGY: GENERATING ELECTRICITY WITH HOT AIR

Meantime, another would-be tallest man-made structure could soon be towering over the Australian outback. This, as part of a plan to capitalize on the global push for greater use of renewable energy.

By 2006, the Australian power company EnviroMission Ltd hopes to build a 3,300 foot high solar tower in southwest New South Wales state. The 200 megawatt solar generating station will cost nearly $563 million dallars to build and will be the width to a football field.

The technology behind its operation is very simple. The sun heats air under the tower’s glass roof. As the hot air rises, a powerful updraft is also created by the tower that allows air to be continually sucked through 32 turbines, which spin to generate power.

EnviroMission hopes to begin construction on the solar tower before the end of the year. It says that it plans on generating enough electricity to supply 200,000 homes around the beginning of 2006.

Currently, the world's tallest free-standing structure is the Canadian National Tower in Toronto. Its about 1650 feet high. (W8HDU)

**

CHANGING OF THE GUARD: DON MACKAY, ZL3RW - S.K.

The changing of the guard in Amateur Radio continues. This, with word that NZART Honorary Life Member and Past President Don Mackay, ZL3RW has passed away.

MacKay died at his home in Christchurch on January 14th after a long illness. Among his many accomplishments was his work in the introduction of Amateur service repeaters to New Zealand. This, at a time when that nations Post Office was opposed to such operation.

ZL3RW used his experience in emergency communications to sway the agencys decision in favor of permitting repeater operation. For many years it was this aspect of Amateur Radio that ensured their continuation.

Don MacKay is survived by his sister Margaret. A service in celebration of his life was held Saturday January 18th in the city of Christchurch. (NZART)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: NO PACKET TO THE ISS
Packet users are being requested to not send e-mail messages to the all ham crew on board the International Space Station at this time. This, according to the AMSAT News Sercice which reports that they are not answering e-mail, and are realkly not expected to do so in the near future. No specific reason was given, but according to news reopprts the current all ham crew is very busy with many non ham radio related on-orbit duties. (ARISS)
**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: ISS ALABAMA EXHIBIT FEATURES HAM RADIO
Ham radio will play a part as the City of Mobile, Alabama is hosts a four month exhibit of the International Space Station. This at the new Science Exploreum building.

The exhibit consists of a full scale mockup of the main parts of the ISS along with other aspects of living and working in space. According to N4UXY the Mobile Amateur Radio Club " W4IAX " will host a ham radio station that will attempt to talk to the real space station durinvg the exposition. The club also plans to demonstrate other aspects of the Amateur radio to an expected 80,000 visitors.

The show began on January 9th and ends on April 5th. More information is on the web at www.exploreum.net (N4UXY)
**

CONTESTS: 2003 WINTER 6 METERS CONTEST

The 2003 winter 6 meter contest is will commence at 2300 U-T-C on Friday February 7th and conclude at 03:00 U-T-C on Saturday February 8th. The rules are very simple. Each in-country QSO is worth one point. Out of country contacts score as two points. Hawaii and Alaska count as separate nations in this one.

Scoreing is total Q-S-O points multiuplied by the number of grid squares worked. Entries go by e-mail to w4wrl@aol.com before March 15th. They can also be sent snail-mail to Wayne Lewis, 3338 South Cashur Drive, Florence, South Carolina, 29501. (VHF Reflector)

**

DX

In D-X, PA3GIO will be active as ZK2GI from Niue from about the 18th to 26th of January. He will operate SSB only with 100 watts and a dipole antenna. If you work him, Q-S-L as directed on the air.

Also, KM1E is active from the Bahamas as C6AGN. He’s on 160 through 6 meters from now through the 4th of March.

And lastly, some good news about famed D-X’er Ron Wright ZL1AMO who suffered collapsed lungs in late November. According to Judy Rausch, AA7UC, of the International D-X Network, Wright returned to his home on January 13th to complete his recocery. (AA7UC, INDEXA)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: CELEBRATING A NEW LICENSE CLASS

And finally, a big success for a big operating event celebrating a new license. That’s the word out of the United Kingdom as reports on the first ever Foundation Class Q-S-O party begin to filter in. Again to England and GB2RS news presenter Jeramy Boot, G4NJH:.

--
The M3 'QSO Party' on 40 metres on the 1st of January was a huge success with hundreds of newly-licensed M3 amateurs and their friends wanting to take part. Richard Jolliffe, G3ZGC, said: "I planned just to join in but when I switched on there were two M3s looking for a net controller. So as one of the Newbury club's Foundation Licence instructors I volunteered.

The pile-up was certainly the largest I have ever heard and I had to go to letters in the suffix and ask for M3 Alfa stations and work through the alphabet. In two hours I worked 112. At least half as many again were 'gotaways'."

Richard added, "What was very noticeable was that the standard of operating was fantastic by the M3s. It was noticeable how appreciative most of them were at having passed their exams. Many messages of thanks were passed to their local clubs. An excellent event."

Douglas Nixon, M3BKC, was one of the numerous Foundation Licensees joining in the fun. He said, "Richard did a splendid job as net controller during the hectic conditions that followed at times during the next two hours. Roger, G4RUW, also from Newbury, took over at 1200, followed by John, G4TSN, from Nottingham. Many thanks to all concerned."

Jeramy Boot, G4NJH
--

Obviously, the concepts behind the U-K Foundation Class license are rock solid and it is most likely the way other nations will go as they seek too increase participation in the hobby. (GB2RS)

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, Amateur News Weekly, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline @arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I’m Jim Damron, N8TMW, and I’m Jeff Clark, K8JAC, saying 73 and we thank you for listening."
Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2002. All rights reserved.

649. Cronkite Leaves Baxter For ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-18 19:10:24 UTC
From: franktheham@juno.com
Message-ID: <715f8c2a.0301181110.4b022b5f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59732
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I found this on the ARRL website. Guess it answers the earlier posts about K1MAN and Walter Cronkite. Looks like the most trusted man in America really trusts the ARRL not K1MAN.

ARRL Announces Amateur Radio Today CD-ROM Presentation

NEWINGTON, CT, Jan 17, 2003--The ARRL is offering a new video presentation, Amateur Radio Today, that tells Amateur Radio's public service story to nonhams. The video presentation, directed by Dave Bell, W6AQ, and narrated by former CBS news anchorman Walter Cronkite, KB2GSD, runs approximately six minutes.

"We wanted to have something for people to take to nonhams and civic clubs," said ARRL President Jim Haynie, W5JBP. Haynie also anticipates that the CD-ROM production will come in handy during his visits to Capitol Hill. The presentation focuses on Amateur Radio's role in emergency communications.

"Dozens of radio amateurs helped the police and fire departments and other emergency services maintain communications in New York, Pennsylvania and Washington, DC," narrator Cronkite intones in reference to ham radio's response on September 11, 2001. "Their country asked, and they responded without reservation." Amateur Radio Today also highlights ham radio's part in helping various agencies respond to wildfires in the Western US during 2002 and mentions ham radio in space.

Haynie said he and Bell discussed the project, and Bell agreed to take it on. Alan Kaul, W6RCL, authored the script, and Keith Glispie, WA6TFD, edited the production at Suite Sixteen, a production facility in Burbank, California, that he co-owns. Haynie said Bell, Kaul and Glispie donated a lot of their own time and effort in making the the video presentation a reality.

"Someone once said, and it's probably true, that Amateur Radio is the only fail-safe communications system in the world," Cronkite says in his final remarks, noting that he has ham gear aboard his sailboat. "It really is the best back-up communications system in the world," he concludes, adding, "and that's the way it is." That phrase was the one Cronkite always used to close out his nightly newscasts during his tenure with CBS.

The League has made the presentation available for downloading via the ARRL Web site. The 70-MB file is in MPEG video format, which can be played by Windows Media Player, Apple Quicktime or RealPlayer. To view

the video directly from the Web you'll need to be able to receive data at 1.5 Mbit/s. If your connection speed is slower than that, you should download the file to your local hard drive and play it from there.

Individuals may order a copy of the CD-ROM from the ARRL on-line catalog. Plans are under way to also make Amateur Radio Today available in VHS videotape format.

Haynie says Amateur Radio Today will be the first in a planned series of at least three presentations. The second will point up the "fun" aspects of Amateur Radio. The third--but not necessarily the last--will offer a tour of ARRL Headquarters and its activities on behalf of ham radio.

Bell, a Hollywood TV producer, is a past chairman of the ARRL Public Relations Committee.

650. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-18 21:37:32 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030118163732.05670.00000043@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 59733

>Subject: Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 1/18/03 10:04 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030118110444.24770.00000066@mb-bh.aol.com>

>>From: "KB9TMP" kb9tmp@juno.com
>
>>> If you are going to label the term "Ham" as somehow demeaning or
>>> derogatory, why do YOU insist on using it?
>>
>>Good point!!!
>
>That's incorrect. I almost always separate amateur vs Ham. Any time I used
>the
>word "Ham" improperly, it must have been a slip.

No, Vipul, YOU are incorrect. "Almost always" is again another
near-absolute. Most of your posts DO use the term "Ham" in the context of your
posts.

>>If the term "Ham" is derogatory then we MUST start using the the new
>>term Amateurfest.
>
>Except, its not an Amateurfest. Its organized by Hams for Hams, and Hams
>attend. Therefore its a Hamfest.

But is it attended ONLY by "Hams" in YOUR application of the term, Vipul?
YOU suggest that a "Ham", as opposed to an Amateur Radio operator, is somehow a
less-than-adequate or embarrassing representitive of the Amateur Radio Service.

>I didn't say Ham is derogatory.

Granted...No, you have not SPECIFICALLY said "Ham is derogatory" You have
only made countelss suggestions that "Ham" Radio and "Amateur" radio are not
necessarilly the same thing, and that "Hams" are less qualified to be
"Amateurs".

>Hams are often very skilled in antennas, contesting, and Morse code.

Many are into all of those. Some into NONE of those. Many NCT's I know
do not know a single letter of Morse Code and call themselves "Hams".

>Hams are often into the Ham traditions and culture.

Duh...Ya think?

>It is possible other radio amateurs have the license, do not call themselves
>"Ham", and are interested into the other aspects, and not into the Ham

>culture.

Define "Ham Culture", Vipul. Be detailed. I cannot find any reference to that term in 73, QST, CQ, the Encyclopedia Brittanica or on Google.

73

Steve, K4YZ

651. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-18 21:41:09 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030118164109.05670.00000044@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 59734

>Subject: Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade
>From: "Bert Craig" wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM
>Date: 1/18/03 9:40 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3AeW9.262558$FT6.42479240@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>

>I don't think he's kidding, William. (I didn't wan't to assume whether of
>not you prefer Bill.) Check out KB1HMW on your favorite call sign server

It's one of the few things Vipul has owned up to. But you guys should see
the rather vile anti-Ham Radio things Vipul has been saying on rec.radio.CB.

Strange, as just a few days ago Vipul clearly stated that he "defended and
supported" Amateur Radio outside of Amateur Radio related circles.

Me thinks he speaks with forked tongue.

73

Steve, K4YZ

652. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-18 21:49:42 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030118164942.05670.00000045@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 59735

>Subject: Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade
>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>Date: 1/18/03 12:20 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030118132057.12035.00000061@mb-da.aol.com>

>For example, consider poor ol' broken down me. Been licensed 35 years, but
>I'm
>only 48.

I made 30 years as a licensee last year (October 27th, not that I keep
track of such nostalgic points!) and I turned 47 this past year.

>Only a few pounds above recommended weight for my height,...(SNIP)

I won't go into weight, but if anyone cares to look at my current QRZ
"bio", I hardly think anyone (othr than Lennie or Vipul) could call me fat.
The pic is only 2 months old.

>So am I a "Ham" or a "radio amateur"? To me there's no difference - nor to
>anybody but Vipul

I've querried Vipul on several occassions as to just what accomplishments
he has "racked up" in his Amateur Radio "career", but he has yet to be
forthcoming. Nor has he been forthcoming on any professional or educational
achievements in the radiocommunications field.

>>Steve don't even kid around about Vipul being a Ham,
>>that statement hurts us hams is worse than any of the
>>bad things he has said about the ARS.
>
>As evidenced by his posts in rec.radio.cb

Like I said...!

73

Steve, K4YZ

653. This Is How KB1HMW "Supports" Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-18 22:00:10 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030118170010.05670.00000047@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 59736

I cut-and-pasted the following from rec.radio.cb. The only "editing" I did was to snip out about 15 lines of carriage returns.

This guy has a lot of intestinal fortitude to state he "supports" Amateur (or Ham, what ever you care to call it, Vipul) radio, then to make such obviously inflammatory remarks to a CB related NG.

Nice going, Vipul.

QUOTE:

Subject: Re: Are there aliens among us??????? Come get a laugh
From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
Date: 1/8/03 9:34 PM Central Standard Time
Message-id: <20030108223422.22983.00000505@mb-mf.aol.com>

>Subject: Re: Are there aliens among us?

Yes-they're called Hams.

There are Hams among us!

It could be your neighbor, the butcher, the baker, the candlestick maker, … anybody. Secretly, they may be Hams. Some of them wear an "identifier" which consists of numbers and letters. They identify themselves and fellow Hams through this identifier. Also, their mannerisms and colloquialisms are recognizable for those who know about them. Still, they travel unrecognized.

On the outside they look like humans. Like a body snatcher, their goal is to convert each and every one of us. They communicate with each other with electronic devices over the airwaves. Those who have gotten this far have seen certain traditions and protocol utilized. They form secret societies. Some, which know of the existence of Hams, have called it a cult.

They use codewords in their conversation, replacing regular works with Qxx. Some have developed the ability to send and receive real time encoded symbols. One gains higher status in the Ham society for demonstrating this ability. Some of them feel superior because of this.

They live.

From: "Cult Guy" OhNO!@Anon.com
Now we have it! Here, for the first time it is out in the open. The ARRL is a cult! They speak in codes. Tongues. Have secret societies with arcane initiation rituals.
Odd groups such as the QCWA, ARES, and an odd-duck bunch calling themselves the 10-10 Club abound and all are rather reclusive and exclusive.
Yes, indeed. This strange bunch of other world types are often seen with

funny little metal sticks protruding from the roofs of their cars, from the tops of their funny little aluminum hard hats, and some even keep funny looking protuberances on their belts to, one assumes, keep their dungarees from falling down from their chests.
Where do these strange critters come from? What do they do? Do they bear their children live? Incubate them? Why do they glow in the dark? How do they reproduce?
They must.
They live.

654. Re: I love 14.275mhz USB!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-18 22:25:49 UTC
From: bignose hambone the cenobite <ersuxme@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3e29d472@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 59737
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Lloyd, N0VFP" <brother_lloyd_99@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:3e28e90a$1_2@server....
>
> "Lloyd, N0VFP" <brother_lloyd_99@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:3e28c8b3$1_8@server....
> > It's better than:
> >
> > Hal Turner
> > Profit Stair (i can't remember the last time I heard the profit)
> >
> > Pete Peters
> >
> > I enjoy listening to K1MAN broadcasts......
> >
> > I am gonna write a short e-book soon called "School of the profits"
> >
> > Stay Tuned.....
> >
> >
> >
>
> I also listen to 3865 and 3947.5 too!

SWL Places to be:

The infamous Liberty Net: Saturday evening 10:00 PM Eastern 3.947 LSB (+/-
alligators)

The Regional Militia Patriots Net weeknights 8:00 PM Eastern 3.860 LSB (+/-
wide signal porto-rickans)

Jerimiaha 33.3 [LP RPM records?] Ministries weekdays 17.495 at 1:00 PM EST &
5.050 at 9:00 PM EST
(rantings from a former South African kook preacher that makes Brother
Stair & Hal Turner
look like the Rev Al Sharpton & Ted Kennedy by comparason...)

K1MAN's "Jump up on my shoulders naked facing me and say
I-Luv-You-you studded Leather clad Stud Muffin with beer-bellys
Net"..... 14.275 all freakin day long plus spill-over on 14.313
gloryhole (the name sez it all folks.....Woooo Hooooo!!!!!)

655. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-18 22:40:14 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030118174014.09063.00000076@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 59738

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
> And on what basis do you assert the test is "easy"..? That it MAY have
>been easy for YOU...?

They have "license in a day: classes. It is expected that those that attend will take the test the same day and pass. At least 75% do, the rest pass it on their 2nd try. So, the test is easy.

You would have to admit, one does not have to learn the material to pass the test. But, one has to learn Morse code to do code. Some do just that. Therefore they are an only-coder.

656. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-18 22:45:35 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030118174535.09063.00000077@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 59739

From: "KB9TMP"

>Then just what do YOU consider YOURSELF, a ham or an amateur radio op?

I possess an AMATEUR radio license. I do not call myself a "Ham".

>Are you saying those who attend a "HamFest" are hogs or unskilled actors?

Neither. The word "Ham" is well know by those that possess an amateur radio license.

657. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-18 22:55:58 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030118175558.09063.00000078@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 59740

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
>Most of your posts DO use the term "Ham" in the context of your
>posts.

I don't believe I do that. But, if I do, it's incorrect.

>>Hams are often very skilled in antennas, contesting, and Morse code.
>
> Many are into all of those. Some into NONE of those.

The Hams that are good with antennas often are quite good. Antennas is not an easy topic. So, many Hams are very intelligent, in this topic.

> Define "Ham Culture", Vipul. Be detailed. I cannot find any reference to
>that term in 73, QST, CQ, the Encyclopedia Brittanica or on Google.

Dictionaries do not define cultures. Even encyclopedias do not do this.
Yes, its there. When one of these publications QST, ARRL handbook, etc say "Hams like to...",this is an example of "Ham" culture.

658. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-18 23:03:11 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030118180311.09063.00000079@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 59741

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>He sees "Hams" as being generally old, fat, speaking in jargon, technically
>ignorant and focused on operating (particularly Morse)

A non-Ham asked me if Ham radio was a cult and if they still use Morse code.

>Note that Vipul never says what he thinks ham radio should be, what he does,
>or
>what he wants. Only what he doesn't like and doesn't want.

I have put in the suggestion for more technical certifcations. I made my
opinion known on code-testing. I made a whole list of some suggestions.

659. Re: Just One More Example

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-18 23:03:19 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030118180319.00690.00000030@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 59743

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.h8rw0td.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 15 Jan 2003 00:22:52 GMT, Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
>>>Pizzing or not, WARC-79 was TWENTY-FOUR YEARS AGO.
>>> The dispute between SW BC folks and hams on the 40m band
>>> HASN'T BEEN RESOLVED YET.

Sure it has.

Hams have 7000-7100 kHz worldwide exclusive. Hams in Region 2 also have
7200-7300 kHz.

7200-7300 is not the only place hams share spectrum with other services.

>>Why not?
>>
>> Because all those "radio professionals" can't get their collective
>>heads out of thier rectums long enough to make up their minds.
>
> Not really - it's because the Region I broadcasters say "screw you,
> buddy - I got mine" to anyone who wants to displace them, just as
> the US military through the NTIA said to the amateurs about 6.9-7.0
> MHz here.
>
Been that way since at least 1947. Anybody who knows something about ham radio
history knows that....

> Shows you the REAL view of "the needs of amateur radio" in the
> larger scheme of things. We're lucky to keep what we have at 7 MHz.
>
And lots of other places...

Perhaps the 40 meter situation will improve at WRC 2003. Who should we thank if
it does improve?

73 de Jim, N2EY

660. Re: Just One More Example

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-18 23:03:19 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030118180319.00690.00000029@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 59747

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.h8nzo89.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 08 Jan 2003 20:47:14 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>> No. The entire US administration is bound by agreement to the
>> terms of the United Nations charter. The International
>> Telecommunications Union is a UN organization.
>>
>> There is NO "international treaty" in regards to amateur radio.
>> There is only the agreement of the United States of America
>> to meet the terms of the United Nations charter. That includes
>> all UN organizations in which the USA is a member.
>
> The International Telecommunications Convention is a separate
> treaty that the US is a signatory to, and requires specific
> ratification by the Senate to be effective. The International
> Radio Regulations is a separate treaty that the US is a
> signatory to, and requires specific ratifivation by the
> Senate to be effective.

So let me get this straight, Phil:

1) The ITU Convention and International Radio Regulations are, indeed, separate
and distinct TREATIES that are independent of other agreements, like the UN
Charter.

2) As treaties, they are ratified by the Senate, as required by the
Constitution.

3) Amateur Radio is part of those treaties.

Sunuvagun!
>
> I'm still POed at (now ex-) Senator John Glenn who held up
> Senate ratification of the 1979 WARC Radio Regs (published as
> the 1980 Edition) for several months. As an "astronaut" the rest
> of the Senate looked up to him on things scientific or technical,
> while the real reason for his antics was because of some ego
> pizzing contest he was having with the head of NASA over budget
> and expenditures - nothing to do with the content of the treaty.
>
Never heard that one, but that shoe fits...

73 de Jim, N2EY

661. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-18 23:03:20 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030118180320.00690.00000031@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 59742

In article <C2TU9.62190$GF.18482838@twister.columbus.rr.com>, "Mike H. KC8UBH"
<mhaas@nospam.insight.rr.com> writes:

>> Better yet, Mike, don't repeat the mistake of license-class bigotry
>evidenced
>> by someone who is simply trying to get you steamed. That's exactly what he
>> wants.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>> Extra class since 1970 (no big deal, really)
>
>You're right...of course...but...but...but...but....ah, hell...
>
Yeah....I know, I know.....but it's just like dealing with a child having a
tantrum. That's what trolls are, really.

73 de Jim, N2EY

662. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-18 23:03:20 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030118180320.00690.00000032@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 59744

In article <d22b54c3.0301141612.732be1b5@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20030114063631.02538.00000992@mb-da.aol.com>...
>> In article <G9IU9.58076$GF.17879716@twister.columbus.rr.com>, "Mike H.
>KC8UBH"
>> <mhaas@nospam.insight.rr.com> writes:
>>
>> >Most of the No-Code Techs I know do more for the hobby on their feet and
>> >with their hands, heads, and hearts in Emergency and other Community
>Service
>> >Organizations than Extra's like you who sit on your asses in the shack,
>> >probably pissing other HAMS off by sarcastically announcing that the
>> >frequency you're camping out on (but not using) "is in use" and doing
>> >absolutely NOTHING to further the hobby.
>> >
>> >Next time you go to Hamvention in Dayton, thank all those No-Code Techs
>who
>> >did *MOST* of the legwork setting up the entire event, you thankless slob.
>> >Next time you go to your next field day with a whole bunch of Extra class
>> >HAMS standing around looking important and being jerks, thank the No-Code
>> >Techs who did the *real* work setting THAT event up.
>>
>> Better yet, Mike, don't repeat the mistake of license-class bigotry
>evidenced
>> by someone who is simply trying to get you steamed. That's exactly what he
>> wants.
>
>True enough but that ain't no FUN . .
>
Sure it is. The trolls get all ticked off and act worse and worse. And they look more and more foolish because nobody is paying any attention. Works best on west coast Final Authority wannabes.

73 de Jim, N2EY

663. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-18 23:03:21 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030118180321.00690.00000034@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 59745

In article <b04srl$km6$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:

>Well of course thats the important stuff.

'zactly. Passing the test is the beginning, not the end.

I have much more respect for the new Tech who is actually DOING something
positive with his/her license than I do for the Extra of any vintage who
doesn't.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>Dan/W4NTI
>
>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030114223652.25350.00000004@mb-mj.aol.com...
>> In article <b02ah3$1v1$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
>> <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:
>>
>> >Why do you say that Jim? (no big deal, really).
>>
>> 'Cause it's only one accomplishment in a ham career of over 35 years.
>> >
>> >I took mine in 75 or 76 and it was probably a similar test.
>>
>> Yup. FCC office, the whole deal. From another era.
>>
>> >I was/am quite proud to have passed it.
>>
>> Yeah, me too. But there's no point in making a big deal of it.
>>
>> >And I know this will piss off some
>> >folks...but.....that is when it meant something.
>> >
>> Still does!
>>
>> >So be proud.
>> >
>> >Just don't be a bragard like some are.
>> >
>> Good points, Dan, but the way I see it is this: The license test was just
>the
>> beginning. What's most important is what is done with the license. Rigs
>built,

>> QSOs, skills developed, friendships made, equipment destroyed, antennas
>raised,
>> 807s consumed, articles written, beginners Elmered, SKN, FD, SS, DX tests,
>club
>> meetings, hamfests, etc., etc.
>>
>> That's the stuff what's a big deal.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>> Extra class since 1970 (no big deal, really)
>>
>

664. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-18 23:03:21 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030118180321.00690.00000033@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 59746

In article <d22b54c3.0301150644.8acc294@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
(Brian Kelly) writes:

>Subject: Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade
>From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)
>Date: 15 Jan 2003 06:44:09 -0800
>
>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20030114223653.25350.00000006@mb-mj.aol.com>...
>> In article <d22b54c3.0301141620.5e889058@posting.google.com>,
>kelly@dvol.com
>> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>>
>> >Subject: Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade
>> >From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)
>> >Date: 14 Jan 2003 16:20:22 -0800
>> >
>> >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>> >news:<20030113210548.01791.00000391@mb-cb.aol.com>...
>> >
>> >>
>> >> >they are only 1 Step Above a cber, and its
>> >> >really a pretty tiny step, actually you really cant tell much
>difference
>> >>
>> >> Maybe YOU can't, but I sure can. No such thing as a cb licnese, for one
>> >thing.
>> >
>> >'Scuse me here but I have a Class D Citizens Radio Service station &
>> >operator's license issued to me by the FCC, callsign is KLK1937.
>>
>> And it expired when?
>
>I think they were issued "for the duration".

Naw, I think they were good for five years.

> There is such a thing and
>I do have one, expired or not.
>
Then rewrite my statement to read:

"No such thing as a current, valid cb license, for one thing. Hasn't been for a
quarter century or so."

73 de Jim, N2EY

665. Re: This Is How KB1HMW "Supports" Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-18 23:29:11 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030118182911.09063.00000080@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 59748

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
> This guy has a lot of intestinal fortitude to state he "supports"
>Amateur
>(or Ham, what ever you care to call it, Vipul) radio, then to make such
>obviously inflammatory remarks to a CB related NG.
>
> Nice going, Vipul.

Its humor, please.

Some time around last October, I invited a non-Ham to a Hamfest. Also, I gave a copy of my ARRL handbook to someone. I mentioned I was a Ham on a few occasions.

Also, I attempted to form an amateur radio club. Only two attended. So, not too successful. Couldn't get the club started as not enough members and other priorities took over.

Lets not get personal.

666. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-19 03:06:00 UTC
From: K�HB <k�hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <sCoW9.285$Sv3.37394@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 59749

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote

: Therefore they are an only-coder.

Is that a "bad thing�"?

There are some hams who are only-2M-repeater. Is that a "bad thing�"?

There are some hams who are only-packet. Is that a "bad thing�"?

There are some hams who are only-ragchew. Is that a "bad thing�"?

There are some hams who are only-homebrew. Is that a "bad thing�"?

There are some hams who are only rrap. Is that a "bad thing�"?

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

667. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-19 03:07:33 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <VDoW9.288$Sv3.28964@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 59750

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote

: I do not call myself a "Ham".

We appreciate that.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

668. Glad I don't use 27MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-19 04:29:20 UTC
From: K�HB <k�hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <AQpW9.392$Sv3.49491@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 59751

Bought a Micro$oft cordless mouse for my shack computer. Has a really ugly sounding output at 27.045MHz (or 27.145MHz selectable).

But the receiver is pretty good -- I can run full 1.5KW limit at 28.001MHz and it isn't affected, even though the amp is 17 inches from the mouse receiver.

��� 73, de Hans, K0HB
--
Help support youth involved in Amateur Radio.
http://www.mnyarc.org
http://www.k0bsa.org

669. Re: Glad I don't use 27MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-19 05:39:33 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E2A3A54.FC884C24@earthlink.net>
Source record: 59752

"Kï¿½HB" wrote:
>
> Bought a Micro$oft cordless mouse for my shack computer. Has a really ugly
> sounding output at 27.045MHz (or 27.145MHz selectable).
>
> But the receiver is pretty good -- I can run full 1.5KW limit at 28.001MHz
> and it isn't affected, even though the amp is 17 inches from the mouse
> receiver.

Sounds like more of a tribute to your amp's shielding than to the mouse
receiver.

Was the EA6 Excel DXCC tracking program what you were looking for?

Dave K8MN

670. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-19 11:48:40 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030119064840.05670.00000062@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 59753

>Subject: Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 1/18/03 4:55 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030118175558.09063.00000078@mb-mf.aol.com>

>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)

>>Most of your posts DO use the term "Ham" in the context of your
>>posts.
>
>I don't believe I do that. But, if I do, it's incorrect.

Then who is writing this stuff for you, Vipul? You should go back through the history file and READ what you WRITE. It's very entertaining.

>Dictionaries do not define cultures. Even encyclopedias do not do this.
>Yes, its there. When one of these publications QST, ARRL handbook, etc say
>"Hams like to...",this is an example of "Ham" culture.

But what do YOU consider to be the "Ham culture" that you so adamantly disdain? So far, it seems to be just about evrything.

Steve, K4YZ

671. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-19 11:53:03 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030119065303.05670.00000063@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 59754

>Subject: Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 1/18/03 4:40 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030118174014.09063.00000076@mb-mf.aol.com>
>
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
>> And on what basis do you assert the test is "easy"..? That it MAY have
>>been easy for YOU...?
>
>They have "license in a day: classes. It is expected that those that attend
>will take the test the same day and pass. At least 75% do, the rest pass it
>on
>their 2nd try. So, the test is easy.

If the test were "easy", Vipul, folks would pass it 100%. And I passed
all of my exams except the Extra on the first pass, but NONE of them were what
I considered easy.

By the way, I did it "the hard way" and actually learned the material.

>You would have to admit, one does not have to learn the material to pass the
>test. But, one has to learn Morse code to do code. Some do just that.
>Therefore
>they are an only-coder.

No, Vipul...As long as there is a written test required to be a licensed
Amateur, one cannot be an "only-coder". It still requires a practical Code
test AND the written.

You are wrong.

Steve, K4YZ

672. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-19 11:54:32 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030119065432.05670.00000064@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 59755

>Subject: Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 1/18/03 4:45 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030118174535.09063.00000077@mb-mf.aol.com>
>
>From: "KB9TMP"
>
>>Then just what do YOU consider YOURSELF, a ham or an amateur radio op?
>
>I possess an AMATEUR radio license. I do not call myself a "Ham".
>
>>Are you saying those who attend a "HamFest" are hogs or unskilled actors?
>
>Neither. The word "Ham" is well know by those that possess an amateur radio
>license.

Therefore, LIKE IT OR NOT, Vipul Shah, KB1HMW, >>IS<< a HAM!!!

Steve, K4YZ

673. Re: This Is How KB1HMW "Supports" Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-19 12:03:53 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030119070353.05670.00000065@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 59756

>Subject: Re: This Is How KB1HMW "Supports" Amateur Radio
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 1/18/03 5:29 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030118182911.09063.00000080@mb-mf.aol.com>

>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
>> This guy has a lot of intestinal fortitude to state he "supports"
>>Amateur
>>(or Ham, what ever you care to call it, Vipul) radio, then to make such
>>obviously inflammatory remarks to a CB related NG.
>>
>> Nice going, Vipul.
>
>Its humor, please.

No, it's not. I don't consider it to be the least bit funny. Maybe where YOU come from slapping peoploe in the face is hillarious, but I miss the point.

>Also, I attempted to form an amateur radio club. Only two attended. So, not too successful.

Considering your attitude and lack of experience, I am not the least bit surprised.

>Lets not get personal.

Sorry...YOU already made it personal. You don't insult as many people as you do enmasse and not cause the hair on thier neck to rise.

Your propensity to say one thing then do another leaves you with some major charachter issues to resolve. How can we trust a person who claims to enjoy, support and "defend" Amateur Radio who makes such silly an irreverent comments in a public forum? Especially when that "forum" is to a group of folks who themselves already dislike Amateurs?

Steve, K4YZ

674. Re: This Is How KB1HMW "Supports" Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-19 16:03:46 UTC
From: bignose hambone the cenobite <ersuxme@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3e2acc87@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 59757

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030119070353.05670.00000065@mb-df.aol.com...

> Sorry...YOU already made it personal. You don't insult as many
people as
> you do enmasse and not cause the hair on thier neck to rise.
>
> Your propensity to say one thing then do another leaves you with some
> major charachter issues to resolve. How can we trust a person who claims
to
> enjoy, support and "defend" Amateur Radio who makes such silly an
irreverent
> comments in a public forum? Especially when that "forum" is to a group of
> folks who themselves already dislike Amateurs?
>
> Steve, K4YZ

This kinda stuff always makes me laugh.
What the heck do you think Ham Radio is?
Some kind of a Holy Cow akin to a religion of some type?
Do lightning bolts come down from heaven when the
great "Goddess of Ham Radio" is insulted?
I have always said that if Lyndon Larouche or the Unification
Church ever needed extra screwballs for recruitment
uses in airports and kiosks in mass transit causeways, all
they need do is goto any hamfest and look around.
Stop taking ham radio so damm seriously! It's nothing but
a goddamed insignificant hobby as far as the rest of
th world is concerned - OyVey go get yerself a nice bagel
w/cream cheese and chill out!

"Psychology is the study of everyone else's bullshit."

- Taylor

"History does not record anywhere at any time a religion
that has any rational basis. Religion is a crutch for people
not strong enough to stand up to the unknown without help.
But, like dandruff, most people do have a religion and
spend time and money on it and seem to derive
considerable pleasure from fiddling with it."

- Lazarus Long, "Time Enough For Love" by Robert Heinlein

675. FCC tells ... whatever

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-19 17:25:49 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301190925.308a877e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59758

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030119065432.05670.00000064@mb-df.aol.com>...

>
> Therefore, LIKE IT OR NOT, Vipul Shah, KB1HMW, >>IS<< a HAM!!!
>
> Steve, K4YZ

You rag on one guy because he's not a ham and you rag on another because he is!

Either this group has imploded or I've simply outgrown the silliness.

Of course, its possible that both are true.

See you around.

Brian/N0iMD

676. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-19 17:32:22 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030119123222.01578.00000045@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 59759

>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)

>No, Vipul...As long as there is a written test required to be a licensed
>Amateur, one cannot be an "only-coder". It still requires a practical Code
>test AND the written.
>
> You are wrong.

Sorry, I couldn't resist. I put the question if anyone would admit they are an only-coder. It is in rec.radio.amateur. It is not inflammatory. It is just a question. Any question can have a yes or no answer.

677. Re: FCC tells ... whatever

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-19 19:03:11 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030119140311.03962.00000120@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 59760

>Either this group has imploded or I've simply outgrown the silliness.
>
>Of course, its possible that both are true.

All of the above, besides this group is just for FUN, and just BSing the other guy. Its amazing how many people take this group so serious.
I like this group because I can spread hate and discountent, then sit back and watch people squirm. Its amazing how many people take all this BS as fact.
I HATE CBPLUSSERS!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

678. feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-19 20:59:53 UTC
From: g3zhi@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <3e2d1173.4260074@news.btinternet.com>
Source record: 59761

http://www.qsl.net/g3zhi/qst.pdf

qst article on internet linking

73 ian

http://www.qsl.net/g3zhi - many ham radio links

United Kingdom Internet Radio Linking Project

http://www.ukirlp.co.uk http://www.irlp.co.uk http://www.irlp.net

I usually monitor G4NJI node 520 simplex 145.2875mhz and GB3DV node
513 repeater 433.025mhz

Ian Abel G3ZHI
52 Hollytree Ave
Maltby
Rotherham
Yorkshire
S66 8DY

Tel: 01709 799911
Mobile 0776 481 3363

679. A famous 75 Meter personality has returned !!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-19 21:14:52 UTC
From: belcher <derelstom@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <3e2b165e@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 59762
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Well, last night I was looking for the Liberty
Net. Could not find them anyplace. The band
was packed solid from 3.940 thru 3.970
so I guess I's just forget about them and listen
to k5blb and his group on 3.947.9 - when
out of the blue a MIRACLE occurred.....

I hear someone with an s-5 signal ranting in
the background...he's going on and on and
on in a tirade....quoting bible verses...making
non-sensible rhymes.....talking to himself...and
others.....like a demented Energizer Bunny
on Crack or Speed.....

No.....!!!!.....Yes.....???.....CAN IT REALLY
BE???.....YES!!....OH SWEET JEEZUS STRAPPED
DOWN ON A ROCKET POWERED SLED AT THE
BONNEVILLE SALTFLATS.....IT...IS...REALLY..
.....HIM.....WOOOOO...HOOOOOO!!!!!!!!!!!!

I nearly fell out of the chair. I had to pinch myself to
be sure I was awake. Was it live or was it Memorex?
No.....IT'S REALLY HIM.....Hams of 75 meters
and beyond.....get ready once again people...for HAM
RADIO FUN in it's ultra-purest virgin Bertolli olive-oil
form.....because...(hope your sitting down reading this folks)...

N X 0 T HAS RETURNED TO THE AIRWAVES !!!!!!!!

Yes...I mean that NX0T people - the one and only!

Jone was one of the few would drive David - WA9KJI absolutely
INSANE and turn whatever frequency they bumped heads
upon - into one big gigantic sandbox filled with 5 year-olds
on a chocolate and sugartit high that made even the best days
of the infamous "Mike and Judy Show" pale by comparason.

Please, PLEASE will somebody please tell KJI that his old pal "NX" is
back on 75 meters and was tearin up BLB's crew a new
bunghole on 47.9 last night. Rest assured we ain't heard the last
of our pal John folks! (I'm so happy over this development folks that
I could just shit in my BVD's)

WELCOME BACK JOHN!! We missed ya boy!
Please get back in there and up on 14.275 to "straighten
things out" (KJI bounces back in-between 275 and 313

please be sure to say "hello" to him sometime)

680. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-19 21:50:26 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030119165026.04873.00000035@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 59763

In article <20030118164942.05670.00000045@mb-df.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>Subject: Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
>Date: 18 Jan 2003 21:49:42 GMT
>
>>Subject: Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade
>>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>>Date: 1/18/03 12:20 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20030118132057.12035.00000061@mb-da.aol.com>
>
>>For example, consider poor ol' broken down me. Been licensed 35 years, but
>>I'm only 48.
>
> I made 30 years as a licensee last year (October 27th, not that I keep
>track of such nostalgic points!) and I turned 47 this past year.

So are we "old"? I don;t think so.
>
>>Only a few pounds above recommended weight for my height,...(SNIP)
>
> I won't go into weight, but if anyone cares to look at my current QRZ
>"bio", I hardly think anyone (othr than Lennie or Vipul) could call me fat.
>The pic is only 2 months old.

The ultimate reference is BMI (body mass index).
>
>>So am I a "Ham" or a "radio amateur"? To me there's no difference - nor to
>>anybody but Vipul
>
> I've querried Vipul on several occassions as to just what
>accomplishments
>he has "racked up" in his Amateur Radio "career", but he has yet to be
>forthcoming.

That sez it all. No answer = nothing to report.

> Nor has he been forthcoming on any professional or educational
>achievements in the radiocommunications field.

Don't go there - PLEASE don't go there!
>
>>>Steve don't even kid around about Vipul being a Ham,
>>>that statement hurts us hams is worse than any of the
>>>bad things he has said about the ARS.

>>
>>As evidenced by his posts in rec.radio.cb
>
> Like I said...!
>
So why bother to answer his trolls?
>
73 de Jim, N2EY

681. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-19 21:50:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030119165027.04873.00000036@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 59764

In article <20030118180311.09063.00000079@mb-mf.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>>He sees "Hams" as being generally old, fat, speaking in jargon, technically
>>ignorant and focused on operating (particularly Morse)
>
>A non-Ham asked me if Ham radio was a cult and if they still use Morse code.

It's not a cult and yes, many of us do still use Morse code.
>
>>Note that Vipul never says what he thinks ham radio should be, what he does,
>>or
>>what he wants. Only what he doesn't like and doesn't want.
>
>I have put in the suggestion for more technical certifcations.

But not how to achieve it. You complain about the written tests, but do not produce any practical ways that they could be improved.

>I made my
>opinion known on code-testing.

And a lot more.

>I made a whole list of some suggestions.

They looked like complaints.
>
N2EY

682. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-19 22:42:35 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <vRFW9.1715$bL4.164188@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 59765

Blatant copyright infringement. Hope that ARRL doesn't refer this to their lawyers.

Hans, K0HB
k0hb_at_arrl.net

"g3zhi" <g3zhi@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:3e2d1173.4260074@news.btinternet.com...
:
: http://www.qsl.net/g3zhi/qst.pdf
:
:
:
: qst article on internet linking
:
:

683. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-19 23:07:20 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030119180720.08239.00000089@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 59766

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>It's not a cult and...

Thats what a cult belonger would say.

To some its a hobby, not a cult. To others, its a cult.

>But not how to achieve it. You complain about the written tests, but do not
>produce any practical ways that they could be improved.

Keep the test as it is.

Change the nature of the clubs. Less code, politics, Wuoff Hong, etc. More
kitbuilding, homebrewing,antenna setups, and social events.

I "belonged" to another cult before, a good cult. Now, the cult no longer
exists.

Morse code is fun. Real-time decoding can be addicting.

684. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-19 23:14:34 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030119181434.13301.00000190@mb-fe.aol.com>
Source record: 59767

>Keep the test as it is.

The TEST is to easy

>Change the nature of the clubs. Less code, politics, Wuoff Hong, etc. More
>kitbuilding, homebrewing,antenna setups, and social events.

Are you kidding I dont want to socialize with these people.

685. Re: This Is How KB1HMW "Supports" Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-19 23:37:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030119183725.00690.00000057@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 59768

In article <20030118182911.09063.00000080@mb-mf.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
>> This guy has a lot of intestinal fortitude to state he "supports"
>>Amateur
>>(or Ham, what ever you care to call it, Vipul) radio, then to make such
>>obviously inflammatory remarks to a CB related NG.
>>
>> Nice going, Vipul.
>
>Its humor, please.

Except it's not funny.

First rule of comedy: If you have to explain to the audiencethat it's a joke, it's not funny.

>Some time around last October, I invited a non-Ham to a Hamfest.

Why?

>Also, I gave a
>copy of my ARRL handbook to someone.

YOUR ARRL Handbook? Did you write the whole thing yourself?

>I mentioned I was a Ham on a few occasions.

Then you are one.

Here's an equation for ya:

Ham = amateur radio operator = person holding valid amateur radio license.
>
>Also, I attempted to form an amateur radio club. Only two attended. So, not
>too successful.

Think about WHY only two attended.

>Couldn't get the club started as not enough members and other
>priorities took over.

Indeed.

>Lets not get personal.
>
Then start by not making fun of hams.

N2EY

686. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-19 23:38:33 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030119183833.08239.00000090@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 59769

>From: wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX)
> Are you kidding I dont want to socialize with these people.

The hobby has the perception of social misfits. Attending a Hamfest does little to change one's perception.

Things like waiting three hours to hear a secret chant about code from the Wuoff Hong.

The majority of its particitants are male, old, fat. This is true of the last two Hamfest s I went to. Most of them use radio for a diversion (hence the appeal of the cult) and are not EEs. The only social event Hams seems to have are eating events (Sunday brunch, cookouts, etc) and Hamfests (which usually has a buffet).

687. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-19 23:57:24 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E2B3B4B.7020504@adelphia.net>
Source record: 59770

g3zhi wrote:

> http://www.qsl.net/g3zhi/qst.pdf
>
> qst article on internet linking

Hey, maybe they could even do something with cameras as well as microphones! Oh wait, they already have.

Seems like a answer in search of a problem. Seems like you could do much better by keeping the signal on the net 100 percent of the time. The whole thing sounds like a chat room for licensed amateurs.

This is hardly any technology breakthrough, it sounds like something that someone who wanted to "cash" in on the internet dreamed up.

It ranks right up there with the PSK31 voice mode.

Would we send QSL cards?

Other than that I think it's great.

- Mike KB3EIA -

688. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-20 00:05:43 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <r3HW9.1806$bL4.175308@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 59771

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030119183833.08239.00000090@mb-cq.aol.com...
: >From: wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX)

:
: The majority of its particitants are male, old, fat. This is true of the
last
: two Hamfest s I went to. Most of them use radio for a diversion (hence the
: appeal of the cult) and are not EEs. The only social event Hams seems to
have
: are eating events (Sunday brunch, cookouts, etc) and Hamfests (which
usually
: has a buffet).
:

You're a meat flavored imitation of a doorstop hanging around Wuoff Hong
cults?. Be careful, be VERY careful!

Hans
Grand Exhalted Liberator of Electric Smoke

689. Re: Cronkite Leaves Baxter For ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-20 00:37:23 UTC
From: rfburns2003@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <634e00e4.0301191637.e1d935e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59772
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

frankthe ham@juno.com wrote:

> I found this on the ARRL website. Guess it answers the earlier posts
> about K1MAN and Walter Cronkite. Looks like the most trusted man in
> America really trusts the ARRL not K1MAN.

Heck we already knew all that... but it just keeps getting worse...

Look what I just found Frankie!

http://users.adelphia.net/~k3vr/hell.htm

690. Re: This Is How KB1HMW "Supports" Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-20 00:51:16 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030119195116.04110.00000065@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 59773

N2EY wrote:
>>Lets not get personal.
>>
>Then start by not making fun of hams.

I went a little overboard at times, even today. I know that Hams are basically good people. I will try to be more sensitive.

Sadly, amateur radio lead to my demise. I could not see the light at the end of the tunnel. It was the longer pathway. I was too impatient and chose the shorter pathway. Then, the train ran me over.

I had a chance to sell out (to "CB"). I did not take it. As a result, I did not get my amateur radio or CB.

It looks like the path I chose will lead me to leave amateur radio. I will ponder and reflect. I may still keep my radio as a diversion.

The terms tunnel, train, ran, CB are metaphors. (Its something totally different than CB, but using CB illustrates "selling out").

691. Re: This Is How KB1HMW "Supports" Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-20 01:25:34 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030119202534.24933.00000083@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 59774

>Subject: Re: This Is How KB1HMW "Supports" Amateur Radio
>From: "bignose hambone the cenobite" ersuxme@yahoo.com
>Date: 1/19/03 10:03 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3e2acc87@snipnews.snip.net>

>This kinda stuff always makes me laugh.

What makes ME laugh are those weak-spiritied, testicularly deficient anonymous cowards who ooze out of the woodwork to make such comments without putting thier name to them.

The same kinda guy who struts around the house snorting about how he wears the pants in the family...as long as no one hears him say it, of course...

>Stop taking ham radio so damm seriously! It's nothing but
>a goddamed insignificant hobby as far as the rest of
>th world is concerned.

The need to disenfranchise others so as to feel important themselves is common, witness the foregoing.

What a loser.

692. Re: FCC tells ... whatever

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-20 01:29:19 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030119202919.24933.00000084@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 59775

>Subject: FCC tells ... whatever
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 1/19/03 11:25 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0301190925.308a877e@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
>news:<20030119065432.05670.00000064@mb-df.aol.com>...
>
>>
>> Therefore, LIKE IT OR NOT, Vipul Shah, KB1HMW, >>IS<
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>You rag on one guy because he's not a ham and you rag on another because he
>is!

Of course, Brian, the actual context of the post was lost upon you.

The point is not that "he's a Ham", the point is that he alleges to
"support" Amateur Radio, yet makes so blatantly insulting commetns ABOUT
Amateur Radio in public forums.

>Either this group has imploded or I've simply outgrown the silliness.

Or you ahve not been paying attention, which is far more likely.

>Of course, its possible that both are true.

Or, as I said, you've not been paying attention. That IS far more likely.

>See you around.

Not likely.

Steve, K4YZ

693. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-20 01:31:28 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030119203128.24933.00000085@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 59776

>Subject: Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 1/19/03 5:07 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030119180720.08239.00000089@mb-cq.aol.com>

>Change the nature of the clubs. Less code, politics, Wuoff Hong, etc. More
>kitbuilding, homebrewing,antenna setups, and social events.

Hey dingleberry...The clubs reflect the desires of the members!

And "social events" include all those activities you seem to disdain...So
what is it you really mean?

694. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-20 01:34:58 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030119203458.09289.00000089@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 59777

In article <v2hu693p16nb10@corp.supernews.com>, "KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com>
writes:

>> Who -- Moi? An "only coder?" Only if you include Baudot and PSK-31
>
>PSK31 you say. What bands and when? I'll start looking for you.

Primarily 20-meters. I'm kind of tied up with the VHF Sweepstakes
this weekend, but let's try to make a sked, OK? Any weeknight
or Tuesday or Sunday (my days off) would be fine! I'd love having a
QSO with someone from rrap!

>> unicode! And ASCII. And a lot of others I don't even know the names of!
>
>Have you tried Hellschriber? It looks interesting to me also.

No, not yet -- but I'm game to give it a try if you are! The text display
is very unusual! BTW my digital mode software is MixW 2.06 (Reg.).

>> I spend more time on the digital modes than I do on CW!
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>I spend about 99% of my time just listening
>(or watching/reading) and just a little TXing.

Well, it's about time you got on the air with those digital modes! BTW --
I hope you can type! I can do around 75 WPM, with spurts over 100! I
don't use a lot of pre-canned function-key responses on-the-air! If I
catch you doing so, be prepared to take your medicine here in the NG!

73 de Larry, K3LT

695. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-20 01:34:58 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030119203458.09289.00000088@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 59778

In article <sCoW9.285$Sv3.37394@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "KØHB"
<kØhb@arrl.DOTORG> writes:

>
>: Therefore they are an only-coder.
>
>Is that a "bad thing™"?

Not at all -- as long as those "codes" include the ones used in the
digital modes!

>There are some hams who are only-2M-repeater. Is that a "bad thing™"?

Yes. Definitely. Absolutely. It's a VERY bad thing™!

>There are some hams who are only-packet. Is that a "bad thing™"?

Yes. Martha Stewart would not approve. Any ham who would be
"only packet" must be seeking a cure for insomnia.

>There are some hams who are only-ragchew. Is that a "bad thing™"?

No. It's The Worst Thing™!

>There are some hams who are only-homebrew. Is that a "bad thing™"?

Absolutely not -- as long as they are using their creations on a variety
of bands and modes!

>There are some hams who are only rrap. Is that a "bad thing™"?

Since rrap is not ham radio, it wouldn't count, either way.

BTW -- hams that are "only Public Service" are not Real Hams™ either!
They're just a bunch of frustrated cop/fireman/paramedic wannabes who
are more likely to be dangerous than helpful!

73 de Larry, K3LT

696. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-20 01:46:42 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030119204642.24933.00000086@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 59779

>Subject: Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 1/19/03 5:38 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030119183833.08239.00000090@mb-cq.aol.com>

>The hobby has the perception of social misfits. Attending a Hamfest does
>little
>to change one's perception.

"Social misfits"...?!?!

BBBWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!

>Things like waiting three hours to hear a secret chant about code from the
>Wuoff Hong.

Let's see...You condem "Hams" as being "fat old males" who are social misfits, yet wait around at a hamfest to attend a "cult" ritual that you don't even like?

Hmmmmmmmmmmmm.....

>The majority of its particitants are male, old, fat.

Then at the NEXT hamfest, why don't YOU sponsor a wellness booth, or sponsor a Jenny Craig booth?

>This is true of the last two Hamfest s I went to.

If all you are going to do is be disappointed, why don't you just stay home? I am sure they won't miss you. I know I've not missed you at a single hamfest I have been to, and I dare say I've been to a few more than you!

>Most of them use radio for a diversion...(SNIP)

DUH...! Ya THINK...?!?! Aspointed out in this forum by many, this is a HOBBY to many who participate in it...it is a diversion by it's very nature to many.

...(UNSNIP)..(hence the appeal of the cult) and are not EEs

So who give's a rat's kazoo about being EE's...?!?!

Vipul...You are an Amateur Radio licensee for ALL the WRONG reasons!

>The only social event Hams seems to have
>are eating events (Sunday brunch, cookouts, etc) and Hamfests (which usually
>has a buffet).

So why don't you organize a beer bust at the local bump-and-grind bar, Vipul?

And WHICH hamfest has a "buffet"...?!?! I've ate a lot of over-priced hot dogs and hamburgers at hamfests before, but have yet to be to one with a "buffet".

(Although Dayton has some grrrreat sausage and burger stands ! ! !)

697. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-20 02:02:53 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030119210253.09289.00000090@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 59781

In article <20030119183833.08239.00000090@mb-cq.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>The majority of its particitants are male, old, fat.

Vshah:

You've just described a high percentage of football fans, NASCAR fans, hot rod fans, bass fishermen, hunters, and a lot of other old, fat men who enjoy a wide variety of sports and hobby activities.

>This is true of the last
>two Hamfest s I went to.

It was also true of the last football game I attended.

> Most of them use radio for a diversion (hence the
>appeal of the cult) and are not EEs.

I see. Are you saying that having an EE degree should now be a requirement for an amateur radio license?

>The only social event Hams seems to have
>are eating events (Sunday brunch, cookouts, etc) and Hamfests (which usually
>has a buffet).

Hmmm...something's wrong here, then. The last few ham events I attended had little or nothing to do with food, and a lot to do with hard work (setting up antennas, stations, generators, etc.) and then a lot of operating. Yes, they fed us, but only at normal mealtimes and there was no competitive (event-style) eating involved. Everyone ate normal, healthy portions and was grateful for what they received.

73 de Larry, K3LT

698. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-20 02:02:54 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030119210254.09289.00000091@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 59780

In article <20030119181434.13301.00000190@mb-fe.aol.com>, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) writes:

>>Keep the test as it is.
>
>The TEST is to easy
>
>>Change the nature of the clubs. Less code, politics, Wuoff Hong, etc. More
>>kitbuilding, homebrewing,antenna setups, and social events.
>
> Are you kidding I dont want to socialize with these people.

Don't look now, Bruce, but they don't want to socialize with YOU, either!

73 de Larry, K3LT

699. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-20 02:02:54 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030119210254.09289.00000092@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 59782

In article <20030119180720.08239.00000089@mb-cq.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>
>To some its a hobby, not a cult. To others, its a cult.
>
>>But not how to achieve it. You complain about the written tests, but do not
>>produce any practical ways that they could be improved.
>
>Keep the test as it is.
>
>Change the nature of the clubs. Less code, politics, Wuoff Hong, etc. More
>kitbuilding, homebrewing,antenna setups, and social events.

Less code than what? Is that nasty 'ole 5 WPM code test too much
for your feeble widdle mind to comprehend?

73 de Larry, K3LT

700. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-20 02:05:51 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030119210551.03082.00000086@mb-mn.aol.com>
Source record: 59783

>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
> "Social misfits"...?!?!
Yes.

>>Things like waiting three hours to hear a secret chant about code from the
>>Wuoff Hong.
>
> Let's see...You condem "Hams" as being "fat old males" who are social
>misfits, yet wait around at a hamfest to attend a "cult" ritual that you
>don't
>even like?

No, Wuoff Hong ritual is three hours after the end of the Hamfest day. I didn't
say I stayed.

> Then at the NEXT hamfest, why don't YOU sponsor a wellness booth, or
>sponsor a Jenny Craig booth?

I might get trampled over.

> If all you are going to do is be disappointed, why don't you just stay
>home?
Sometimes they have technical presentations. The flea market might have
interesting stuff.

>>The only social event Hams seems to have
>>are eating events (Sunday brunch, cookouts, etc) and Hamfests (which usually
>>has a buffet).
>
> So why don't you organize a beer bust at the local bump-and-grind bar,
>Vipul?

Beats Wuoff Hong.

> (Although Dayton has some grrrreat sausage and burger stands ! ! !)

I will try to make the next Dayton Hamfest. (I was just joking about getting
trampled over).

701. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-20 02:50:48 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030119215048.25001.00000082@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 59784

>Subject: Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 1/19/03 8:05 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030119210551.03082.00000086@mb-mn.aol.com>
>
>>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)

>> "Social misfits"...?!?!

>Yes.

There IS a social misfit in Amatuer radio, Vipul, and it would appear that
it is you. YOU want Amateur Radio to be what YOU want it, and you insult and
demean everything that is not to your specifications.

Seems to me YOU are the one outside looking in...

>> Let's see...You condem "Hams" as being "fat old males" who are social
>>misfits, yet wait around at a hamfest to attend a "cult" ritual that you
>>don't
>>even like?
>
>No, Wuoff Hong ritual is three hours after the end of the Hamfest day. I
>didn't
>say I stayed.

Then how do you kow what goes on? Third party reports? A court of law
would call taht simple heresay.

>>Then at the NEXT hamfest, why don't YOU sponsor a wellness booth, or
>>sponsor a Jenny Craig booth?

>I might get trampled over.

Or simply laughed at, which is more likely. And that's ALREADY happening.

>>If all you are going to do is be disappointed, why don't you just stay
>>home?

>Sometimes they have technical presentations. The flea market might have
>interesting stuff.

But Vipul ! Are there any EE's in the flea market?

>>So why don't you organize a beer bust at the local bump-and-grind bar,
>>Vipul?
>
>Beats Wuoff Hong.

If you've never been to one, how would you know? Maybe "Wuoff Hong" is a euphemism for a stripper?

>> (Although Dayton has some grrrreat sausage and burger stands ! ! !)
>
>I will try to make the next Dayton Hamfest. (I was just joking about getting
>trampled over).

Like Jim said, if you have to explain that it was a joke, it wasn't a joke...And >>I<< wasn't joking.

Steve

702. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-20 02:52:12 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030119215212.25001.00000083@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 59785

>Subject: Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 1/19/03 8:05 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030119210551.03082.00000086@mb-mn.aol.com>

>I will try to make the next Dayton Hamfest.

Why bother? Just a bunch of fat, old male social misfits who don't want
to talk about what YOU like, Vipul.

See you at the Jenny Craig booth.

Steve

703. self build kits

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-20 03:16:07 UTC
From: knocklist@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <c5ca1849.0301191916.35b9b8a9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59786

Can anyone tell me where in the uk i can find self build radio kits,i have noticed in the states you can buy such things but not here.
thanks.

704. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-20 03:29:01 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030119222901.16054.00000185@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 59787

>Don't look now, Bruce, but they don't want to socialize with YOU, either!
>
>73 de Larry, K3LT

GOOD, I dont want to be around a bunch of knucle draggin misfits.

705. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-20 03:33:58 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030119223358.16054.00000186@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 59788

>The only social event Hams seems to have
>are eating events (Sunday brunch, cookouts, etc) and Hamfests (which usually
>has a buffet).
>

I agree, lets have them have some naked women on stage dancing, wait a minute, forget that, they would probably have some TOOTHLESS CBPLUSSER HEEFERS up there.

706. Re: FCC tells ... whatever

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-20 03:41:36 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301191941.2f56fc15@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59789

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030119140311.03962.00000120@mb-ba.aol.com>...
> >Either this group has imploded or I've simply outgrown the silliness.
> >
> >Of course, its possible that both are true.
>
> All of the above, besides this group is just for FUN, and just BSing the other
> guy. Its amazing how many people take this group so serious.
> I like this group because I can spread hate and discountent, then sit back and
> watch people squirm. Its amazing how many people take all this BS as fact.
> I HATE CBPLUSSERS!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Bruce, please don't agree with me then tack on your hick philosophy as
if it had something to do with me. It doesn't.

707. Re: FCC tells ... whatever

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-20 04:49:26 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030119234926.16177.00000184@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 59790

>Bruce, please don't agree with me then tack on your hick philosophy as

The Hick philosopy, was for your benefit, the part of OHIO you live in is full of HICKS

708. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-20 05:25:38 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v2n2278niedv6f@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 59791

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030119210254.09289.00000092@mb-ch.aol.com...
> In article <20030119180720.08239.00000089@mb-cq.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com
> (Vshah101) writes:
>
> >
> >To some its a hobby, not a cult. To others, its a cult.
> >
> >>But not how to achieve it. You complain about the written tests, but do
not
> >>produce any practical ways that they could be improved.
> >
> >Keep the test as it is.
> >
> >Change the nature of the clubs. Less code, politics, Wuoff Hong, etc.
More
> >kitbuilding, homebrewing,antenna setups, and social events.
>
> Less code than what? Is that nasty 'ole 5 WPM code test too much
> for your feeble widdle mind to comprehend?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

No, I think he's waiting for the great freebie HF giveaway
that keeps being rumored about coming soon. I said
to heck with that and just knuckled down and did it. Now
that I passed the 5wpm I could care less if the code requirement
EVER changes! (really I kinda hope it don't change but Sssshhhh
that's a secret) ;^) I just thought of something, I'm a member of
NCI. I think I'm going to go quit my membership in that group.
--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx

709. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-20 05:45:34 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v2n37lt6kndu0d@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 59792

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030119203458.09289.00000089@mb-ch.aol.com...
> In article <v2hu693p16nb10@corp.supernews.com>, "KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com>
> writes:
>
> >> Who -- Moi? An "only coder?" Only if you include Baudot and PSK-31
> > >
> > >PSK31 you say. What bands and when? I'll start looking for you.
> >
> > Primarily 20-meters. I'm kind of tied up with the VHF Sweepstakes
> > this weekend, but let's try to make a sked, OK? Any weeknight
> > or Tuesday or Sunday (my days off) would be fine! I'd love having a
> > QSO with someone from rrap!
> >

It would have to be Tuesday daytime or Sunday some time
I work Mon-Fri 20:00-05:00 UTC

> >> unicode! And ASCII. And a lot of others I don't even know the names
of!
> > >
> > >Have you tried Hellschriber? It looks interesting to me also.
> >
> > No, not yet -- but I'm game to give it a try if you are!

Sounds good to me.

> The text display
> is very unusual!

That's what has got my interest peaked, plus I read the history
of it and it's only second in age to CW itself, patented back
in 1929

> BTW my digital mode software is MixW 2.06 (Reg.).

I've got that and I also use WinPSKse.

>
> >> I spend more time on the digital modes than I do on CW!
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >>
> > >
> > >I spend about 99% of my time just listening
> > >(or watching/reading) and just a little TXing.
> >

> Well, it's about time you got on the air with those digital modes! BTW --
> I hope you can type! I can do around 75 WPM, with spurts over 100! I
> don't use a lot of pre-canned function-key responses on-the-air! If I
> catch you doing so, be prepared to take your medicine here in the NG!

I run about 50 or so WPM, I've got three fingers on my right
hand that are nerve dead (no feeling at all) which makes touch
typing kinda hard for me. I don't like those canned function keys
either they seem to be out of place in the conversation when people
use them. I just write it out instead of trying to figure out which Fkey
says what!

>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

You can email me with a sked just make it after 14:00 UTC, I
need my beauty sleep ;^) The email address I use here is real
kb9tmp@juno.com they don't filter out any of the spam
so I just use it for posting in here.
--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx

710. Re: Ham Running For Office - Orange County, California

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-20 10:03:32 UTC
From: "William A. Wetzel" <n6rky@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <UPPW9.2244$Sv3.269724@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 59793

Ryan,

Done as of 01/20/03
Thanks for your advice :)

> > clubs need to get on board..... invite them to a club meeting! Share
your
> > concerns regarding amateur radio. Even if it does not work much in your
> > favor, at least they will have gained some insight to the hobby. Hell,
> get
> > 'em licensed!!!!
> >

Best Wishes,
--
William A. Wetzel
http://home.earthlink.net/~n6rky
http://www.qsl.net/n6rky
mailto:n6rky@earthlink.net
mailto:n6rky@qsl.net

William A. Wetzel <n6rky@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:...
> Ryan,
>
> You have good advice here. I will do just that!!!
>
> Best Wishes,
> --
> William A. Wetzel
> http://home.earthlink.net/~n6rky
> http://www.qsl.net/n6rky
> mailto:n6rky@earthlink.net
> mailto:n6rky@qsl.net
>
>
> KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
> news:aveqfq41dpp@enews4.newsguy.com...
> > Thanks,
> >
> > I vote for the individual, and what I have learned about the politician
> > through as many sources as possible, to figure out which one is the
LEAST
> > crooked as well as aligned with my personal ideals.
> >
> > I have spoken with about a dozen michigan senators/representatives

> (current)
> > as well as some of the ones that have ran in the past 2 1/4 years and
only
> > one actually knew anything about ham radio!!!! This is where our local
> > clubs need to get on board..... invite them to a club meeting! Share
your
> > concerns regarding amateur radio. Even if it does not work much in your
> > favor, at least they will have gained some insight to the hobby. Hell,
> get
> > 'em licensed!!!!
> >
> >
> > --
> > Ryan, KC8PMX
> > FF/MFR
> > REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
> >
> > "Symbolism is for the simple minded....."
> >
> >
> > "William A. Wetzel" <n6rky@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:dYOR9.15890$9N5.1463144@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> > > Ryan,
> > >
> > > You have an excellent point there. If amateur radio enthusiasts voted
> > > independently as you had suggested, the voice would be unified and
heard
> > all
> > > the way to Washington. Many interest groups do just that. Why not
> amateur
> > > radio as well? Something to think about :)
> > >
> > > Best Wishes,
> > > & Thank you for your support!
> > > --
> > > William A. Wetzel
> > > http://home.earthlink.net/~n6rky
> > > http://www.qsl.net/n6rky
> > > mailto:n6rky@earthlink.net
> > > mailto:n6rky@qsl.net
> > >
> > > KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
> > > news:aupff85adl@enews2.newsguy.com...
> > > >
> > > > "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> > > > news:cuvyxnansvbet.h7rb50w.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> > > > > On Thu, 26 Dec 2002 04:15:32 -0500, KC8PMX wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > >Anyone who votes democrat or republican is nuts.... It is
> > > > > >a no-win situation on either side of that political coin. Look at

> > this
> > > > last
> > > > > >presidential election, neither partie's candidate was worth a
damn,
> > > > except
> > > > > >for being a puppet on a string for their respective parties.
> > > > >
> > > > > "None of the above" was not an option.
> > > >
> > > > There were other candidates other that the Big 2 parties...
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > >"Vote Independant; Think For Yourself, Not What People Want You
To
> > > > Think"
> > > > >
> > > > > The last "independents" in Presidemtial elections were Ross
Perot
> > > > > and Ralph Nader, both of whom were scarier than the Demo-Rep
> > > > > candidates.
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > Maybe I should have cleared that one up a bit.... Independant
meaning
> > any
> > > > party other than the republican and democrat parties.
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > The first and last independent that I voted for was John
Anderson
> in
> > > > > 1980, because neither Carter nor Reagan were acceptable.
> > > > >
> > > > > None of the above were hams....
> > > > >
> > > > > ---
> > > > > 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
> > > >
> > > > Maybe that would be the ultimate goal for the ARRL? After all,
aren't
> > these
> > > > the people (any elected officials that is) that we are going to look
> to
> > > for
> > > > defense, and support? Me thinks they would understand the hobby
> better
> > if
> > > > they knew more about it if they were licensed also. I would almost

> join
> > > the
> > > > ARRL just to get a motion made to get that to happen.... :)
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > --
> > > > Ryan, KC8PMX
> > > > FF/MFR
> > > > REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
> > > >
> > > > "Symbolism is for the simple minded....."
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
> >
>
>

711. Lets face it ... we're just communicators.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-20 10:10:29 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b0h28i5oa3@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 59799

True to a point.... most often on most scenes the ham op's are only needed in a communications capacity, usually set up somewhere in vicinity of a scene, or at a E.C.C. About the only "hands on" act I can see that hams can serve extremely well is the "search" part of search and rescue. I have seen this done, where a ham is is assigned to a firefighter or officer working on a "search line." The ham is not there to be the "rescuer" nor being the person offering medical care when finding the lost party, but does help to expand the area being search and covering more ground quicker. This has worked real well in the past. Seems like the county I live in "busses in" senior citizens here, as there are more "old folks homes" than there are apartment buildings in a community of around 40-45,000. They seem to like to wander away from the homes on a regular basis.....

All in all... all we are is communicators.... regardless of band or mode. Let's not kid ourselves.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

"America: Work to improve it.... or leave it."

>
> BTW -- hams that are "only Public Service" are not Real HamsT either!
> They're just a bunch of frustrated cop/fireman/paramedic wannabes who
> are more likely to be dangerous than helpful!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

712. Re: self build kits

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-20 11:40:43 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030120064043.06541.00000147@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 59794

>Subject: self build kits
>From: knocklist@hotmail.com (ranger)
>Date: 1/19/03 9:16 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <c5ca1849.0301191916.35b9b8a9@posting.google.com>

>Can anyone tell me where in the uk i can find self build radio kits,i
>have noticed in the states you can buy such things but not here.
>thanks.

TenTec has a small line of QRP kits and accessory items available via a
British distributor:

TenTec DIRECT, 4E East Mill, Bridgefoot,
Belper, Derbyshire DE56 2UA, England
Tel: 01773 880788 Fax: 01773 880780
tentec@aoruk.com http://www.aoruk.com/tentec

73 es GL de K4YZ

713. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-20 14:23:51 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030120092351.14672.00000151@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 59795

> just thought of something, I'm a member of
>NCI. I think I'm going to go quit my membership in that group.
>--
>'73' From KB9TMP

You will fell like a new person when you Quit. Just think you will no longer have to go to COSMIC KARL for guidance.

714. Re: FCC tells ... whatever

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-20 14:24:45 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301200624.5c7e5ec8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59796

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030119202919.24933.00000084@mb-bh.aol.com>...
> >Subject: FCC tells ... whatever
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 1/19/03 11:25 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0301190925.308a877e@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
> >news:<20030119065432.05670.00000064@mb-df.aol.com>...
> >
> >>
> >> Therefore, LIKE IT OR NOT, Vipul Shah, KB1HMW, >>IS<
> >> Steve, K4YZ
> >
> >You rag on one guy because he's not a ham and you rag on another because he
> >is!
>
> Of course, Brian, the actual context of the post was lost upon you.
>
> The point is not that "he's a Ham", the point is that he alleges to
> "support" Amateur Radio, yet makes so blatantly insulting commetns ABOUT
> Amateur Radio in public forums.

You're kidding, right? You think you're having a serious discussion
where content matters? Not around here.

> >Either this group has imploded or I've simply outgrown the silliness.
>
> Or you ahve not been paying attention, which is far more likely.
>
> >Of course, its possible that both are true.
>
> Or, as I said, you've not been paying attention. That IS far more likely.

Not paying attention is a virtue, sometimes. This is one of those
times.

> >See you around.
>
> Not likely.

I was just being polite. Like Hans' "best wishes."

715. Re: FCC tells ... whatever

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-20 14:58:43 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030120095843.02817.00000091@mb-mn.aol.com>
Source record: 59797

>Subject: Re: FCC tells ... whatever
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 1/20/03 8:24 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0301200624.5c7e5ec8@posting.google.com>

>You're kidding, right? You think you're having a serious discussion
>where content matters? Not around here

Perhaps "not around here" to you, but in most matters, yes, I am serious about what I say.

>Not paying attention is a virtue, sometimes. This is one of those
>times.

If you like getting caught with your britches down, I guess you'd be right. But in retrospect, I guess you DO like getting caught with them down or you wouldn't be trying to catch up all the time.

>I was just being polite. Like Hans' "best wishes."

I generally try to not say something I don't mean. Hans' "best wishes" comments are, in my opinion, usually sarcastic in nature. I ignore it. If you can't be sincere about it, why say it? One cannot offer "best wishes", "73", "have a nice day", etc etc after trying to slam someone in a RRAP post.

Steve, K4YZ

716. Re: FCC tells ... whatever

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-20 15:01:14 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030120100114.02817.00000092@mb-mn.aol.com>
Source record: 59798

>Subject: Re: FCC tells ... whatever
>From: wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX)
>Date: 1/19/03 1:03 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030119140311.03962.00000120@mb-ba.aol.com>

>I HATE CBPLUSSERS!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Makes it kinda hard to look in the mirror to shave, don;t it Brucie?

717. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-20 15:37:26 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030120103726.12173.00000052@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 59800

In article <r3HW9.1806$bL4.175308@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG> writes:

>: The majority of its particitants are male, old, fat. This is true of the
>: last two Hamfest s I went to.

Two hamfests, seen by an obviously biased observer, is not a representative sample. Someone interested in technical knowledge should know that.

>: Most of them use radio for a diversion (hence the
>: appeal of the cult) and are not EEs.

Go hang out at an IEEE event and tell us about it. Are IEEE event attendees mostly "male, old, fat"?

>The only social event Hams seems to
>have are eating events (Sunday brunch, cookouts, etc) and Hamfests (which
>usually has a buffet).
>:
I've been a ham 35 years and been to numerous hamfests. Never seen ONE that had a buffet.
>
>You're a meat flavored imitation of a doorstop hanging around Wuoff Hong
>cults?. Be careful, be VERY careful!
>
"Do not tangle with dragons, for you are crunchy and taste good with ketchup"

>Hans
>Grand Exhalted Liberator of Electric Smoke
>
N2EY

718. Re: FCC tells ... whatever

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-20 15:38:34 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <_JUW9.2632$bL4.281751@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 59801

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote

: One cannot offer "best wishes", "73", "have a nice day", etc etc
: after trying to slam someone in a RRAP post.

Of course you can, despite this a new Net-rule from your Teutonic
control-freak keyboard.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

719. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-20 16:01:20 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0301200801.4a2d4348@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59802

vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030119180720.08239.00000089@mb-cq.aol.com>...
> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> >It's not a cult and...
>
> Thats what a cult belonger would say.

It's not a cult. You defined "a unified belief system" as one of the
necessary conditions for a cult. Ham radio does not have a unified
belief system. Therefore, it is not a cult. QED.
>
> To some its a hobby, not a cult. To others, its a cult.

You are the only person I have ever known to use the term "cult" to
describe the ARS. Here's a clue: "Cult" does not have positive
connotations to most English-speaking people. The word implies
mindless acceptance of illogical beliefs.
>
> >But not how to achieve it. You complain about the written tests, but do not
> >produce any practical ways that they could be improved.
>
> Keep the test as it is.

There are currently four tests - three written and one code.
>
> Change the nature of the clubs.

How? Clubs usually reflect the interest of the members.

Are you willing to do the work necessary to effect changes?

> Less code, politics, Wuoff Hong, etc.

"Less code" - what does this mean? Stop having code training classes?
Ban CW from Field Day and other club events?

All that's left of code TESTING is single 5 wpm code test that will
probably be gone in less than a year. So when you say "less code" it
must mean you want to suppress things like code training classes and
hams actually using the mode.

What is wrong with live and let live?

"politics" - all depends what you mean by "politics".

"Wuoff Hong" (actually spelled, "Wouff Hong"). Never seen one of those
at a club meeting in 30+ years. Do you even know what it stands for?

> More
> kitbuilding, homebrewing, antenna setups, and social events.
>
Are YOU volunteering to do the work to make those things happen? For example, what have YOU built that would be a good program for a club meeting?

(long mysterious white space deleted)

> ---
> ----------------------
> I "belonged" to another cult before, a good cult.

What "cult" was this? I do not know of any "good cults".

> Now, the cult no longer exists.

What happened?
>
> Morse code is fun.

Finally something we agree on!

> Real-time decoding can be addicting.

??

N2EY

720. Re: FCC tells ... whatever

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-20 16:32:54 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030120113254.17355.00000169@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 59803

>Makes it kinda hard to look in the mirror to shave, don;t it Brucie?
>
>

No not hard at all, since Im not a CBplusser, now in your case it most be really tough. By the way, I thought you had me on ignore, I knew you just couldnt live without my comments.

721. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-20 16:37:23 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030120113723.05739.00000106@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 59804

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>Two hamfests, seen by an obviously biased observer, is not a representative
>sample.

Also, one can see this at club meetings, any random Hamfest, and surveys,
which is more representative.

>I've been a ham 35 years and been to numerous hamfests. Never seen ONE that
>had
>a buffet.

The Hamfest last August in Boxboro, MA had a buffet.

From: "Kï¿½HB"
>>You're a meat flavored imitation of a doorstop hanging around Wuoff Hong
>>cults?. Be careful, be VERY careful!
>>
From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>"Do not tangle with dragons, for you are crunchy and taste good with ketchup"

I am not worried about the Ham influence. I go to the Hamfests for the seminars
and the flea market. The Ham culture there makes it more interesting.

722. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-20 16:51:47 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030120115147.05739.00000107@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 59805

From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
>You are the only person I have ever known to use the term "cult" to
>describe the ARS.

Someone else asked me if its a cult.

>The word implies
>mindless acceptance of illogical beliefs.

>> Change the nature of the clubs.
>
>How? Clubs usually reflect the interest of the members.

Start new specialty clubs.

>Are you willing to do the work necessary to effect changes?

Yes.

>"Less code"
>What is wrong with live and let live?

Nothing. And as soon as they stop tying the code test to the license classes,
this will occur.

>Are YOU volunteering to do the work to make those things happen? For
>example, what have YOU built that would be a good program for a club
>meeting?

I have put in suggestions, but no interest in the club. I would volunteer if
there were interest.

723. Re: happy Martin Lucifer Coon day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-20 17:23:17 UTC
From: Flatus von Cowspoos <fatfloppydd@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <3e2c3080@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 59806
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

```
......only in a shortwave and ham radio newsgroup
would I know I could find such a posting.

Please go back to 14.313 and or 14.275 where they
have been telling "coon jokes" all morning long.

tnx!

PFHBBBBLT!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

"R-75 MAN" <r75man@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030120081226.29974.00000103@mb-bg.aol.com...
> PRESIDENT DENOUNCES MICHIGAN ADMISSIONS QUOTAS: "DESERVING LEGACY 'C'
STUDENTS
> ARE BEING DISPLACED BY UPPITY NEGRO TRASH!"
> Address by the President to Assembled Students of Malcolm Shabazz High
School
>
> THE PRESIDENT: Good morning. It's a real pleasure to be here at Malcolm
Shabazz
> High School. You know it's rare that I feel so totally comfortable and
safe in
> the company of this many young coloreds. But then how could I not? Your
school
> lobby has more metal detectors than O'Hare Airport.
> (Boos.)
> Now as one or two of you may have heard on the Hot 97 FM "Phat Newz
Minute,"
> the shining star of your race - United States Supreme Court Justice
Clarence
> Thomas - will soon hear arguments on a potentially landmark case filed
> against the University of Michigan. It's all very complicated, but to put
it in
> a nutshell: some common white trash with shit grades who weren't rich
enough to
> buy their way into even a lousy school like Michigan are lashing out in
anger
> through the courts - and as such have provided my administration with a
> wonderful opportunity to irreversibly dismantle three decades of
affirmative
> action legislation.
> You see, in the programs under review by the Supreme Court, the University
of
> Michigan has established an admissions process which we like to say is
```

"based
> on race." Fact is, it's based on achievement, but by saying otherwise,
Karl
> Rove can whip swing-state crackers who didn't finish high school into a
racist
> frenzy believing you darkies are stealing the Chef Boy-ar-dee right out of
> their babies' mouths.
> Of course, I realize that some of you might actually believe that
affirmative
> action is a good thing. Hell, you might even know older black folks who
went to
> college and seem to be better off for it. But did you know that for every
last
> one of them that illicitly savored the nectar that pours forth from
formerly
> white-only University water fountains, there was some other,
more-deserving
> person - an upstanding blue-eyed legacy C-student exactly like my younger
> self - who was unjustly displaced by that uppity negro trash? Well there
was.
> And THAT, my young Lincoln-lovers, is the problem. Fortunately, Yale and
> Harvard still know how to pay homage to a political dynasty - and rightly
> look past such trivial matters as academic achievement and criminal
records
> when admitting members of my family to their hallowed, disgustingly
> intellectual and tweed-wearing-faggot-infested halls.
> You know, I speak often of the "soft bigotry of low expectations" - and I
> mean it. In fact, I speak for all Republicans when I manage to not burst
into
> laughter while stating that we really want you people to believe that we
have
> HIGH expectations and great respect for you. Don't believe me? Listen to
Trent
> Lott. And that's why it pains us when we hear you all still clinging to
this
> affirmative action nonsense. I mean, how are you people ever supposed to
pull
> yourselves up out of the gutter if you're not going to leave advancement
to the
> nice white folks, whose pennies will miraculously "trickle down" to you
while
> you're cleaning the toilets in their vacation villas?
> In closing, I think it's worth spending a minute to attempt to emphasize
our
> common ground. Yes, I may be a white omnipotent millionaire and you all
are
> just poor helpless nobodies, but deep deep down, we share something very
> meaningful. We both know that the notion of higher education for
minorities is
> bunk - that it's nothing but a silly product of liberals conspiring to

convince
> colored youth that college is something they want, when in fact we all
know you
> people are perfectly happy chanting your rap-hop songs, stealing Cadillac
> Escalades, shooting each other over crack, and having a grand old time
> lollygagging around on death row until such time as a good Republican
Governor
> demonstrates true compassionate conservatism by putting you out of your
misery.
> And I'll tell you something, it's that knowledge that brings our two
seemingly
> diametrically opposed groups closer together every day.
> Thank you, and God Bless.
>
>
> Lloyd Davies
> V.O.M.I.T. Cheef of Kommunicashuns
> Amateur Radio Club for Fat, Gay, White Americans
>
> "Vulgar Obese Man In Trouble"

724. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-20 18:28:53 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v2ofurbcsjubc@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 59807

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030120092351.14672.00000151@mb-fc.aol.com...
> > just thought of something, I'm a member of
> >NCI. I think I'm going to go quit my membership in that group.
> >--
> >'73' From KB9TMP
>
> You will fell like a new person when you Quit. Just think you will no
longer
> have to go to COSMIC KARL for guidance.

I never did do that as a member of NCI, I must
not have been very committed to their cause!
--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx

725. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-20 19:01:51 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v2ohskpuhfbh6b@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 59808

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030120092351.14672.00000151@mb-fc.aol.com...
> > just thought of something, I'm a member of
> >NCI. I think I'm going to go quit my membership in that group.
> >--
> >'73' From KB9TMP
>
> You will fell like a new person when you Quit. Just think you will no
longer
> have to go to COSMIC KARL for guidance.

Did it! I no longer am a member of NCI. Here is a copy of the email I sent
out.

I have been a Member of NCI 1999 and have changed my mind on the code test
question. I believe there is a good reason for keeping at least a 5WPM code
requirement for access to the HF bands. So I am resigning my membership in
No Code International. Please remove me from your member database.
Thank You.

"73" from Orange County Indiana!
WW - KB9TMP EM68sp
E-Mail me at: kb9tmp@juno.com
Home Page: http://www.qsl.net/kb9tmp/

Bruce will get a real kick out of this part. The email address to send
email changes goes to none other than Carl R. Stevenson - WK3C himself.
--
'73' From KB9TMP
former NCI member # NCI-2385

726. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-20 19:14:32 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030120141432.05773.00000092@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 59809

>I have been a Member of NCI 1999 and have changed my mind on the code test
>question.

Are you saying you fought against the code because you felt it was too much trouble? Then, after you passed the code test, you are no longer against it? This sounds like a setup, not sincere.

>I believe there is a good reason for keeping at least a 5WPM code
>requirement for access to the HF bands.

HF does not need code to transmit. What is the "good reason" to keep the code requirement?

727. Re: Lets face it ... we're just communicators.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-20 19:29:51 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.h90rca5.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 59810

On Mon, 20 Jan 2003 05:10:29 -0500, KC8PMX wrote:

>True to a point.... most often on most scenes the ham op's are only needed
>in a communications capacity, usually set up somewhere in vicinity of a
>scene, or at a E.C.C. About the only "hands on" act I can see that hams
>can serve extremely well is the "search" part of search and rescue. I have
>seen this done, where a ham is is assigned to a firefighter or officer
>working on a "search line." The ham is not there to be the "rescuer" nor
>being the person offering medical care when finding the lost party, but does
>help to expand the area being search and covering more ground quicker. This
>has worked real well in the past. Seems like the county I live in "busses
>in" senior citizens here, as there are more "old folks homes" than there are
>apartment buildings in a community of around 40-45,000. They seem to like
>to wander away from the homes on a regular basis.....
>
>All in all... all we are is communicators.... regardless of band or mode.
>Let's not kid ourselves.

In times past Los Angeles City Civil Defense cross-trained each and
every ham radio volunteer in other disaster-related specialties and
we were far more than "radio-based message passers", capable of
originating the message or acting upon it in addition to passing it
competently.

Don't kid YOURSELF - it can be done.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

728. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-20 19:31:58 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <b0hire$1vch$1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 59811

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote:
>g3zhi wrote:
>
>> http://www.qsl.net/g3zhi/qst.pdf
>>
>> qst article on internet linking
[...]
> Seems like a answer in search of a problem. Seems like you could do
> much better by keeping the signal on the net 100 percent of the time.

My feeling exactly. I've been wondering the same thing about cell phones, in fact. What is the point of using a wireless phone to access the wired telephone network when it would be so much easier to do the same thing with a phone directly wired to the network? I mean, if there are wires in the middle why would anyone want to use radio at the edges?

> This is hardly any technology breakthrough, it sounds like something

Absolutely! And we've had wired telephones for 75 years or more, so why anyone would think that wireless phones were a technology advance is beyond me.

> that someone who wanted to "cash" in on the internet dreamed up.

You mean they're generating cash by using the Internet to link amateur repeaters? Damn, I wish I'd thought of that.

Dennis Ferguson

729. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-20 20:04:13 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <1DYW9.3012$bL4.316357@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 59812

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote

:
: Are you saying you fought against the code because you felt it was too
much
: trouble? Then, after you passed the code test, you are no longer against
it?
: This sounds like a setup, not sincere.
:

It sounds to me like he found some reason to change his mind. Happens all the time. For example, once upon a time I thought you might be somewhat intelligent, but after reading your jeremiads about the state of ham radio, I've changed my mind about your IQ. Are you related to Masataka Noda?

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

730. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-20 21:00:40 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030120160040.10089.00000184@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 59813

>Did it! I no longer am a member of NCI. Here is a copy of the email I sent
>out.

Smart move, you have just been upgraded from CBplusser status, you are now in
my DATA BASE as a REAL HAM

731. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-20 21:03:09 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030120160309.10089.00000185@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 59814

>I never did do that as a member of NCI, I must
>not have been very committed to their cause!
>--
>'73' From KB9TMP

Good for you at least you dont need someone to give you advise on what you should say. Now if only Brian could wake up and smell the COFFEE.

732. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-20 21:28:54 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <qSZW9.5053$Z5.2035091@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 59815

"KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com> wrote in message
news:v2ohskpuhfbh6b@corp.supernews.com...
>
> "WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030120092351.14672.00000151@mb-fc.aol.com...
> > > just thought of something, I'm a member of
> > >NCI. I think I'm going to go quit my membership in that group.
> > >--
> > >'73' From KB9TMP
> >
> > You will fell like a new person when you Quit. Just think you will no
> longer
> > have to go to COSMIC KARL for guidance.
>
> Did it! I no longer am a member of NCI. Here is a copy of the email I sent
> out.
> ------------------------------------
> I have been a Member of NCI 1999 and have changed my mind on the code test
> question. I believe there is a good reason for keeping at least a 5WPM
code
> requirement for access to the HF bands. So I am resigning my membership in
> No Code International. Please remove me from your member database.
> Thank You.
>
> "73" from Orange County Indiana!
> WW - KB9TMP EM68sp
> E-Mail me at: kb9tmp@juno.com
> Home Page: http://www.qsl.net/kb9tmp/
> ------------------------------------
> Bruce will get a real kick out of this part. The email address to send
> email changes goes to none other than Carl R. Stevenson - WK3C himself.
> --
> '73' From KB9TMP
> former NCI member # NCI-2385

And KB9TMP will note that I promptly replied to his message, indicating that
his request would be promptly handled.

That's the difference between NCI and some of the fanatical procoders who
frequent this newsgroup ... unlike the fanatical procoders, NCI believes in,
and supports, freedom of choice, rather than forcing views on others.

73,
--
Carl R. Stevenson - wk3c

Grid Square FN20fm
mailto:wk3c@wk3c.com (general personal e-mail and NCI e-mail)
mailto:wk3cqth@wk3c.com (QSO, QSL, skeds, only, please)

NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, QCWA (31424)
Member, ARRL
Member, TAPR
Member, The SETI League

Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

733. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-20 21:30:50 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3E2C6A8A.2010602@psu.edu>
Source record: 59816

Dennis Ferguson wrote:
> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote:

>> Seems like a answer in search of a problem. Seems like you could do
>>much better by keeping the signal on the net 100 percent of the time.
>
>
> My feeling exactly. I've been wondering the same thing about cell phones,
> in fact. What is the point of using a wireless phone to access the wired
> telephone network when it would be so much easier to do the same thing
> with a phone directly wired to the network?

VoIP is a different animal altogether from cellular phones.(at least in
this context - there is nothing to prevent cellular VoIP. The whole
point with cellular is to have a telephone connection that allows you to
be portable.

> I mean, if there are wires in
> the middle why would anyone want to use radio at the edges?

If that interests you, then go for it! I find it uninteresting though.
It equivalent function is an autopatch, and doesn't even seem like radio.

>> This is hardly any technology breakthrough, it sounds like something
>
> Absolutely! And we've had wired telephones for 75 years or more, so why
> anyone would think that wireless phones were a technology advance is beyond
> me.

Huh? I'm talking about Ham Radio, and I think you are talking about
telephones. If what you are talking about is telephone comms through the
internet, that's just fine with me. I just kind of like the radio aspect
of radio myself. You know, putting up antennas, trying to work DX when
the propagation is good bad or indifferent, working contests, that sort
of thing.

I wonder if FRS radios can be patched into VoIP? Sounds like a good way
for the unlicensed to work DX. Heck, who needs to be a ham anymore?

- Mike KB3EIA -

734. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-20 21:44:22 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <W4_W9.5057$Z5.2036961@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 59817

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030120103726.12173.00000052@mb-mr.aol.com...
> In article <r3HW9.1806$bL4.175308@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>,
"Kï¿½HB"
> <kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG> writes:
>
> >: The majority of its particitants are male, old, fat. This is true of
the
> >: last two Hamfest s I went to.
>
> Two hamfests, seen by an obviously biased observer, is not a
representative
> sample. Someone interested in technical knowledge should know that.
>
> >: Most of them use radio for a diversion (hence the
> >: appeal of the cult) and are not EEs.
>
> Go hang out at an IEEE event and tell us about it. Are IEEE event
attendees
> mostly "male, old, fat"?

Hans,

Just got back Friday from a week in Ft. Lauderdale, FL for the IEEE 802
wireless WG interim meetings ... a few observations ... and they are
consistent
with my recollections of a number of years of these meetings, which are
held every 2 months and typically have attendance > 1k people ...

Yes, the majority of attendees were male, but there were quite a few
females.
(some of whom were actually rather attractive ... but that's just an
objective
observation that any observant person would have difficulty avoiding, as I'm
a
happily married man ...)

Old ... a few, but the majority appeared to range from their late 20's to
early 50's,
with the bulk of that being in their 30's or 40's.
Darned few older than mid 50's, but those that are are still VERY sharp and
up-to-date on the latest technology ... and quite well respected by their
younger
colleagues.

Fat ... a few, but in the minority ... probably because the population is dominated
by well-educated "baby boomers" and "generation-x'ers" who have the sense to be (at least reasonably) fit and health-conscious.

And yes, at 52, I am on the older tail of the distribution ...

73,
Carl - wk3c

735. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-20 21:45:38 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <66_W9.5058$Z5.2037145@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 59818

Sorry ... I replied to Hans, when I should have replied to Jim ...
the comments still stand ...

Carl - wk3c

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030120103726.12173.00000052@mb-mr.aol.com...
> In article <r3HW9.1806$bL4.175308@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>,
"Kï¿½HB"
> <kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG> writes:
>
> >: The majority of its particitants are male, old, fat. This is true of
the
> >: last two Hamfest s I went to.
>
> Two hamfests, seen by an obviously biased observer, is not a
representative
> sample. Someone interested in technical knowledge should know that.
>
> >: Most of them use radio for a diversion (hence the
> >: appeal of the cult) and are not EEs.
>
> Go hang out at an IEEE event and tell us about it. Are IEEE event
attendees
> mostly "male, old, fat"?
>
> >The only social event Hams seems to
> >have are eating events (Sunday brunch, cookouts, etc) and Hamfests (which
> >usually has a buffet).
> >:
> I've been a ham 35 years and been to numerous hamfests. Never seen ONE
that had
> a buffet.
> >
> >You're a meat flavored imitation of a doorstop hanging around Wuoff Hong
> >cults?. Be careful, be VERY careful!
> >
> "Do not tangle with dragons, for you are crunchy and taste good with
ketchup"
>
> >Hans
> >Grand Exhalted Liberator of Electric Smoke
> >
> N2EY
>

736. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-20 22:03:44 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <4n_W9.2979$Sv3.346155@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 59819

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote

:
: Seems like a answer in search of a problem.
:

It's quite a handy answer it is, too. When I'm up on my lake in northern Minnesota, I can get on the local repeater with my HT, enter the code for my "home" repeater in Minneapolis, and describe my catch to my friends at home as those poor bastards drive back and forth to work.

As you say, the technology is just a clever mix of IP and ham radio -- nothing "breakthrough", but certainly useful. I can imagine a lot of scenarios in public service communications where this would be particularly suited.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

737. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-20 22:22:46 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <v2otmui6fp23ac@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 59820

Mike,

You could send QSL cards, but to be politically correct, they should be
e-qsl cards ;)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3E2B3B4B.7020504@adelphia.net...
> g3zhi wrote:
>
> > http://www.qsl.net/g3zhi/qst.pdf
> >
> > qst article on internet linking
>
>
>
> Hey, maybe they could even do something with cameras as well as
> microphones! Oh wait, they already have.
>
> Seems like a answer in search of a problem. Seems like you could do much
> better by keeping the signal on the net 100 percent of the time. The
> whole thing sounds like a chat room for licensed amateurs.
>
> This is hardly any technology breakthrough, it sounds like something that
> someone who wanted to "cash" in on the internet dreamed up.
>
> It ranks right up there with the PSK31 voice mode.
>
> Would we send QSL cards?
>
>
> Other than that I think it's great.
>
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.443 / Virus Database: 248 - Release Date: 1/10/03

738. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-20 22:35:04 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030120173504.19815.00000187@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 59821

>That's the difference between NCI and some of the fanatical procoders who
>frequent this newsgroup ... unlike the fanatical procoders, NCI believes in,
>and supports, freedom of choice, rather than forcing views on others.
>
>73,
>--
>Carl R. Stevenson - wk3c

WOW, the BIG WELFARE BOY shows up

>NCI-1052
>Executive Director, No Code International

WOW, how Impressive, I will bet you Karl can get a cup of Coffee in most Fast Food Joints for $1.00 when he tells them that

>Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
>Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.

Yes you to can join NCI, and then you can let Karl and his bunch whine to the FCC or who ever will listen.

739. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-20 23:26:18 UTC
From: David Robbins <k1ttt@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <yTWdnVwoUJcHGLGjXTWcpA@crocker.com>
Source record: 59822

"K&#65533;HB" <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG> wrote in message
news:4n_W9.2979$Sv3.346155@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote
>
> :
> : Seems like a answer in search of a problem.
> :
>
> It's quite a handy answer it is, too. When I'm up on my lake in northern
> Minnesota, I can get on the local repeater with my HT, enter the code for
my
> "home" repeater in Minneapolis, and describe my catch to my friends at
home
> as those poor bastards drive back and forth to work.
>
> As you say, the technology is just a clever mix of IP and ham radio --
> nothing "breakthrough", but certainly useful. I can imagine a lot of
> scenarios in public service communications where this would be
particularly
> suited.
>
yep, the irlp system is already being used around here to link skywarn
operators at nws offices that otherwise can't talk directly to spotters in
areas where repeater coverage isn't good enough.

740. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-20 23:44:38 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v2p2enidb1knc3@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 59823

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030120141432.05773.00000092@mb-df.aol.com...
> >I have been a Member of NCI 1999 and have changed my mind on the code
test
> >question.
>
> Are you saying you fought against the code because you felt it was too
much
> trouble? Then, after you passed the code test, you are no longer against
it?
> This sounds like a setup, not sincere.

Well for one CW is a neat mode, I wish I was better at it. Another thing
when you hear a beacon on 10 meter or somewhere else it's nice to be
able to understand what it's trying to tell you.

I've learned over the years that stuff that I hated and didn't see a use for
at first turned out to be things I really like, for example spinach, olives,
burr haircuts and dogs! And maybe even Morse Code :^)

>
> >I believe there is a good reason for keeping at least a 5WPM code
> >requirement for access to the HF bands.
>
> HF does not need code to transmit. What is the "good reason" to keep the
code
> requirement?

When half of the HF band width is for code or digital mode only that's
large chunk of "good reason"! I hated the fact that I had to learn
Morse Code to get on HF, but now that I don't have to have a single
thing to do with the mode I keep finding myself down on the lower
half of each band listening. In other words I'm beginning to "warm up"
to the mode!!!
--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx

741. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-20 23:55:26 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v2p330cqjusg89@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 59824

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:qSZW9.5053$Z5.2035091@nnrp1.ptd.net...
> "KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:v2ohskpuhfbh6b@corp.supernews.com...
> >
> > "WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20030120092351.14672.00000151@mb-fc.aol.com...
> > > > just thought of something, I'm a member of
> > > >NCI. I think I'm going to go quit my membership in that group.
> > > >--
> > > >'73' From KB9TMP
> > >
> > > You will fell like a new person when you Quit. Just think you will no
> > longer
> > > have to go to COSMIC KARL for guidance.
> >
> > Did it! I no longer am a member of NCI. Here is a copy of the email I
sent
> > out.
> > ----------
> > I have been a Member of NCI 1999 and have changed my mind on the code
test
> > question. I believe there is a good reason for keeping at least a 5WPM
> code
> > requirement for access to the HF bands. So I am resigning my membership
in
> > No Code International. Please remove me from your member database.
> > Thank You.
> >
> > "73" from Orange County Indiana!
> > WW - KB9TMP EM68sp
> > E-Mail me at: kb9tmp@juno.com
> > Home Page: http://www.qsl.net/kb9tmp/
> > ----------
> > Bruce will get a real kick out of this part. The email address to send
> > email changes goes to none other than Carl R. Stevenson - WK3C himself.
> > --
> > '73' From KB9TMP
> > former NCI member # NCI-2385
>
> And KB9TMP will note that I promptly replied to his message, indicating
that
> his request would be promptly handled.
>

> That's the difference between NCI and some of the fanatical procoders who
> frequent this newsgroup ... unlike the fanatical procoders, NCI believes
in,
> and supports, freedom of choice, rather than forcing views on others.

That is very true! I will tell anyone you didn't try to convince me to
change
my mind you just kindly accepted my request. And I thank you for that.
--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx

>
> 73,
> --
> Carl R. Stevenson - wk3c
> Grid Square FN20fm
> mailto:wk3c@wk3c.com (general personal e-mail and NCI e-mail)
> mailto:wk3cqth@wk3c.com (QSO, QSL, skeds, only, please)
> --
> NCI-1052
> Executive Director, No Code International
> Fellow, The Radio Club of America
> Senior Member, IEEE
> Member, QCWA (31424)
> Member, ARRL
> Member, TAPR
> Member, The SETI League
> --
> Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
> Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
> <http://www.nocode.org>
>

742. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-20 23:57:17 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030120185717.17197.00000267@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 59826

In article <3E2C6A8A.2010602@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>Dennis Ferguson wrote:
>> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote:
>
>>> Seems like a answer in search of a problem. Seems like you could do
>>>much better by keeping the signal on the net 100 percent of the time.
>>
>>
>> My feeling exactly. I've been wondering the same thing about cell phones,
>> in fact. What is the point of using a wireless phone to access the wired
>> telephone network when it would be so much easier to do the same thing
>> with a phone directly wired to the network?
>
>VoIP is a different animal altogether from cellular phones.(at least in
>this context - there is nothing to prevent cellular VoIP. The whole
>point with cellular is to have a telephone connection that allows you to
>be portable.

Mike, have you thought of massage therapy for the lower
extremities? Your leg was being expertly pulled and you
give no evidence of feeling it... :-)

> I wonder if FRS radios can be patched into VoIP? Sounds like a good way

>for the unlicensed to work DX. Heck, who needs to be a ham anymore?

Why is it "necessary to work DX?" With a ham license (an
amateur radio license grant, that is...). I did that a half
century ago on a 24/7 basis as part of ACAN, without any
license whatsoever.

Why is it "necessary" to demonstrate OOK CW skills in order
to "work DX on HF?" Do you have any sane, rational reason
other than the obviously-political need for that in a HOBBY?

743. Re: Lets face it ... we're just communicators.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-20 23:57:18 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030120185718.17197.00000268@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 59825

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.h90rca5.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On Mon, 20 Jan 2003 05:10:29 -0500, KC8PMX wrote:
>
>>All in all... all we are is communicators.... regardless of band or mode.
>>Let's not kid ourselves.
>
> In times past Los Angeles City Civil Defense cross-trained each and
> every ham radio volunteer in other disaster-related specialties and
> we were far more than "radio-based message passers", capable of
> originating the message or acting upon it in addition to passing it
> competently.
>
> Don't kid YOURSELF - it can be done.

Gosh, old-timer, that must have been done before 1957, yes?

I remember the 1994 Northridge Earthquake very well and
saw NO evidence of this great "service to the country" at the
eastern half of The Valley. Same thing in the Sylmar Quake
of 1971. Or the Whittier Narrows quake in between those
two. Or the big Wildfires we've had around these parts.

I've seen/heard much of those individuals involved directly
with all those emergencies/disasters...not a word on "hams."

How can that be?

744. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-20 23:57:20 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030120185720.17197.00000269@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 59828

In article <W4_W9.5057$Z5.2036961@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030120103726.12173.00000052@mb-mr.aol.com...
>> In article <r3HW9.1806$bL4.175308@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>,
>"Kï¿½HB"
>> <kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG> writes:
>>
>> >: The majority of its particitants are male, old, fat. This is true of the
>> >: last two Hamfest s I went to.
>>
>> Two hamfests, seen by an obviously biased observer, is not a representative
>> sample. Someone interested in technical knowledge should know that.
>>
>> >: Most of them use radio for a diversion (hence the
>> >: appeal of the cult) and are not EEs.
>>
>> Go hang out at an IEEE event and tell us about it. Are IEEE event attendees
>> mostly "male, old, fat"?
>
>Hans,
>
>Just got back Friday from a week in Ft. Lauderdale, FL for the IEEE 802
>wireless WG interim meetings ... a few observations ... and they are
consistent
>with my recollections of a number of years of these meetings, which are
>held every 2 months and typically have attendance > 1k people ...
>
>Yes, the majority of attendees were male, but there were quite a few females.
>(some of whom were actually rather attractive ... but that's just an objective
>observation that any observant person would have difficulty avoiding, as I'm a
>happily married man ...)
>
>Old ... a few, but the majority appeared to range from their late 20's to
early 50's,
>with the bulk of that being in their 30's or 40's.
>Darned few older than mid 50's, but those that are are still VERY sharp and
>up-to-date on the latest technology ... and quite well respected by their
younger
>colleagues.
>
>Fat ... a few, but in the minority ... probably because the population is
dominated

>by well-educated "baby boomers" and "generation-x'ers" who have the sense to
>be (at least reasonably) fit and health-conscious.
>
>And yes, at 52, I am on the older tail of the distribution ...

Carl, permit an interruption of an interruption here, but a few things
need correction.

Firstly, N2EY is trolling with the remark about the IEEE. Second,
IEEE is a PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIP ORGANIZATION, not
a hobby/recreational activity organization. The only comparison
possible (by sane, rational individuals) is that they are organizations,
have dues, publish books and periodicals...in the most general of
those terms. IEEE goes way beyond the scope of anything ARRL
does or has done, ever Period.

I don't attend the IEEE "big" functions, just the local group meetings
of interest (published monthly in the IEEE Los Angeles Chapter
newsletter, well in advance, usually...). None of the attendees seem
to be involved in electronics, radio, or electric power as a hobby or
even in guise of some mythical "service to their country" ("amateur
radio is a SERVICE not a hobby!"). It is their WORK, an
intellectual pursuit, a creative one, mentally stimulating and
challenging, that is continually advancing the state of all electric
and electronic arts.

The "traditionalist" hams in here (Miccolis, Heil, Roll, even Brakob
and Warren) continually dwell on the mythical "service" aspect as
if amateur radio was some profound, noble, self-sacrificing service
to humanity and that they are all somehow "superior" to ordinary
mortals who do not possess an amateur radio license grant. As a
result we get the continuing talk-downs, insults on the persons of
those who do not buy into their fantasy or agree with their grande
self-enobled opinions. No one can possibly ever be as good as
they according to their own opinions, nor is anyone ever allowed
any opposing opinions.

What is interesting is that Miccolis jumped in here with some
barbed comment on the IEEE membership. He does not appear
on any IEEE membership search, yet he claims to be an
"engineer" at an (unnamed) company engaged in electronics and
working for hire there (definition of professional, work for pecuniary
interest).

I'm a Life Member of IEEE, meaning the total of my years of
IEEE membership plus chronological age equals or exceeds
100 years. IEEE Life members do not pay dues yet have full
voting, membership status, receive the monthly Spectrum
membership magazine plus all other newsletters requested.

Members of ARRL represent less than a quarter of all licensed
US amateur radio licensees. ARRL membership is about half

the number of IEEE members. ARRL is an organization of amateurs engaged in an avocational pursuit...IEEE is a worldwide professional organization.

Len Anderson
retired (from regular hours) electronic engineer person
Life Member IEEE
Work Unit Processor for SETI@home

745. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-20 23:57:22 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030120185722.17197.00000270@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 59827

In article <1DYW9.3012$bL4.316357@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
<kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG> writes:

>"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote
>
>: Are you saying you fought against the code because you felt it was too much
>: trouble? Then, after you passed the code test, you are no longer against it?
>: This sounds like a setup, not sincere.
>
>It sounds to me like he found some reason to change his mind. Happens all
>the time.

Not "all" the time...only during those times when someone wants
to harass, browbeat, or talk down to someone who doesn't agree
with him about "proper service behavior." Sort of like what Warren
and Brakob do (failure to obey proper tradition and attitude is
a capital offense).

>For example, once upon a time I thought you might be somewhat
>intelligent, but after reading your jeremiads about the state of ham radio,
>I've changed my mind about your IQ. Are you related to Masataka Noda?

Interesting style of talking-down to someone...a curious mix
of Super Chief Dill Sergeant, Mr. Manager, and general icehole
sitter, all trying to spit on someone simultaneously.

Must have been a warm winter in the northern lands...

>With all kind wishes,

That salutation always lacked sincerity. On the other
hand, coming from a Mr. Manager and a Super Chief, it
sounds commonplace. :-)

[watch Sgt Putz, aka Steam Robeson, come marching in on this
interruption of an interruption of an interruption...like an eruption]

746. Re: Lets face it ... we're just communicators.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-21 00:25:16 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301201625.1667a639@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59829

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.h90rca5.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> On Mon, 20 Jan 2003 05:10:29 -0500, KC8PMX wrote:
>
> >True to a point.... most often on most scenes the ham op's are only needed
> >in a communications capacity, usually set up somewhere in vicinity of a
> >scene, or at a E.C.C. About the only "hands on" act I can see that hams
> >can serve extremely well is the "search" part of search and rescue. I have
> >seen this done, where a ham is is assigned to a firefighter or officer
> >working on a "search line." The ham is not there to be the "rescuer" nor
> >being the person offering medical care when finding the lost party, but does
> >help to expand the area being search and covering more ground quicker. This
> >has worked real well in the past. Seems like the county I live in "busses
> >in" senior citizens here, as there are more "old folks homes" than there are
> >apartment buildings in a community of around 40-45,000. They seem to like
> >to wander away from the homes on a regular basis.....
> >
> >All in all... all we are is communicators.... regardless of band or mode.
> >Let's not kid ourselves.
>
> In times past Los Angeles City Civil Defense cross-trained each and
> every ham radio volunteer in other disaster-related specialties and
> we were far more than "radio-based message passers", capable of
> originating the message or acting upon it in addition to passing it
> competently.
>
> Don't kid YOURSELF - it can be done.
>
> ---
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

Soem of us are even Red Cross 1st aid/CPR instructors.

747. Re: FCC tells ... whatever

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-21 00:30:38 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301201630.19b0d037@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59830

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030120095843.02817.00000091@mb-mn.aol.com>...

> I generally try to not say something I don't mean. Hans' "best wishes"
> comments are, in my opinion, usually sarcastic in nature. I ignore it. If you
> can't be sincere about it, why say it? One cannot offer "best wishes", "73",
> "have a nice day", etc etc after trying to slam someone in a RRAP post.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

You give Hans a pass on it every day. What were you saying about being serious?

748. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-21 01:27:50 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b0i7q5$5r3$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 59831

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030119204642.24933.00000086@mb-bh.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade
> >From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
> >Date: 1/19/03 5:38 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20030119183833.08239.00000090@mb-cq.aol.com>
>
> >The hobby has the perception of social misfits. Attending a Hamfest does
> >little to change one's perception.
>
> "Social misfits"...?!?!
>
> BBBWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!
.....
> >The majority of its particitants are male, old, fat.
>
> Then at the NEXT hamfest, why don't YOU sponsor a wellness booth, or
> sponsor a Jenny Craig booth?
.....

Allow me an observation...it matters not what the hobby is, MOST people
have a narrow perspective of what is "normal". If you aren't into
golf, tennis or some other "socially accepted" recreactional endeaver, then
your not normal if you listen to the vast majority of such folk.

It matters not if you are an antique car buff, into model trains, model
airplanes, ham radio,
or whatever. None of these seem to fit the normal perception of a great
many
people. Frankly, such folk can stuff it anyway. I enjoy what I do and
happily
have a spouse that also enjoys most of my hobby activities.

If anyone expects any hobby to somehow be a reflection of the normal
distributions of age, gender, race or whatever, it just ain't gonna happen.
I really don't give a hoot, and I'd hope most people also don't, simply
because ham radio demographics may be tilted towards white males,
or whatever.

Enjoy whatever you do and as long as it is legal, apologize to no one
for your interests. At least you are DOING something. Another big group
of folks that consider themselves "normal" do nothing but eat and
work the channel selector of their TV remote.

Anyway, just my observations.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

749. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-21 01:30:55 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030120203055.05578.00000122@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 59832

"N2EY" wrote:
Go hang out at an IEEE event and tell us about it. Are IEEE event
>attendees
>> mostly "male, old, fat"?

Then "Carl R. Stevenson", wk3c replied:
>Yes, the majority of attendees were male, but there were quite a few
>females.
>
>Old ... a few, but the majority appeared to range from their late 20's to
>early 50's,
>with the bulk of that being in their 30's or 40's.
>Fat ... a few, but in the minority

As I suspected a lower percentage in each of the three categories
(male,old,fat) are present than are present in Ham radio.

N2EY, this answers your question.

750. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-21 01:37:01 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030120203701.16889.00000076@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 59836

In article <20030120115147.05739.00000107@mb-df.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
>>You are the only person I have ever known to use the term "cult" to
>>describe the ARS.
>
>Someone else asked me if its a cult.

And the correct answer is: No, it's not.
>
>>The word implies
>>mindless acceptance of illogical beliefs.
>
>>> Change the nature of the clubs.
>>
>>How? Clubs usually reflect the interest of the members.
>
>Start new specialty clubs.

Be my guest.
>
>>Are you willing to do the work necessary to effect changes?
>
>Yes.
>
>>"Less code"
>>What is wrong with live and let live?
>
>Nothing. And as soon as they stop tying the code test to the license classes,
>this will occur.

What will occur?

You say "less code" not "no code testing". Totally different things. Sounds to me like you want code USE to die out, not just code testing.
>
>>Are YOU volunteering to do the work to make those things happen? For
>>example, what have YOU built that would be a good program for a club
>>meeting?
>
>I have put in suggestions, but no interest in the club. I would volunteer if
>there were interest.

In other words, you want somebody else to do it.

If you want the things you suggest to happen, you have to do them. For example, homebrew some projects, then ask for a meeting date when your projects can be the program. You have to do this well ahead of time - don't just show up and expect them to put you on the agenda that night.

I've been to local club meetings where club members put on the follwoing demonstrations and programs:

- SWLing
- APRS
- Packet
- Skywarn
- PSK31
- Homebrew/kit QRP rigs
- History of US amateur radio licensing since WW2
- "Mike and Key night" where hams brought mikes and keys, new and old, then told the story connected with each one.

And much more. Of course, somebody had to take the lead on each one.

73 de Jim, N2EY

751. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-21 01:37:02 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030120203702.16889.00000077@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 59834

In article <20030120113723.05739.00000106@mb-df.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>>Two hamfests, seen by an obviously biased observer, is not a representative
>>sample.
>
>Also, one can see this at club meetings, any random Hamfest, and surveys,
>which is more representative.

But you based that conclusion on two hamfests. Hamfests are not representative of the ham population. I used to be a regular at every 'fest within 100 miles - but in the past 4 years I haven't been to a single one.
>
>>I've been a ham 35 years and been to numerous hamfests. Never seen ONE >>that had a buffet.
>
>The Hamfest last August in Boxboro, MA had a buffet.

Sounds good to me!
>
>From: "Kï¿½HB"
>>>You're a meat flavored imitation of a doorstop hanging around Wuoff Hong
>>>cults?. Be careful, be VERY careful!
>>>
>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>>"Do not tangle with dragons, for you are crunchy and taste good with
>ketchup"
>
>I am not worried about the Ham influence. I go to the Hamfests for the
>seminars
>and the flea market. The Ham culture there makes it more interesting.
>
Where's Puff when ya need him?

73 de Jim, N2EY

752. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-21 01:37:03 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030120203703.16889.00000079@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 59833

In article <1DYW9.3012$bL4.316357@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
<kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG> writes:

>"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote
>
>:
>: Are you saying you fought against the code because you felt it was too
>:much
>: trouble? Then, after you passed the code test, you are no longer against
>:it?
>: This sounds like a setup, not sincere.
>:
>
>It sounds to me like he found some reason to change his mind.

New data produced new conclusions - watta concept!

>Happens all
>the time. For example, once upon a time I thought you might be somewhat
>intelligent, but after reading your jeremiads about the state of ham radio,
>I've changed my mind about your IQ.

> Are you related to Masataka Noda?

Just 70 days to go, folks! April 2, 1998 plus five years......!!!

73 de Jim, N2EY

I will clap my hands.

753. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-21 01:37:03 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030120203703.16889.00000078@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 59835

In article <qSZW9.5053$Z5.2035091@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>> "73" from Orange County Indiana!
>> WW - KB9TMP EM68sp
>> E-Mail me at: kb9tmp@juno.com
>> Home Page: http://www.qsl.net/kb9tmp/
>> -----------------------------------
>> Bruce will get a real kick out of this part. The email address to send
>> email changes goes to none other than Carl R. Stevenson - WK3C himself.
>> --
>> '73' From KB9TMP
>> former NCI member # NCI-2385
>
>And KB9TMP will note that I promptly replied to his message, indicating that
>his request would be promptly handled.
>
>That's the difference between NCI and some of the fanatical procoders who
>frequent this newsgroup ...

Who are these "fanatical procoders"?

Is there something wrong with being pro-code? (Not procodeTEST, mind you).

73 de Jim, N2EY

754. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-21 01:37:05 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030120203705.16889.00000080@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 59837

In article <W4_W9.5057$Z5.2036961@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030120103726.12173.00000052@mb-mr.aol.com...
>> In article <r3HW9.1806$bL4.175308@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>,
>"Kï¿½HB"
>> <kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG> writes:
>>
>> >: The majority of its particitants are male, old, fat. This is true of
>> >: the last two Hamfest s I went to.
>>
>> Two hamfests, seen by an obviously biased observer, is not a
>> representative
>> sample. Someone interested in technical knowledge should know that.
>>
>> >: Most of them use radio for a diversion (hence the
>> >: appeal of the cult) and are not EEs.
>>
>> Go hang out at an IEEE event and tell us about it. Are IEEE event
>> attendees mostly "male, old, fat"?
>
>Hans,

(Actually, "Jim", as corrected in a followup post):
>
>Just got back Friday from a week in Ft. Lauderdale, FL for the IEEE 802
>wireless WG interim meetings ... a few observations ... and they are
>consistent with my recollections of a number of years of these meetings, which
are
>held every 2 months and typically have attendance > 1k people ...

Carl,

Hope you don't think I was implying that IEEE folk or EEs in general fit that
description.

"Vshah101" (Vipul) has made a point of telling us repeatedly how hams are
almost all male, overweight, and "old". My question was to find out if he would
categorize other groups the same way.
>
>Yes, the majority of attendees were male, but there were quite a few
>females.

Which is to be expected in any technical pursuit, professional or amateur. I
will leave it to others to argue whether such tendencies are genetic, cultural,

or both. Fortunatley, the gender imbalances are decreasing.
>
>Old ... a few, but the majority appeared to range from their late 20's to
>early 50's, with the bulk of that being in their 30's or 40's.
>Darned few older than mid 50's, but those that are are still VERY sharp and
>up-to-date on the latest technology ... and quite well respected by their
>younger colleagues.

Of course an IEEE gathering draws a different demographic than a hamfest. Most IEEE attendees are not there on their own time or their own nickel. (That's not a bad thing!). And there are few EEs under the age of about 22, while many of those older than about 60 are retired. Not all, of course.
>
>Fat ... a few, but in the minority ... probably because the population is
>dominated
>by well-educated "baby boomers" and "generation-x'ers" who have the sense to
>be (at least reasonably) fit and health-conscious.

Three mile run every morning helps me keep the pounds down.
>
>And yes, at 52, I am on the older tail of the distribution ...
>
But not "old".

73 de Jim, N2EY

755. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-21 01:37:31 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b0i8camnj1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 59838

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030120115147.05739.00000107@mb-df.aol.com...
> From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
> >You are the only person I have ever known to use the term "cult" to
> >describe the ARS.
>
> Someone else asked me if its a cult.
>
> >The word implies
> >mindless acceptance of illogical beliefs.
>
> >> Change the nature of the clubs.
> >
> >How? Clubs usually reflect the interest of the members.
>
> Start new specialty clubs.

WHY? Just to serve your interests? If you want a new specialty club,
then start one yourself. Free enterprise, free choice...hey what a concept.

> >Are you willing to do the work necessary to effect changes?
>
> Yes.

Not based on anything I've seen from you here.

> >"Less code"
> >What is wrong with live and let live?
>
> Nothing. And as soon as they stop tying the code test to the license
classes,
> this will occur.

The only one doing that today is the FCC. Others that wish to keep
it that way are free to take that position. If you believe otherwise,
then support the change when it is proposed. It won't be proposed
until after the international treaty is changed.

> >Are YOU volunteering to do the work to make those things happen? For
> >example, what have YOU built that would be a good program for a club
> >meeting?
>
> I have put in suggestions, but no interest in the club. I would volunteer
if
> there were interest.

Translation: IF someone else does all the formative work, then maybe I'll join and help.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

756. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-21 02:01:46 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030120210146.05578.00000124@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 59839

>From: lenover21@aol.com

>ARRL is an organization of
> amateurs engaged in an avocational pursuit...IEEE is a
> worldwide professional organization.

Thanks for the distinction, but was it necessary? ARRL and Hams should be more truthful about the hype. Hype such as the value of service, Hams technical capabilities, Hams with degrees, where 1% is touted as representative of the hobby. The hype only makes themselves feel better and does not convince the public. This ultimately hurts the hobby.

Also, tying code testing to higher license classes support the hype that coders have higher technical capabilities.

Also, did you read my suggestion about mini-radio certifications? I would like to see more tech people, like yourself, starting technical clubs.

How can anyone with an EE degree have a Ham license, belong to ARRL, but not to IEEE? Also, how can any self respecting EE learn code (unless they TRULY enjoy it)?

757. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-21 02:25:11 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <bc2X9.5102$Z5.2075336@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 59840

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030120203703.16889.00000078@mb-cc.aol.com...
> In article <qSZW9.5053$Z5.2035091@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
> >> "73" from Orange County Indiana!
> >> WW - KB9TMP EM68sp
> >> E-Mail me at: kb9tmp@juno.com
> >> Home Page: http://www.qsl.net/kb9tmp/
> >> -----------------------------------
> >> Bruce will get a real kick out of this part. The email address to send
> >> email changes goes to none other than Carl R. Stevenson - WK3C himself.
> >> --
> >> '73' From KB9TMP
> >> former NCI member # NCI-2385
> >
> >And KB9TMP will note that I promptly replied to his message, indicating
that
> >his request would be promptly handled.
> >
> >That's the difference between NCI and some of the fanatical procoders who
> >frequent this newsgroup ...
>
> Who are these "fanatical procoders"?
>
> Is there something wrong with being pro-code? (Not procodeTEST, mind you).
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Jim ... I stand corrected ... when I said "fanatical procoders" I *MEANT*
something
like "those who are fanatical about forcing a code test on everyone" ...
that is what
I mean when I (mis)use the term "procoder" ... I actually mean
"pro-code-tester."

73,
Carl - wk3c

758. Re: Lets face it ... we're just communicators.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-21 02:31:33 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030120213133.00111.00000240@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 59841

In article <f45722ac.0301201625.1667a639@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> In times past Los Angeles City Civil Defense cross-trained each and
>> every ham radio volunteer in other disaster-related specialties and
>> we were far more than "radio-based message passers", capable of
>> originating the message or acting upon it in addition to passing it
>> competently.
>>
>> Don't kid YOURSELF - it can be done.
>>
>> ---
>> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>Soem of us are even Red Cross 1st aid/CPR instructors.

Brian:

Don't get me started on Red Cross 1st Aid/CPR instructors! I think they're
the biggest bunch of baloon-headed egomaniacs in the world -- and they
are almost as dangerous as Ham Hero (tm) wannabes! They keep
emphasizing that you MUST receive your CPR refresher training on an
annual basis, you MUST carry your current CPR qualification card, you
MUST do this, you MUST do that, and most importantly, you MUST
glorify and venerate your local CPR instructor as a God of Lifesaving.
After completing my own First Aid/CPR Instructor training many years ago
while stationed in Germany, I came to the conclusion that I wasn't going
to adopt the mandatory asshole posture with my students. I just taught
them how to do basic First Aid/CPR and let it go at that. If they encounter
someone choking to death, or not breathing, or WHATEVER, I don't want
them to think they have to stand by and let someone die just because it
has been more than 12 months since their last refresher class! Nobody
is going to get sued for trying to help -- that just doesn't happen!

73 de Larry, K3LT

759. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-21 02:31:33 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030120213133.00111.00000241@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 59843

In article <v2n2278niedv6f@corp.supernews.com>, "KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com>
writes:

>No, I think he's waiting for the great freebie HF giveaway
>that keeps being rumored about coming soon. I said
>to heck with that and just knuckled down and did it. Now
>that I passed the 5wpm I could care less if the code requirement
>EVER changes! (really I kinda hope it don't change but Sssshhhh
>that's a secret) ;^) I just thought of something, I'm a member of
>NCI. I think I'm going to go quit my membership in that group.

Bill:

NCI stands for No Code International. No Code means no code at
all! If you pass a code test, you're immediately disqualified! Send
an E-mail to Carl Stevenson and his cohorts and tell them you
grew up!

73 de Larry, K3LT

760. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-21 02:31:34 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030120213134.00111.00000242@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 59842

In article <v2n37lt6kndu0d@corp.supernews.com>, "KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com>
writes:

>> >Have you tried Hellschriber? It looks interesting to me also.
>>
>> No, not yet -- but I'm game to give it a try if you are!
>
>Sounds good to me.
>
>> The text display
>> is very unusual!
>
>That's what has got my interest peaked, plus I read the history
>of it and it's only second in age to CW itself, patented back
>in 1929

Hmmm. Where did you find that history? Got a URL? I'll do a
search on it later.

>> BTW my digital mode software is MixW 2.06 (Reg.).
>
>I've got that and I also use WinPSKse.

>> Well, it's about time you got on the air with those digital modes! BTW --
>> I hope you can type! I can do around 75 WPM, with spurts over 100! I
>> don't use a lot of pre-canned function-key responses on-the-air! If I
>> catch you doing so, be prepared to take your medicine here in the NG!
>
>I run about 50 or so WPM, I've got three fingers on my right
>hand that are nerve dead (no feeling at all) which makes touch
>typing kinda hard for me. I don't like those canned function keys
>either they seem to be out of place in the conversation when people
>use them. I just write it out instead of trying to figure out which Fkey
>says what!

Good! I know people with ten good fingers who, well into their middle
age, and having been using computers since the day after they were
invented, are still hunting and pecking and totally dependent on the
Function Keys. Trying to work them in digital modes is like trying to
pull your own teeth with a pair of lineman's pliers! I'm sure that working
you will be most enjoyable!

>You can email me with a sked just make it after 14:00 UTC, I
>need my beauty sleep ;^)

How about 1700 UTC tomorrow (Tuesday, Jan 21) on 20 meters? I'm not sure what a proper frequency for Hellschreiber would be; let's start around 14.080 unless you have a better idea! If you want, we can first establish contact in RTTY and QSY to Hellschreiber. E-mail me with your preference. Looking forward to our QSO!

73 de Larry, K3LT

761. Re: Lets face it ... we're just communicators.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-21 06:08:51 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b0jfqq2q2l@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 59903

That is fine if it is working for them. But in a general sense I still
stand by my statement.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

"Symbolism is for the simple minded....."

>
> In times past Los Angeles City Civil Defense cross-trained each and
> every ham radio volunteer in other disaster-related specialties and
> we were far more than "radio-based message passers", capable of
> originating the message or acting upon it in addition to passing it
> competently.
>
> Don't kid YOURSELF - it can be done.
>
> ---
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>
>

762. Re: Lets face it ... we're just communicators.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-21 06:11:12 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b0jfqr3q2l@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 59904

(snippage)

> Soem of us are even Red Cross 1st aid/CPR instructors.

Now here is a point I believe in no matter what..... I beleive that most every person out there should know basic first aid, as well as CPR, regardless of what they are doing, radio related or not. Instructor status is great but at least having a basic functional knowledge of those skills is a positive asset to anyone.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

"Symbolism is for the simple minded....."

763. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-21 06:13:39 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E2CE4EF.59AFFC80@earthlink.net>
Source record: 59844

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> "KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:v2ohskpuhfbh6b@corp.supernews.com...

> > Did it! I no longer am a member of NCI. Here is a copy of the email I sent
> > out.
> > ----------
> > I have been a Member of NCI 1999 and have changed my mind on the code test
> > question. I believe there is a good reason for keeping at least a 5WPM
> code
> > requirement for access to the HF bands. So I am resigning my membership in
> > No Code International. Please remove me from your member database.
> > Thank You.
> >
> > "73" from Orange County Indiana!
> > WW - KB9TMP EM68sp
> > E-Mail me at: kb9tmp@juno.com
> > Home Page: http://www.qsl.net/kb9tmp/
> > ----------
> > Bruce will get a real kick out of this part. The email address to send
> > email changes goes to none other than Carl R. Stevenson - WK3C himself.
> > --
> > '73' From KB9TMP
> > former NCI member # NCI-2385
>
> And KB9TMP will note that I promptly replied to his message, indicating that
> his request would be promptly handled.
>
> That's the difference between NCI and some of the fanatical procoders who
> frequent this newsgroup ... unlike the fanatical procoders, NCI believes in,
> and supports, freedom of choice, rather than forcing views on others.

It isn't your freedom to bestow. You haven't given KB9TMP anything
which wasn't already his.

You have demonstrated repeatedly that you are as fanatical toward doing
away with code testing as anyone who supports continued testing. If you
suupported "freedom of choice" you'd have no problem supporting the view
of those who believe that testing should remain.

Dave K8MN

764. Re: Lets face it ... we're just communicators.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-21 07:12:58 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030121021258.01401.00000091@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 59845

>Subject: Re: Lets face it ... we're just communicators.....
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 1/20/03 5:57 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030120185718.17197.00000268@mb-bd.aol.com>

>How can that be?

With your head so firmly placed where only a poctologist dare roam, it's
not surprising that such deficits in your awareness exist.

765. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-21 07:17:21 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030121021721.01401.00000092@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 59846

>Subject: Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 1/20/03 10:37 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030120113723.05739.00000106@mb-df.aol.com>

>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>>Two hamfests, seen by an obviously biased observer, is not a representative
>>sample.

>Also, one can see this at club meetings, any random Hamfest, and surveys,
>which is more representative.

Can see what?

>>I've been a ham 35 years and been to numerous hamfests. Never seen ONE that
>>had
>>a buffet.

>The Hamfest last August in Boxboro, MA had a buffet.

So, we have one buffet in...How many hundreds of examples?

>I am not worried about the Ham influence. I go to the Hamfests for the
>seminars
>and the flea market. The Ham culture there makes it more interesting.

Oh no, Vipul! Don't allow culture to ruin you!

766. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-21 07:29:14 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030121022914.01401.00000093@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 59847

>Subject: Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 1/20/03 5:57 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030120185720.17197.00000269@mb-bd.aol.com>

>Carl, permit an interruption of an interruption here, but a few things
> need correction.
>
> Firstly, N2EY is trolling with the remark about the IEEE. Second,
> IEEE is a PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIP ORGANIZATION, not
> a hobby/recreational activity organization.

Oh, THIS is GRAND!

Lennie the Licenseless giving a lecture about not comparing things...

Lennie the Licenseless is the first one to compare Amateur Radio to
"professional" radio, the Armed Forces, civil aviation communications, and
1950's era rear area radio relay stations at which he once fought a war.

>None of the attendees seem
> to be involved in electronics, radio, or electric power as a hobby or
> even in guise of some mythical "service to their country" ("amateur
> radio is a SERVICE not a hobby!").

Even when it was your "work", you didn't seem to be involved it it,
either, Lennie. So say third parties, anyway.

>The "traditionalist" hams in here (Miccolis, Heil, Roll, even Brakob
> and Warren) continually dwell on the mythical "service" aspect as
> if amateur radio was some profound, noble, self-sacrificing service
> to humanity and that they are all somehow "superior" to ordinary
> mortals who do not possess an amateur radio license grant

You'll have one heckuvatime coming up with quotes on that, Lennie.

Shall we add those to the "Waiting on Lennie to Provide Evidence" pile?

>I'm a Life Member of IEEE, meaning the total of my years of
> IEEE membership plus chronological age equals or exceeds
> 100 years.

I know this has some relevence to Amateur Radio. Lennie would NEVER delve
into a non-topic related discussion on his non-Amateur Radio related
experiences as a means to somehow perpetuating his own glory...

>Len Anderson
> retired (from regular hours) electronic engineer person

> Life Member IEEE
> Work Unit Processor for SETI@home

And not a bit of it related to Amatuer Radio...Again...

Putz.

767. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-21 07:34:32 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030121023432.01401.00000094@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 59848

>Subject: Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 1/20/03 8:01 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030120210146.05578.00000124@mb-df.aol.com>

>Also, did you read my suggestion about mini-radio certifications? I would
>like
>to see more tech people, like yourself, starting technical clubs.

It would be nice to see folks with the alleged experience of Lennie making that experience and knowledge available to the young and curious, but in this case, it won't happen, Vipul.

Lennie is a very mean-spirited, selfish and self-serving person. He is quick to spout off technical blurbs when it serves his rantings, but when asked to REALLY help, it's never forthcoming.

Lennie has had a lifetime of opportunities to share his supposed experience and skills with youth and adult alike, but he never has...Not at least unless money was involved.

You'll be waiting a long time if you are waiting for Len Anderson to do anything that doesn't serve him first.

Steve, K4YZ

768. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-21 07:36:35 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030121023635.01401.00000095@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 59849

>Subject: Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 1/20/03 7:30 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030120203055.05578.00000122@mb-df.aol.com>

>As I suspected a lower percentage in each of the three categories
>(male,old,fat) are present than are present in Ham radio

You have yet to enlighten us as to what polling method you used to come up with these assertions, Vipul.

>N2EY, this answers your question.

Hardly.

Steve, K4YZ

769. Re: FCC tells ... whatever

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-21 07:38:11 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030121023811.01401.00000096@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 59850

>Subject: Re: FCC tells ... whatever
>From: "Kï¿½HB" kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG
>Date: 1/20/03 9:38 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <_JUW9.2632$bL4.281751@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>

>: One cannot offer "best wishes", "73", "have a nice day", etc etc
>: after trying to slam someone in a RRAP post.
>
>Of course you can, despite this a new Net-rule from your Teutonic
>control-freak keyboard.

Thanks, Hans.

Steve, K4YZ

770. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-21 07:40:43 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030121024043.01401.00000097@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 59901

>Subject: Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade
>From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
>Date: 1/20/03 7:37 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <b0i8camnj1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>

>> I have put in suggestions, but no interest in the club. I would volunteer
>if
>> there were interest.
>
>Translation: IF someone else does all the formative work, then
>maybe I'll join and help.

Exactly.

73

Steve, K4YZ

771. Re: FCC tells ... whatever

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-21 07:52:12 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030121025212.01401.00000099@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 59902

>Subject: Re: FCC tells ... whatever
>From: wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX)
>Date: 1/20/03 10:32 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030120113254.17355.00000169@mb-bd.aol.com>

>No not hard at all, since Im not a CBplusser

Sure you are. Upgraded to Extra Lite. Had the chance to do it "the olde fashioed way", but you opted to wait and do it this way.

>By the way, I thought you had me on ignore, I knew you just
>couldnt live without my comments.

I unfortunatly see you when someone else quotes you. Most of your stuff still hits the floor without review. Gives the cat something to do HIS business on.

772. Re: FCC tells ... whatever

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-21 13:43:23 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030121084323.01918.00000257@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 59905

> Sure you are. Upgraded to Extra Lite. Had the chance to do it "the olde
>fashioed way", but you opted to wait and do it this way.

I guess you dont know what a CBplusser is, besides I never wanted the Extra
just did it on bet

> I unfortunatly see you when someone else quotes you.

BS this post wasnt quoted, tell the truth, we all know you love my stuff

773. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-21 15:01:01 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v2qo4t45l82i1e@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 59906

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030120213134.00111.00000242@mb-mv.aol.com...
> In article <v2n37lt6kndu0d@corp.supernews.com>, "KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com>
> writes:
>
> >> >Have you tried Hellschriber? It looks interesting to me also.
> >>
> >> No, not yet -- but I'm game to give it a try if you are!
> >
> >Sounds good to me.
> >
> >> The text display
> >> is very unusual!
> >
> >That's what has got my interest peaked, plus I read the history
> >of it and it's only second in age to CW itself, patented back
> >in 1929
>
> Hmmm. Where did you find that history? Got a URL? I'll do a
> search on it later.

I found it in the help files for MixW. Plus a few websites I've run
on to have the same history for it. I did a Google search and now
Google only brings up sites for selling me Hellschriber software and
RigBlaster web pages. So much for Google being the greatest of
all the web search sites. :(

<SNIP>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx

774. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-21 15:12:47 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v2qor2n5ovk07@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 59907

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030120185720.17197.00000269@mb-bd.aol.com...
> In article <W4_W9.5057$Z5.2036961@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20030120103726.12173.00000052@mb-mr.aol.com...
> >> In article <r3HW9.1806$bL4.175308@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>,
> >"K&#65533;HB"
> >> <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG> writes:
> >>

<SNIP>

> I'm a Life Member of IEEE, meaning the total of my years of
> IEEE membership plus chronological age equals or exceeds
> 100 years.

And just for the record I'm 20+ years as a GM service tech. Plus
my 46 years of age, gives me at least 66 years which doesn't mean
anything because you don't add your age to your years of service
to get anything meaningful. Your 100 years and $2.50 will get you
a cup of coffee at Starbucks. MAYBE!!

I would have left this post alone but you included my name in
a part that I snipped so I feel like you invited me to join in.

<SNIP>

>
> Len Anderson
> retired (from regular hours) electronic engineer person
> Life Member IEEE
> Work Unit Processor for SETI@home

SETI at home, that's that deal where you use my computer
for free to do your work and all I get is a "pretty" screen
saver out of the deal isn't it? IT FIGURES!
--
KB9TMP

"Half the world is composed of people who have
something to say and can't, and the other half who
have nothing to say and keep on saying it"
-Robert Frost

775. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-21 15:23:03 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v2qpmb48bu2r6f@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 59908

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030120213133.00111.00000241@mb-mv.aol.com...
> In article <v2n2278niedv6f@corp.supernews.com>, "KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com>
> writes:
>
> >No, I think he's waiting for the great freebie HF giveaway
> >that keeps being rumored about coming soon. I said
> >to heck with that and just knuckled down and did it. Now
> >that I passed the 5wpm I could care less if the code requirement
> >EVER changes! (really I kinda hope it don't change but Sssshhhh
> >that's a secret) ;^) I just thought of something, I'm a member of
> >NCI. I think I'm going to go quit my membership in that group.
>
> Bill:
>
> NCI stands for No Code International. No Code means no code at
> all! If you pass a code test, you're immediately disqualified! Send
> an E-mail to Carl Stevenson and his cohorts and tell them you
> grew up!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

I did and I posted that email in an other part of this thread.
I told them I changed my mind and now think that a code
test is a good thing to have to pass to gain HF privileges.
--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx

>

776. NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-21 17:03:51 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0301210903.31276a3f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59909

See:

http://www.remote.arrl.org/news/features/2003/01/20/?nc=1

73 de Jim, N2EY

777. Re: This Is How KB1HMW "Supports" Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-21 17:10:19 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0301210910.79b1960a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59910

vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030119195116.04110.00000065@mb-fr.aol.com>...
> N2EY wrote:
> >>Lets not get personal.
> >>
> >Then start by not making fun of hams.
>
> I went a little overboard at times, even today.

True.

> I know that Hams are basically
> good people.

Good to see you recognize that.

>I will try to be more sensitive.

How about logical, too?
>
Question: Why all the white space between that last sentence and the
next?

(25+ lines of white space deleted)
>
> ---
> ---
> Sadly, amateur radio lead to my demise.

How did you post here, then? "Demise" indicates that you're dead.

> I could not see the light at the end of
> the tunnel. It was the longer pathway. I was too impatient and chose the
> shorter pathway.

What the HECK is that supposed to mean?

>Then, the train ran me over.

Railroads in the USA are private private property. If you are in a
railroad tunnel, you're trespassing.
>
> I had a chance to sell out (to "CB"). I did not take it. As a result, I did
> not get my amateur radio or CB.

It's your choice.
>
> It looks like the path I chose will lead me to leave amateur radio. I will

> ponder and reflect. I may still keep my radio as a diversion.
> ---
> ---------------
> The terms tunnel, train, ran, CB are metaphors. (Its something totally
> different than CB, but using CB illustrates "selling out").

Why not just write what happened? Leave out the white space and
metaphors, and just tell the facts. Were you operating HF illegally?

N2EY

778. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-21 17:20:16 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <kjfX9.4413$Sv3.475131@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 59912

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote

: See:
:
: http://www.remote.arrl.org/news/features/2003/01/20/?nc=1
:
: 73 de Jim, N2EY

Must be a damned slow news day at Newington! The book has nothing whatever
to do with Amateur Radio.

&#65533;&#65533;&#65533; 73, de Hans, K0HB
--
Help support youth involved in Amateur Radio.
http://www.mnyarc.org
http://www.k0bsa.org

779. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-21 17:20:34 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030121122034.20557.00000239@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 59911

>I told them I changed my mind and now think that a code
>test is a good thing to have to pass to gain HF privileges.
>--
>'73' From KB9TMP

Now you did it, you will now be on NCIs Hall Of Shame List

780. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-21 17:30:48 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3E2D83C8.5070007@psu.edu>
Source record: 59914

```
Jim Hampton wrote:
> Mike,
>
> You could send QSL cards, but to be politically correct, they should be
> e-qsl cards ;)
>

heh, heh! I like it.
```

781. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-21 17:36:14 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0301210936.5be8a051@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59913

vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030120210146.05578.00000124@mb-df.aol.com>...

> How can anyone with an EE degree have a Ham license, belong to ARRL, but not > to IEEE?

Simple: They see more of a need for ARRL membership than for IEEE
membership.

> Also, how can any self respecting EE learn code (unless they TRULY enjoy
> it)?

Simple: Because it's there.

What does one have to do with the other? Morse code is widely used on
the ham bands, as anyone with a suitable receiver can easily
determine. An EE who wants in on the fun will learn Morse.

And for the record: I have BSEE (1976, University of Pennsylvania) and
MSEE (1992, Drexel University). Also been a ham since 1967 and Extra
since 1970. ARRL member since 1968. Employed as an EE since graduation
in '76. Not a member of IEEE, as I see no benefit to such membership
in my job. IEEE is very active in some areas of electrical engineering
but not in others.

Have a healthy amount of self-respect, too.

If you add up my age, years as a licensed ham, years as an ARRL
member, and years as a degreed EE, the total comes out in excess of
150.

N2EY

782. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-21 17:43:18 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0301210943.7fd185fc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59915

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<b0i7q5$5r3$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>...
> "Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030119204642.24933.00000086@mb-bh.aol.com...
> > >Subject: Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade
> > >From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
> > >Date: 1/19/03 5:38 PM Central Standard Time
> > >Message-id: <20030119183833.08239.00000090@mb-cq.aol.com>
>
> > >The hobby has the perception of social misfits. Attending a Hamfest does
> > >little to change one's perception.
> >
> > "Social misfits"...?!?!
> >
> > BBBWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!
> ....
> > >The majority of its particitants are male, old, fat.
> >
> > Then at the NEXT hamfest, why don't YOU sponsor a wellness booth, or
> > sponsor a Jenny Craig booth?
> ....
>
> Allow me an observation...it matters not what the hobby is, MOST people
> have a narrow perspective of what is "normal". If you aren't into
> golf, tennis or some other "socially accepted" recreactional endeaver, then
> your not normal if you listen to the vast majority of such folk.
>
> It matters not if you are an antique car buff, into model trains, model
> airplanes, ham radio, or whatever. None of these seem to fit the normal
> perception of a great many people. Frankly, such folk can stuff it anyway.
> I enjoy what I do and happily
> have a spouse that also enjoys most of my hobby activities.

Bill,

WELL SAID!!!

Almost any activity outside of that narrow band of "normal" is
criticized as "misfit" or "oddball" by some. As in "what kind of nut
gets up at 5 AM to go run 3 miles in 10 degree weather before the sun
has even come up?". Etc.
>
> If anyone expects any hobby to somehow be a reflection of the normal
> distributions of age, gender, race or whatever, it just ain't gonna happen.
> I really don't give a hoot, and I'd hope most people also don't, simply

> because ham radio demographics may be tilted towards white males,
> or whatever.

Bingo!
>
> Enjoy whatever you do and as long as it is legal, apologize to no one
> for your interests. At least you are DOING something. Another big group
> of folks that consider themselves "normal" do nothing but eat and
> work the channel selector of their TV remote.
>
> Anyway, just my observations.
>
All of which I agree with 100%.

Thanks for clearly expressing things several of us have been trying to
say for several posts now. Vipul may not get it, but not for lack of a
clear explanation.

73 de Jim, N2EY

783. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-21 19:09:16 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v2r6mbtlia7pba@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 59916

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030121122034.20557.00000239@mb-fo.aol.com...
> >I told them I changed my mind and now think that a code
> >test is a good thing to have to pass to gain HF privileges.
> >--
> >'73' From KB9TMP
>
> Now you did it, you will now be on NCIs Hall Of Shame List

Oh well! You know you can't have everything in life,
where would you put it all?

BTW I had a real nice QSO today with Larry K3LT on
20 meters this afternoon. We did 3 modes 2 of which I had
never tried before. The PSK31 worked good but we also
tried out RTTY (new to me) and Hellschriber (new to both
of us) and you can ask Larry the last one is a rather nice
mode to work.

Ya want to know something else? Larry's a pretty nice guy
for being the rabid PCTA that everyone thinks he is! ;^)

Thanks for the QSO Larry!!
--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx

784. Re: This Is How KB1HMW "Supports" Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-21 19:31:24 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v2r7vv22g14o43@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 59917

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0301210910.79b1960a@posting.google.com...
> vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030119195116.04110.00000065@mb-fr.aol.com>...
> > N2EY wrote:
> > >>Lets not get personal.
> > >>
> > >Then start by not making fun of hams.
> >
> > I went a little overboard at times, even today.
>
> True.
>
> > I know that Hams are basically
> > good people.
>
> Good to see you recognize that.

Right on! (can't tell I'm out of the 60's can you ;^)

>
> >I will try to be more sensitive.
>
> How about logical, too?

Don't ask for to much this is Vipul after all.

> >
> Question: Why all the white space between that last sentence and the
> next?
>
> (25+ lines of white space deleted)

He likes to do that. I think it's some sort of a bandwidth test.

> >
>
> ---
> > --------------
> > Sadly, amateur radio lead to my demise.
>
> How did you post here, then? "Demise" indicates that you're dead.

I didn't know they have NewGoups over on the "other side"! = O

>
> > I could not see the light at the end of

> > the tunnel.

He should have taken his sunglasses off first before going in.

> It was the longer pathway. I was too impatient and chose the
> > shorter pathway.
>
> What the HECK is that supposed to mean?

He is paraphrasing Star Wars in it's "giving in to the Dark Side"
It sounds like ARS is the "Force" and CB is the "Dark Side".
Kinda funny Vipul talking like that and then badmouthing the
ARS for it's "Code Words" and such. If that ain't a type of
code word nothing is!

>
> >Then, the train ran me over.

I'll bet that hurt! My daughter got hit by a train once.
She spent a week in the hospital but came out ok.
(Just a little extra metel in her head now, that she
didn't have before) But that might explain Vipul's logic.

>
> Railroads in the USA are private private property. If you are in a
> railroad tunnel, you're trespassing.

Mongo not know. Mongo only pawn in game of life.

> >
> > I had a chance to sell out (to "CB"). I did not take it. As a result, I
did
> > not get my amateur radio or CB.
>
> It's your choice.
> >
> > It looks like the path I chose will lead me to leave amateur radio. I
will
> > ponder and reflect. I may still keep my radio as a diversion.
>
> --
> > ---------------

Sometimes your the windshield, sometimes your the bug!

> > The terms tunnel, train, ran, CB are metaphors. (Its something totally
> > different than CB, but using CB illustrates "selling out").
>
> Why not just write what happened? Leave out the white space and
> metaphors, and just tell the facts.

That's to easy, we wouldn't have to guess that way.

>Were you operating HF illegally?
>

I'd bet on it! I'd say he still might be.

> N2EY

--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx

785. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-21 19:46:26 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3E2DA392.1030300@psu.edu>
Source record: 59918

Len Over 21 wrote:
> In article <3E2C6A8A.2010602@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
>
>>Dennis Ferguson wrote:
>>
>>>Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote:
>>
>>>> Seems like a answer in search of a problem. Seems like you could do
>>>>much better by keeping the signal on the net 100 percent of the time.
>>>
>>>
>>>My feeling exactly. I've been wondering the same thing about cell phones,
>>>in fact. What is the point of using a wireless phone to access the wired
>>>telephone network when it would be so much easier to do the same thing
>>>with a phone directly wired to the network?
>>
>>VoIP is a different animal altogether from cellular phones.(at least in
>>this context - there is nothing to prevent cellular VoIP. The whole
>>point with cellular is to have a telephone connection that allows you to
>>be portable.
>
>
> Mike, have you thought of massage therapy for the lower
> extremities? Your leg was being expertly pulled and you
> give no evidence of feeling it... :-)

Oh, I knew the sarcasm.

>> I wonder if FRS radios can be patched into VoIP? Sounds like a good way
>
>
>>for the unlicensed to work DX. Heck, who needs to be a ham anymore?
>
>
> Why is it "necessary to work DX?" With a ham license (an
> amateur radio license grant, that is...). I did that a half
> century ago on a 24/7 basis as part of ACAN, without any
> license whatsoever.

Its completely unnecessary for anyone to work DX. That is just a thing that some people do. My point is that if a FRS radio can legally work VoIP, that the "great unwashed" would be able to do exactly the same things that the rooting tootingest CW lovingest Extra could do without any license whatsoever.

I don't know exactly where the law starts and stops on this, but if you can do VoIP, then you should be able to do PSK, etc over IP also.

> Why is it "necessary" to demonstrate OOK CW skills in order
> to "work DX on HF?" Do you have any sane, rational reason
> other than the obviously-political need for that in a HOBBY?

Its only necessary because it's a qualification at the moment. Otherwise I Don't care a whole lot about it. After it isn't a qualification, it won't be necessary any more.

786. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-21 20:06:37 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030121150637.27095.00000316@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 59919

>BTW I had a real nice QSO today with Larry K3LT on
>20 meters this afternoon. We did 3 modes 2 of which I had
>never tried before. The PSK31 worked good but we also
>tried out RTTY (new to me) and Hellschriber (new to both
>of us) and you can ask Larry the last one is a rather nice
>mode to work.
>

You know thats what I need to do, get back on HF. I have the gear but cant find a good reason to put up Antenna.

>Ya want to know something else? Larry's a pretty nice guy
>for being the rabid PCTA that everyone thinks he is! ;^)

Most of the Pro Coders are, its the CBplussers you have to watch out for.

787. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-21 20:13:06 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0301211213.77b1459c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59920

```
"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<bc2X9.5102$Z5.2075336@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030120203703.16889.00000078@mb-cc.aol.com...
> > In article <qSZW9.5053$Z5.2035091@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> > <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
> >
> > >> "73" from Orange County Indiana!
> > >> WW - KB9TMP EM68sp
> > >> E-Mail me at: kb9tmp@juno.com
> > >> Home Page: http://www.qsl.net/kb9tmp/
> > >> -----------------------------------
> > >> Bruce will get a real kick out of this part. The email address to send
> > >> email changes goes to none other than Carl R. Stevenson - WK3C himself.
> > >> --
> > >> '73' From KB9TMP
> > >> former NCI member # NCI-2385
> > >
> > >And KB9TMP will note that I promptly replied to his message, indicating
> that
> > >his request would be promptly handled.
> > >
> > >That's the difference between NCI and some of the fanatical procoders who
> > >frequent this newsgroup ...
> >
> > Who are these "fanatical procoders"?
> >
> > Is there something wrong with being pro-code? (Not procodeTEST, mind you).
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Jim ... I stand corrected ... when I said "fanatical procoders" I *MEANT*
> something
> like "those who are fanatical about forcing a code test on everyone" ...
> that is what
> I mean when I (mis)use the term "procoder" ... I actually mean
> "pro-code-tester."

Whew! I suspected it was a typo, Carl. No problem! After all, despite
the name, NCI's official position has always been anti-TEST, not
anti-CODE.

Interesting to note that while you are quick to make the correction,
Vipul (Vshah101) has made no such announcement.
```

Anyway, I shall reword my question:

So who are these "fanatical procodetest folks"?

--

And while we're on the subject of 802.11b....

Two opinion questions for one and all:

1) Do you think the rules against on-air encryption by amateurs should be relaxed or eliminated?

2) Do you think the "commercial content" rules in Part 97 should be relaxed or eliminated?

73 de Jim, N2EY

788. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-21 21:13:45 UTC
From: K�HB <k�hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <dKiX9.4945$bL4.492389@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 59921

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote

:
: Two opinion questions for one and all:
:
: 1) Do you think the rules against on-air encryption by amateurs should
: be relaxed or eliminated?

No. Do you? If so, why.

:
: 2) Do you think the "commercial content" rules in Part 97 should be
: relaxed or eliminated?
:

No. Do you? If so, why?

��� 73, de Hans, K0HB
--
SOC # 291
FISTS # 7419
NCI # 4304

789. Re: FCC tells ... whatever

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-21 23:22:02 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3E2DD61A.DCECF687@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 59922

WA8ULX wrote:

>
> All of the above, besides this group is just for FUN, and just BSing the other
> guy. Its amazing how many people take this group so serious.
> I like this group because I can spread hate and discountent, then sit back and
> watch people squirm. Its amazing how many people take all this BS as fact.

Ah ha! So you admit to being a troll!

:-)

790. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-21 23:57:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030121185700.05141.00000065@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 59923

In article <dKiX9.4945$bL4.492389@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG> writes:

>: Two opinion questions for one and all:
>:
>: 1) Do you think the rules against on-air encryption by amateurs should
>: be relaxed or eliminated?
>
>No. Do you?

No. Absolutely not.

>:
>: 2) Do you think the "commercial content" rules in Part 97 should be
>: relaxed or eliminated?
>:
>
>No. Do you?

No. Absolutely not.

>
Current rules are adequate for today's ARS in both cases.

What do others think?

73 de Jim, N2EY

791. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-22 00:28:16 UTC
From: Jackie <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com>
Message-ID: <AAIX9.776069$WL3.766670@rwcrnsc54>
Source record: 59924

"KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com> wrote in message
news:v2r6mbtlia7pba@corp.supernews.com...

> > >I told them I changed my mind and now think that a code
> > >test is a good thing to have to pass to gain HF privileges.

I maintain that the biggest hurdle to getting onto the HF bands is the COST. Code? That was no problem for me. It's those other things, like getting an HF rig, an antenna, a tuner, power supply, lightning arrestors, decent coax, mast, and a keyer- that make it difficult to get onto HF. Not if you're wealthy, or have a lot of extra ka-ching laying around... but I don't quite fit into that category.

Lucky for me, this coming weekend, a very nice local elmer is going to lend me some of his spare radio equipment to try out for a bit... the antenna-raisin' party is this Saturday in my backyard! Bring your Bertha torches folks; it's mighty cold 'round here and the ground, she's frozen solid (but there is STILL no snow! What a gyp for us cross-country skiing lovers)... I think I'll just strap the 5-band vertical to the deck, throw some big sheets of spare chicken-wire under the deck to use as a makeshift counterpoise, and make do until spring. What the heck? If I can work some DX with that set-up, I'll think of myself as a REAL amateur radio operator!

Jackie
KC0ODY

792. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-22 00:33:55 UTC
From: Jackie <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com>
Message-ID: <TFIX9.777020$P31.575275@rwcrnsc53>
Source record: 59925

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0301211213.77b1459c@posting.google.com...

> Two opinion questions for one and all:
>
> 1) Do you think the rules against on-air encryption by amateurs should
> be relaxed or eliminated?

Yeah! I love listening to those "numbers" stations on shortwave... the intrigue! The mystery! The... wait, what did you ask?? Oop, nevermind.

> 2) Do you think the "commercial content" rules in Part 97 should be
> relaxed or eliminated?

No, because then people would be trying to find a way to sell their unsolicited crap on the air, too- like spam is to Usenet. Just another avenue for hucksters to try and push their inferior, otherwise-unsaleable junk off on the public.

Jackie KC0ODY

793. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-22 00:35:21 UTC
From: Jackie <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com>
Message-ID: <dHlX9.654627$GR5.466680@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 59926

"KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com> wrote in message
news:v2qor2n5ovk07@corp.supernews.com...

> SETI at home, that's that deal where you use my computer
> for free to do your work and all I get is a "pretty" screen
> saver out of the deal isn't it? IT FIGURES!

Check this out. As with SETI, I don't think this project has found any
verifiable evidence (yet) of what it is searching for either...

http://totl.net/STI/

LOL!

Jackie
KC0ODY

794. Hey KC0ODY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-22 00:58:13 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b0kqbu$fl7$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 59927

Welcome to ham radio. Best of luck to you in getting on HF. Just read over your info up on QRZ and sounds like you are the kind of operator we need. Keep up the interest.

Ham radio is a great hobby/service. Just remember that USENET is not ham radio.

Dan/W4NTI

795. Re: FCC tells ... whatever

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-22 01:31:31 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030121203131.20446.00000248@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 59928

>Ah ha! So you admit to being a troll!
>
>
>:-)
>

Of course, isnt everyone here a Troll?

796. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-22 01:49:53 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E2DF8A1.5060205@adelphia.net>
Source record: 59942

Jackie wrote:

> "KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:v2qor2n5ovk07@corp.supernews.com...
>
>
>>SETI at home, that's that deal where you use my computer
>>for free to do your work and all I get is a "pretty" screen
>>saver out of the deal isn't it? IT FIGURES!
>>
>
> Check this out. As with SETI, I don't think this project has found any
> verifiable evidence (yet) of what it is searching for either...
>
> http://totl.net/STI/

The geek name generator is a must see for the anonymii who post here.

- mike KB3EIA -

797. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-22 02:17:46 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E2DFF8D.DEF6E25A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 59929

Len Over 21 wrote:

> Why is it "necessary to work DX?"

It isn't necessary for you to work DX.

> With a ham license (an
> amateur radio license grant, that is...). I did that a half
> century ago on a 24/7 basis as part of ACAN, without any
> license whatsoever.

Whoopty-do.

> Why is it "necessary" to demonstrate OOK CW skills in order
> to "work DX on HF?"

> Do you have any sane, rational reason
> other than the obviously-political need for that in a HOBBY?

It certainly isn't necessary with tropical fish or stamp collecting.
Right now, the regs require it for HF amateur radio. Anything which
proves to be a stumbling block for you is "obviously-political".

Dave K8MN

798. Re: Lets face it ... we're just communicators.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-22 02:19:19 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E2DFFF8.4A3DA0B6@earthlink.net>
Source record: 59930

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <cuvyxnansvbet.h90rca5.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
> <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:
>
> >On Mon, 20 Jan 2003 05:10:29 -0500, KC8PMX wrote:
> >
> >>All in all... all we are is communicators.... regardless of band or mode.
> >>Let's not kid ourselves.
> >
> > In times past Los Angeles City Civil Defense cross-trained each and
> > every ham radio volunteer in other disaster-related specialties and
> > we were far more than "radio-based message passers", capable of
> > originating the message or acting upon it in addition to passing it
> > competently.
> >
> > Don't kid YOURSELF - it can be done.
>
> Gosh, old-timer, that must have been done before 1957, yes?
>
> I remember the 1994 Northridge Earthquake very well and
> saw NO evidence of this great "service to the country" at the
> eastern half of The Valley. Same thing in the Sylmar Quake
> of 1971. Or the Whittier Narrows quake in between those
> two. Or the big Wildfires we've had around these parts.
>
> I've seen/heard much of those individuals involved directly
> with all those emergencies/disasters...not a word on "hams."
>
> How can that be?

It must be that you just aren't paying attention.

Dave K8MN

799. Re: FCC tells ... whatever

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-22 02:20:11 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030121212011.20835.00000104@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 59931

In article <20030121203131.20446.00000248@mb-fo.aol.com>, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) writes:

>>Ah ha! So you admit to being a troll!
>>
>>
>>:-)
>>
>
>Of course, isnt everyone here a Troll?
>
No

73 de Jim, N2EY

800. Inside the Baxter Story, in his own words ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-22 02:30:19 UTC
From: Trebb@WebTV.Net
Message-ID: <61c26b4c.0301211830.105d4c0c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59932

Covering the latter-day, ham history of Glenn Baxter a/k/a K1MAN a/k/a IARN a/k/a AARU et al, the following exchange of emails is the definitive word on Baxter, his operations and his mental state.

Answering W4ASX editorials, today Baxter fired back. In the attachment which follows, we learn that he equates himself to Bill Gates and Ted Turner, that people in Dayton ask for his autograph, that AARU is a registered trademark and that www.K1MAN.com had 64,582 hits during the month of December. But more to the point: "My wife Bonnie says I am a narcissist."

Bonnie is on the money. DSM, the internationally accepted manual of mental disorders, defines narcissism as "An all-pervasive pattern of grandiosity (in fantasy or behavior), need for admiration or adulation and lack of empathy, usually beginning by early adulthood and present in variety of contexts."

We all have characteristics that track DSM, but the difference between an order and disorder is dysfunction. If the characteristics give rise to a "presenting problem," then the person is said to have a disorder.

Quite simply, the issue comes down to whether Glenn's narcissism is all pervasive, invading, penetrating, and molding every aspect, nook, and cranny of the personality, which is, granted, a subjective judgment.

The moment I witnessed the forays into foreign policy in Bougainville, I thought that line had been crossed. And now listening to Sam and Glenn talk about operations in Iraq, Jordan, Israel and Somalia, I know they've entered forbidden territory.

Their activity violates the Logan Act, which prevents private citizens from conducting foreign policy. Glenn's response: "And we have done some wild things around the world over the years. But in violation of the Logan Act? Come on Bob, who is deluded now?" In fact, Glenn embraces some of the same people we, worried about homeland security, oppose. Shouldn't a responsible leader be open, in the very least, to the possibility of adverse consequences?

As Brian, K3VR, who has compiled an amazing dossier on Baxter operations in the arena of foreign policy, writes: "Whether he is ill, naive, stupid, or a bona-fide spy, won't matter one iota to the agencies who have questions about his actions. They will want

satisfactory answers to significant questions." Our security demands no less.

As to his respected Wife's assessment of narcissistic mental state, Baxter drops one more hint in the attachment. "Anyway, I sent Bob the $25 and he said he never got it. It did not come back so, being paranoid, I figured Bob was stiffing me." Unbelievable, this after the closest working relationship where I had proved my honesty time and again. Characteristic of Baxter, he does not disclose in the attachment whether the $25 check ever came back, leaving, for the readers, that cloud of suspicion remaining, a classic Baxter tactic.

DSM identifies the narcissist as " 'interpersonally exploitive,' i.e., uses others to achieve his or her own ends." It gives us closeup insight into his apparent view of himself: of the omnipotent, worldwide, IARN Network with offices girding the globe engaged in missions befitting Mother Teresa, his views sought out by leaders of the free and non-free worlds as well as important media, such as the Wall Street Journal and major TV Networks.

We are left with an impression of grandeur, when, in fact, this is but one person, Glenn Baxter, and his Radio Shack recorder on timers and a loop. We would be less than honest if we didn't acknowledge a certain value in the production and distribution of such a bulletin.

To read the DSM criteria for narcissistic disorder is to gain full insight into Baxter. Having 5 of the following qualifies him: 1) Feels grandiose and self-importance (e.g., exaggerates achievements and talents to the point of lying, demands to be recognized as superior without commensurate achievements), 2) Is obsessed with fantasies of unlimited success, fame, fearsome power or omnipotence, unequaled brilliance ..., 3) Firmly convinced that he or she is unique and, being special, can only be understood by, should only be treated by, or associate with, other special or unique, or high-status people (or institutions), 4) Requires excessive admiration, adulation, attention and affirmation -- or, failing that, wishes to be feared and to be notorious (narcissistic supply), 5) Feels entitled. Expects unreasonable or special and favorable priority treatment. Demands automatic and full compliance with his or her expectations, 6) 'interpersonally exploitive' ..., 7) Devoid of empathy. Is unable or unwilling to identify with or acknowledge the feelings and needs of others, 8) Constantly envious of others or believes that they feel the same way about him or her, and 9) Arrogant, haughty behaviors or attitudes coupled with rage when frustrated, contradicted, or confronted."

Quoting Baxter: "He (meaning me) has been on Prozac for several years now and recently a mood regulator as well ... . While apparently making him happier, I now find Bob to be a different functioning human being with regard to his great intellectual abilities."

For sure, Glenn; thanks for the kudos. Deprakote, a mood regulator, prevents those leaps into grandiosity, bad judgment, irritable episodes, pressured speech. The intellect remains, albeit, for more productive pursuits. There isn't a person in my inner circle, including myself, who has failed to notice a vast change for the better. For some, Deprakote can be a miracle drug.

Consider it Glenn. Just a bit of harmless Deprakote can make you the achiever you've only imagined thus far.

Bob Sherin, W4ASX

In a message dated 1/21/03 9:59:55 AM Eastern Standard Time, K1MAN14275 writes:

Scroll to bottom se see Bob Sherin's epistles that prompted this K1MAN Editorial:

K1MAN Editorial - ED030121

Does Glenn Baxter Need Medical Treatment?

Bob Sherin, W4ASX, is a generally well meaning, intelligent, and kind man. He has been on Prozac for several years now and recently a mood regulator as well, according to what he tells us when he gets on 20 meters. While apparently making him happier, I now find Bob to be a different functioning human being with regard to his great intellectual abilities. The last time I talked with Bob on the phone he assumed that I, like him, had just gone through a nasty divorce. Not so, of course, since I have been happily married to my angel wife Bonnie (my first and only marriage) for 23 years now. We have no children.

Bob keeps bringing up Hurricane Andrew and the now world famous $25. IARN was indeed activated for Hurricane Andrew, and we had operators in parts of South Florida where the communications was out. No, I did not personally run down to Miami and hold Bob's hand.....I ran the net from Maine, as I always do during a large scale communications emergency. No, I have never asked Bob about his troubles since he resigned as an IARN Director. I am a busy man.

Regarding the $25, Bob said he made some phone calls and photo copies with regard to my appeal to the five FCC Commissioners and the bogus $3,600 in fines they mailed to me in the early 1990's The appeal was never addressed by the FCC, by the way, Real rebellious of me, right? Anyway, I sent Bob the $25 and he said he never got it. It did not come back, so, being paranoid, I figured Bob was stiffing me. I then sent him $50 and that made him happy for a while. Now, years later, he talks about it almost daily. Bob needs to let go. And it's "paltry" Bob, not "paultry."

When Riley Hollingsworth, FCC Special Counsel, sent me long letter in December 2001 (see www.arrl.org and search under K1MAN), saying, essentially, that K1MAN (and W1AW!) were now somehow illegal, I

responded that he, Riley, should request a refund from wherever it is that he claims to have attended law school. How else is one to respond to a guy who was sick on the day they taught law at law school?

IARN has had hundreds of volunteers since 1985, and there have been many who have dropped out over the years and even started splinter groups, some quite important such as Dave Larsen's (KK4WW) FAIRS, and Hap Holly's (KC9RP) RAIN (An acronym that I coined with Hap one day on 20 meters). Great! IARN continues to evolve and is now the IARN Amateur Radio Peace Corps Foundation, Inc. complete with 501(c)(3) status from the IRS. AARA is a registered trade mark with the U.S. Trade Mark and Patent Office, and www.K1MAN.com had 64,582 hits during the month of December, 2002.

We are just starting to get warmed up! Bob's diagnosis of me doing what I do for my own "self aggrandizement" is another way saying that I do what I do to "self actualize" in a healthy and natural way instead of feeling good about myself in a totally artificial manner by using drugs such as Prozac. My wife Bonnie says I am a narcissist. My Webster Collegiate Dictionary defines this as:

"Erotic feelings aroused by one's own body and personality."

Isn't this exactly what Prozac is supposed to do for you, Bob???? I deny the erotic part Bonnie AND Bob!! You want to hear about erotic? My wife Bommie arouses my erotic nature, big time! The radios just don't do that for me in quite the same way!

Bob goes on saying I am:

"Inauthentic, grandiose, voluable (I had to look that one up), paranoid, rebellious of authority and generally a threat to the well being of ham radio and homeland security."

I hope Bob doesn't charge me another $25 for the paranoid diagnosis and his recommendation that:

"....with treatment, he could clean up his act and make a genuine contribution without the overriding negative."

Here is how Webster defines paranoid:

"A chronic mental disorder characterized by systematized delusions of persecution and of one's own greatness, sometimes with hallucinations."

I can see it all now!

"Doctor, Riley is trying to shut down K1MAN! The ARRL ignores AARA and IARN. ND8V is a meanie to me on 14.275. Bob Sherin says that I am '....generally a threat to the well being of ham radio and homeland security.' K1TP's 14.313 Web Site (go to www.qrz.com

search under K1TP) is comparing me to Hiram Percy Maxim
who started ARRL and also invented the machine gun.....
etc., etc." By the time I got done talking ham radio
politics for a solid hour, the Doctor would either have
me forcefully sedated, confined in a straight jacket, or
else commit HIMSELF to our local mental hospital.

I might be well known by many hams. People at my banquet table at
Dayton always ask for my autograph.....that's a hoot, of course. And
we have done some wild things around the world over the years. But
in violation of the Logan Act? Come on Bob, who is deluded now?

Can AARA, the American Amateur Radio Association, inherit the role
of representing our precious hobby and service if ARRL goes down like
the Titanic or suffers the same fate as the Dinosaurs who once ruled
the earth? Sure.....this is America.....look at Microsoft over
shadowing IBM and look at CNN who had to sue to be allowed to cover
the White House. Ted Turner and Bill Gates sure as hell are not
modest, and they don't need to be "souped up" daily with Prozac!

As I said, Bob Sherin is a well meaning, kind, and intelligent man. I
have my own dysfunctions, to be sure. We all do. What the hell is
"normal" anyway? Let the free market forces of ideas determine how
my career continues to play itself out and what the fate of AARA and
IARN will be. This national and, indeed, international arena of free
ideas is a rough and tumble playing field and sometimes gets a little
nasty. I do what I have to do to get the job done. So does Bill
Gates and Ted Turner. This is America.......hellllllllllllooooo!!!!!

de K1MAN

Subj: Re: GRATEFUL
Date: 1/20/2003 10:33:59 AM Eastern Standard Time
From: BobSherin
To: K1MAN14275, rfburns@yahoo.com
CC: palmerjohn@sbcglobal.net, svoron@hotmail.com
CC: BobSherin

I really don't know which list this is but I do scan these emails with
interest. Having known Glenn since the 80s and being credited by
Glenn with constructing his legal defense, I am long on experience and
insight.

It goes without saying that an independent organization with its own
outlet to disseminate information has vast potential. Without
question many of the Glenn's activities have helped folks. And so,
the idea of ham radio and kids is surely worthwhile. If it weren't
for Glenn's history, many would join him; however, he has alienated
virtually everyone who has worked with him -- save for a few
exceptions.

Quite simply, many question his judgment. When you tinker with
foreign policy in Iraq et al. you have crossed the line into bad

judgment and pose a threat to Homeland Security. I know that Sam and Glenn see their actions as well meaning and maybe they are. But the Logan Act commands citizens to stay out of foreign policy, a law that Sam in Australia would have little knowledge of. Since Bougainville, I have been agahst at what I hear.

Two other incidents turned out conclusive as to my opinion. One was reimbursement of $25, a paultry sum one would relegate to insignificance. So when Glenn began tilting with me over this very simple and clear reimbursement, I knew there was some problem inside. (He eventually antied up.)

The second incident was the ultimate trier of fact for me. When Hurricane Andrew demolished our community here, I was perhaps 2nd in command (if anyone is in command there, other than Glenn). I knew that this is where we shine, so I awaited IARN. To date, it hasn't arrived, nor has Glenn ever inquired about the extent of damage and resurrection.

Thus, reality developed: that Mr. Baxter is in this for his own self aggrandizement. We all do things so that we will become better, but in Glenn's case it's this exagerrated sense of self importance. I have watched this "disorder" worsen over the years, as the text books tell us. He is inauthentic, grandiose, voluable, paranoid, rebellious of authority and generally a threat to the well being of ham radio and homeland security.

I do believe, with treatment, he could clean up his act and make a genuine contribution without the overriding negative. I write these "truths" at the risk of Glenn's threats notwithstanding firm foundation.

God bless you all,

Bob Sherin, W4ASX

Gentlemen, before we are overcome with mob mentality, let's step back and take a deep breath.

That's what I did, as I gathered my past journalism on Glenn Baxter and
the IARN to send to Brian, K3VR. Brian is involved in a major journalistic project on this subject which is worth reading. I had written two cover stories in January and February, 1989, and a follow-up
in March, 1989 that were published in Florida Skip Magazine.

Among other things in that dossier was an IARN accord with the Young Communist League of the then-Soviet Union. I must admit here and now, I
was an "official" participant.

Transfixed by mulling this earlier time, I lost myself in reading the record. Picking myself up, I began wondering how we've come to the present time in which we're accusing Baxter and his organization of nefarious conduct.

At the time of the Soviet initiative, we hams in the West were starved for communications with Soviet hams after having lived through the trigger-happy Cold War. So when the Armenian Earthquake struck and UB5WE, Victor from the Ukraine, came on announcing he could handle third
party traffic, everyone involved thought a watershed had arrived. The technicalities of obtaining permission paled to no consequence.

Ever since, Glenn Baxter has carried on this nonchalant attitude toward
what is essentially foreign policy. Bougainville, Somalia, Jordan, Israel and others. He, his organization and his associates are violating the Logan Act, which limits foreign policy to our federal government. At the sound of Bougainville, I took flight.

Glenn Baxter: Misguided, irresponsible, yes. But terrorist, no. Let's
survey his sincerity. When the cameras are running and the broadcast waves crackling, he is at his charismatic best. I sent several video tapes to him of me representing the network on Miami television during natural disasters. Though he vowed to return them, he hasn't.

We so advertised our emergency capability that when Andrew hit, demolishing my community and home, I awaited my leader. We had no food,
telephone, electricity, law enforcement. A week. Two weeks. A month.
Six months. To this day, Baxter has never as much as asked me a thing about it.

Like a magician, his total pre-occupation is the aggrandizement of his own image. One must listen with a wary ear and read with a wary eye lest the magic trick you. The U.S. Supreme Court did not hold that his
bulletins are legal, as he would have you believe. Rather the Court propounded the principle that once a thing is litigated, that decision is a bar to another suit on the same issue. Known in legal parlance as
res judicata, Baxter bootstrapped this principle and his bulletins, taking a giant leap. We are thus led to believe, the Supreme Court would annoint his bulletins, let alone busy itself with hearing an appeal on them. Nonsense.

In the 80s, the FCC declared, with some measure of formality, Baxter's broadcasts legal. But with the arrival of Riley Hollingsworth, Esq., our regulator at the FCC, Baxter and his bulletins have fallen under scrutiny again.

Hollingsworth mailed Baxter a certified letter on January 29, 2002 detailing the FCC's complaints. In it Baxter is warned concerning "complaints we are receiving about deliberate interference, threats against those who do not relinquish the frequencies for your use or who
would complain, or who have complained, erratic operation, broadcasting,
unauthorized tape recording and broadcast of telephone conversations, business use of an Amateur station and lack of station control ... ." Up to the time of this writing Baxter has failed and refused to comply.

Meanwhile, he continues enlarging his broadcasts. Hams, wanting to use the frequencies, are livid. Uncomprehending, Baxter sees some kind of plot against him, as well as an ARRL highly-paid agent behind it.

But Baxter's conduct is more sufferable. He's defaming Mr. Hollingsworth as nothing but a cheap crook, a claim this writer finds bold-faced slander and completely contrary to fact. As Americans, we cannot allow a well defined controversy to weaken the power of government nor to throw our community into anarchy.

The wheels are grinding on that letter of January 29, 2002. And when action is taken, Baxter will lose his ham radio license, this commentator predicts.

Bob Sherin, W4ASX

if(top.MLRead) top.MLRead._messageLoaded();

801. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-22 02:43:27 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E2E053D.55284A5D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 59933

Len Over 21 wrote:

> I don't attend the IEEE "big" functions, just the local group meetings
> of interest (published monthly in the IEEE Los Angeles Chapter
> newsletter, well in advance, usually...). None of the attendees seem
> to be involved in electronics, radio, or electric power as a hobby or
> even in guise of some mythical "service to their country" ("amateur
> radio is a SERVICE not a hobby!"). It is their WORK, an
> intellectual pursuit, a creative one, mentally stimulating and
> challenging, that is continually advancing the state of all electric
> and electronic arts.
>
> The "traditionalist" hams in here (Miccolis, Heil, Roll, even Brakob
> and Warren) continually dwell on the mythical "service" aspect as
> if amateur radio was some profound, noble, self-sacrificing service
> to humanity and that they are all somehow "superior" to ordinary
> mortals who do not possess an amateur radio license grant.

A participant in anything people desire to do is markedly superior to a mere wanna be. You'd prefere amateur radio to sink to your level rather than attempting to meet the qualifications for entry. Sad.

> As a
> result we get the continuing talk-downs, insults on the persons of
> those who do not buy into their fantasy or agree with their grande
> self-enobled opinions.

You mean you get the talk-downs and insults when you use terms like "fantasy" and "grand(e) self-enobled opinions". I feel your angst.

> No one can possibly ever be as good as
> they according to their own opinions, nor is anyone ever allowed
> any opposing opinions.

You've had opposing, though not broadly supported, opinions. The rest, you simply made up.

> What is interesting is that Miccolis jumped in here with some
> barbed comment on the IEEE membership. He does not appear
> on any IEEE membership search, yet he claims to be an
> "engineer" at an (unnamed) company engaged in electronics and
> working for hire there (definition of professional, work for pecuniary
> interest).

How is that interesting?

> I'm a Life Member of IEEE, meaning the total of my years of
> IEEE membership plus chronological age equals or exceeds
> 100 years. IEEE Life members do not pay dues yet have full
> voting, membership status, receive the monthly Spectrum
> membership magazine plus all other newsletters requested.

I'm a life member of the ARRL and a life member of QCWA. My number of years as a League member and my age total 93. The sum of my years as QCWA member and my age equals 68. Add the two together and you have 161. By odd coincidence, this is the number of power poles between Cameron and Bethlehem, West Virginia.

> Members of ARRL represent less than a quarter of all licensed
> US amateur radio licensees. ARRL membership is about half
> the number of IEEE members. ARRL is an organization of
> amateurs engaged in an avocational pursuit...IEEE is a
> worldwide professional organization.

The ARRL, of course, is an amateur radio organization. This is an amateur radio newsgroup. You are not a radio amateur.

Dave K8MN

802. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-22 02:47:02 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030121214702.16889.00000098@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 59934

In article <TFlX9.777020$P31.575275@rwcrnsc53>, "Jackie"
<buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>news:c2356669.0301211213.77b1459c@posting.google.com...
>
>> Two opinion questions for one and all:
>>
>> 1) Do you think the rules against on-air encryption by amateurs should
>> be relaxed or eliminated?
>
>Yeah! I love listening to those "numbers" stations on shortwave... the
>intrigue! The mystery! The... wait, what did you ask?? Oop, nevermind.

HAW!! That's a good one!

>
>> 2) Do you think the "commercial content" rules in Part 97 should be
>> relaxed or eliminated?
>
>No, because then people would be trying to find a way to sell their
>unsolicited crap on the air, too- like spam is to Usenet. Just another
>avenue for hucksters to try and push their inferior, otherwise-unsaleable
>junk off on the public.

Never thought of that one!

Seriously - that is a VERY good reason to keep the rules as they are. Before
long there would be "eBay of the air" and such. What a mess that would be!

73 de Jim, N2EY

803. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-22 02:47:03 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030121214703.16889.00000099@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 59935

In article <AAlX9.776069$WL3.766670@rwcrnsc54>, "Jackie"
<buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> writes:

>I maintain that the biggest hurdle to getting onto the HF bands is the COST.

See below.

>Code? That was no problem for me.

I think that what really bothers some folks about the code test is the fact
that it cannot be passed by simply reading a book, or spending lots of money on
one gadget or another. A Ph.D in EE will not get anyone out of the code test.
It acts as the Great Equalizer - which is why some people hate it so.

>It's those other things, like getting an
>HF rig, an antenna, a tuner, power supply, lightning arrestors, decent coax,
>mast, and a keyer- that make it difficult to get onto HF.

Not to mention a house without unreasonable restrictions to put it all on or
in.

>Not if you're
>wealthy, or have a lot of extra ka-ching laying around... but I don't quite
>fit into that category.

Same for most of us.

One solution is used or homebrewed equipment - but that takes another couple
layers of know-how and experience. Plus time.
>
>Lucky for me, this coming weekend, a very nice local elmer is going to lend
>me some of his spare radio equipment to try out for a bit... the
>antenna-raisin' party is this Saturday in my backyard!

GREAT!!!!

>Bring your Bertha
>torches folks; it's mighty cold 'round here and the ground, she's frozen
>solid (but there is STILL no snow! What a gyp for us cross-country skiing
>lovers)... I think I'll just strap the 5-band vertical to the deck, throw
>some big sheets of spare chicken-wire under the deck to use as a makeshift
>counterpoise, and make do until spring. What the heck? If I can work some DX
>with that set-up, I'll think of myself as a REAL amateur radio operator!
>
The chicken-wire idea will do fine - just be sure to make decent electrical
connections.

I use a propane torch with solder-iron attachment for antenna work. Does the trick in any weather.

Congrats and good luck! If you want to try out CW, let me know.

73 de Jim, N2EY

804. Re: This Is How KB1HMW "Supports" Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-22 02:47:04 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030121214704.16889.00000100@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 59936

In article <v2r7vv22g14o43@corp.supernews.com>, "KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com>
writes:

>N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>news:c2356669.0301210910.79b1960a@posting.google.com...
>> vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
>news:<20030119195116.04110.00000065@mb-fr.aol.com>...
>> > N2EY wrote:
>> > >>Lets not get personal.
>> > >>
>> > >Then start by not making fun of hams.
>> >
>> > I went a little overboard at times, even today.
>>
>> True.
>>
>> > I know that Hams are basically
>> > good people.
>>
>> Good to see you recognize that.
>
>Right on! (can't tell I'm out of the 60's can you ;^)

Groovy! I mean, that cat's farrrrr-out!!
>
>> >I will try to be more sensitive.
>>
>> How about logical, too?
>
>Don't ask for to much this is Vipul after all.

I must have lost my head.

>> Question: Why all the white space between that last sentence and the
>> next?
>>
>> (25+ lines of white space deleted)
>
>He likes to do that. I think it's some sort of a bandwidth test.
>
Or perhaps an attempt to hide something.
>>
>> --
>> > --------------
>> > Sadly, amateur radio lead to my demise.

>>
>> How did you post here, then? "Demise" indicates that you're dead.
>
>I didn't know they have NewGoups over on the "other side"! = O
>
Indeed.
>>
>> > I could not see the light at the end of
>> > the tunnel.
>
>He should have taken his sunglasses off first before going in.
>
>> It was the longer pathway. I was too impatient and chose the
>> > shorter pathway.
>>
>> What the HECK is that supposed to mean?
>
>He is paraphrasing Star Wars in it's "giving in to the Dark Side"
>It sounds like ARS is the "Force" and CB is the "Dark Side".

Lessee, K0HB is Han(s). Who would be Darth Vader?

>Kinda funny Vipul talking like that and then badmouthing the
>ARS for it's "Code Words" and such. If that ain't a type of
>code word nothing is!

Well, there you have it.

>> >Then, the train ran me over.
>
>I'll bet that hurt!

It's not the train's fault if Vioul got in the way.

> My daughter got hit by a train once.
>She spent a week in the hospital but came out ok.
>(Just a little extra metel in her head now, that she
>didn't have before)

Lucky to be alive!

>But that might explain Vipul's logic.

Or lack thereof.

>> Railroads in the USA are private private property. If you are in a
>> railroad tunnel, you're trespassing.
>
>Mongo not know. Mongo only pawn in game of life.
>
(moment of silence for dear departd N0BK)

Candygram for Mongo!

>> > I had a chance to sell out (to "CB"). I did not take it. As a result, I
>did
>> > not get my amateur radio or CB.
>>
>> It's your choice.
>> >
>> > It looks like the path I chose will lead me to leave amateur radio. I
>will
>> > ponder and reflect. I may still keep my radio as a diversion.
>>
>> --
>> > ---------------
>
>Sometimes your the windshield, sometimes your the bug!

Some folks don't have the sense to come in out of the rain, or to keep their
mouths closed when birdwatching and the flock flies directly overhead...
>
>> > The terms tunnel, train, ran, CB are metaphors. (Its something totally
>> > different than CB, but using CB illustrates "selling out").
>>
>> Why not just write what happened? Leave out the white space and
>> metaphors, and just tell the facts.
>
>That's to easy, we wouldn't have to guess that way.

Plain, clear English. Watta concept!
>
>>Were you operating HF illegally?
>
>I'd bet on it! I'd say he still might be.
>
That would explain a lot! He did say he was on HF.

73 de Jim, N2EY

805. Re: FCC tells ... whatever

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-22 02:49:18 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030121214918.14519.00000286@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 59937

>>Of course, isnt everyone here a Troll?
>>
>No
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Then what are you doing here?

806. Re: Lets face it ... we're just communicators.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-22 02:56:31 UTC
From: Steve Fleckenstein <spfleck@citlink.net>
Message-ID: <v2s24gr9istt76@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 59938

```
| I've seen/heard much of those individuals involved directly
| with all those emergencies/disasters...not a word on "hams."

ham's are out there doing their thing but it is no longer a newsworthy item.

Ask any ARES / RACES member who did duty for 9-11.

If it wasn't for emergency comms provided by ARES/RACES groups there would
be no excuse to give contesters all that bandwidth and the FCC would auction
it off in a new york minute.
```

807. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-22 03:04:51 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030121220451.27873.00000114@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 59939

In article <3E2E053D.55284A5D@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>I'm a life member of the ARRL and a life member of QCWA. My number of
>years as a League member and my age total 93. The sum of my years as
>QCWA member and my age equals 68. Add the two together and you have
>161.

Hmmm....

Total up my age (48), my years as a licensed ham (35), years as an ARRL member
(34), years as a BSEE (26), years as an MSEE (10), years working in jobs
related to electrical engineering (30) years as a homeowner (24), and you get
207.

73 de Jim, N2EY

808. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-22 03:14:20 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <g0oX9.5560$bL4.546819@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 59940

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

:
: It acts as the Great Equalizer - which is why some people hate it so.
:

Ah, yes, we must have an Equalizer!!!! Shades of Diana Moon Glompers!
Damn, Jim, I expected MUCH better of you. Surely you don't dismiss the
lessons of Harrison Bergeron?

Equalizer, INDEED!

Gawd, I think I'm gonna be sick.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

809. Re: This Is How KB1HMW "Supports" Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-22 03:41:13 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030121224113.06736.00000129@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 59941

>From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
>>I will try to be more sensitive.
>
>How about logical, too?

I am logical. How about K4YZ? He can't even tell the difference between information and policy. That's illogical.

>How did you post here, then? "Demise" indicates that you're dead.
Not dead, but wounded.

>> I could not see the light at the end of
>> the tunnel. It was the longer pathway. I was too impatient and chose the
>> shorter pathway.
>
>What the HECK is that supposed to mean?

I wanted amateur radio instead of something else. If I chose the other item, I could have amateur radio later. Obviously I did not know this at the time. I know this now. I chose amateur radio and ended up with neither.

>>Then, the train ran me over.
The train is the system. (Another metaphor).

From: "KB9TMP"
>> > I could not see the light at the end of
>> > the tunnel.
>
>He should have taken his sunglasses off first before going in.
That's true. The signs were there all around me. If I didn't have those sunglasses on, I would be able to see it. The problem was that I thought it was me, when it was everyone. So, I did not take the sunglasses off. Had I done that, I may have changed my plans.

This thing could be right out of the twilight zone. Unfortunately it actually did happen to me (and similar circumstances happened to a lot of other people). I was playing a high stakes game. I am not a gambler, but when ur in the situation, you MUST gamble. The thing is even with the best of intentions one may suffer the consequences.

810. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-22 04:02:51 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030121230251.03858.00000297@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 59943

In article <c2356669.0301210936.5be8a051@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>If you add up my age, years as a licensed ham, years as an ARRL
>member, and years as a degreed EE, the total comes out in excess of
>150.

Is that why they call you "Old Man" on the radio?

73 de Larry, K3LT

811. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-22 04:02:52 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030121230252.03858.00000298@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 59944

In article <v2r6mbtlia7pba@corp.supernews.com>, "KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com>
writes:

>Oh well! You know you can't have everything in life,
>where would you put it all?
>
>BTW I had a real nice QSO today with Larry K3LT on
>20 meters this afternoon. We did 3 modes 2 of which I had
>never tried before. The PSK31 worked good but we also
>tried out RTTY (new to me) and Hellschriber (new to both
>of us) and you can ask Larry the last one is a rather nice
>mode to work.
>
>Ya want to know something else? Larry's a pretty nice guy
>for being the rabid PCTA that everyone thinks he is! ;^)
>
>Thanks for the QSO Larry!!

The pleasure was all mine, Bill! You're QSL card is in the mail!

73 de Larry, K3LT

812. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-22 04:02:52 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030121230252.03858.00000299@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 59945

In article <c2356669.0301211213.77b1459c@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>Two opinion questions for one and all:
>
>1) Do you think the rules against on-air encryption by amateurs should
>be relaxed or eliminated?

Nope. Everything we send should be totally "in the clear." Without this rule, there's too much opportunity for hams to misbehave in a variety of ways hitherto not experienced on the bands.

>2) Do you think the "commercial content" rules in Part 97 should be
>relaxed or eliminated?

Nope. I personally don't want to be listening to commercials for Gold Bond foot powder and the Craft Matic adjustable bed on my local repeater. Bad enough I have to listen to them on the AM broadcast band during the Rush Limbaugh program. This is Amateur Radio. Let it be forever thus.

73 de Larry, K3LT

813. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-22 04:02:53 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030121230253.03858.00000300@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 59946

In article <20030121185700.05141.00000065@mb-fz.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>>: Two opinion questions for one and all:
>>:
>>: 1) Do you think the rules against on-air encryption by amateurs should
>>: be relaxed or eliminated?
>>
>>No. Do you?
>
>No. Absolutely not.

Ditto. Everything we hams send should be totally "in the clear."

>>: 2) Do you think the "commercial content" rules in Part 97 should be
>>: relaxed or eliminated?
>>:
>>
>>No. Do you?
>
>No. Absolutely not.

Ditto again. If we changed that rule, we wouldn't be "Amateur Radio" anymore, would we? Personally, I don't want to be listening to commercials on my local repeater!

>Current rules are adequate for today's ARS in both cases.
>
>What do others think?

I think you're right. The only thing that needs to be fixed is to undo the Restructuring and bring more meaningful licensing requirements back into the system.

73 de Larry, K3LT

814. Fantastic QSO! (Was: Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-22 04:02:53 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030121230253.03858.00000301@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 59947

In article <20030120213134.00111.00000242@mb-mv.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>
>How about 1700 UTC tomorrow (Tuesday, Jan 21) on 20 meters? I'm
>not sure what a proper frequency for Hellschreiber would be; let's start
>around 14.080 unless you have a better idea! If you want, we can first
>establish contact in RTTY and QSY to Hellschreiber. E-mail me with
>your preference. Looking forward to our QSO!
>
>73 de Larry, K3LT

Bill:

I just want to say here in the NG that I really enjoyed our FANTASTIC PSK-31, Hellschreiber, and RTTY QSO! It was a real blast! I also enjoyed the screen shot you sent of my Hellschreiber signal from your end -- I am absolutely flabbergasted at how well it printed considering the puny power and my 35-cent, ten-year old, indoor dipole! This was REAL ham radio in action, my friend! It was also great talking to you over the phone and being able to associate a voice with a call sign among my fellow rrap participants!

All of this made my think about how great it would be to have digital QSO's with all the rest of the rrap NG participants! Anyone interested? I'm available all day Sunday, each weekday after 2300Z, and all day Tuesdays. I have MixW 2.06 digital mode software, and can work you on PSK31, RTTY, Hellschreiber, AMTOR, and, naturally, CW! Let's do it!

73 de Larry, K3LT

815. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-22 04:37:15 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E2E1FFB.502B0D74@earthlink.net>
Source record: 59948

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3E2E053D.55284A5D@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >I'm a life member of the ARRL and a life member of QCWA. My number of
> >years as a League member and my age total 93. The sum of my years as
> >QCWA member and my age equals 68. Add the two together and you have
> >161.
>
> Hmmm....
>
> Total up my age (48), my years as a licensed ham (35), years as an ARRL member
> (34), years as a BSEE (26), years as an MSEE (10), years working in jobs
> related to electrical engineering (30) years as a homeowner (24), and you get
> 207.

Len keeps getting trumped.

Dave K8MN

816. Re: Lets face it ... we're just communicators.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-22 05:23:29 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b0m6at3184m@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 59863

(snippage)
> >
> >Soem of us are even Red Cross 1st aid/CPR instructors.
>
> Brian:
>
> Don't get me started on Red Cross 1st Aid/CPR instructors! I think
they're
> the biggest bunch of baloon-headed egomaniacs in the world -- and they
> are almost as dangerous as Ham Hero (tm) wannabes! They keep
> emphasizing that you MUST receive your CPR refresher training on an
> annual basis, you MUST carry your current CPR qualification card, you
> MUST do this, you MUST do that, and most importantly, you MUST
> glorify and venerate your local CPR instructor as a God of Lifesaving.

WRONG LARRY! I am not aware of the laws in your state, but the Good Samaritan Laws of my state dictate that if you render aid to someone else, as long as you act up to the level of your training and not otherwise negligent in other actions you are in a better shape if there is some type of lawsuit. I say this because when doing CPR, there is a great possibility of injury to ribs etc. due to the force applied to the chest.

With refresher training, what is wrong with that?

As far as carrying the card on you..... that may be a false statement as I have never been asked directly for my card, but may if a case ever goes to court. There is a case where you better have it with you.

Glorifying and venerate a instructor as a God of Lifesaving??? Where the hell did you pull this one out of?? About the only way I consider any of that what so ever is if I have had an awesome instructor who had a great knack for teaching, as this applies to any class taken, not just CPR. This is a skill that should be respected, not discouraged. As far as putting them that high on a pedestal, I would love to know who put that idea in your head.

> After completing my own First Aid/CPR Instructor training many years ago
> while stationed in Germany, I came to the conclusion that I wasn't going
> to adopt the mandatory asshole posture with my students.

But that seems to be okay to have that here eh? That actually was a good attitude to have with your students. People are more receptive that way.

I just taught
> them how to do basic First Aid/CPR and let it go at that.

That would be the basic function of an instructor. Those that "got it" quicker than the others would require less of your attention than those that might be having a problem with certain areas. This applies to jsut about any teaching.

If they encounter
> someone choking to death, or not breathing, or WHATEVER, I don't want
> them to think they have to stand by and let someone die just because it
> has been more than 12 months since their last refresher class!

Common sense would hopefully dictate actions in that regard. (In an ideal world that is....)

Nobody
> is going to get sued for trying to help -- that just doesn't happen!

Well... beg to differ as I can dig up (with a little time) plenty of cases of where people got sued (or named in a suit at least) here in Michigan alone. Whether or not the suit was sucessful or not is a different story.

As far as training goes, I am all for it. After all, if you are going to have a situation ever in the future where you required emergency care, would you wish for someone who pursued minimal training or "barely passing results?" I would think not, as if I was in that situation, I would wish for the person(s) with the best training. Refresher courses help to keep those skills active as well as there are some changes from time to time in training that a person should be made aware of.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

"Symbolism is for the simple minded....."

817. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-22 05:50:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030122005047.05514.00000096@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 59851

In article <20030121230253.03858.00000300@mb-ba.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>I think you're right. The only thing that needs to be fixed is to undo
>the Restructuring and bring more meaningful licensing requirements
>back into the system.

Go catch that bus, Larrah...you're late again!

818. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-22 05:50:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030122005047.05514.00000095@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 59950

In article <3E2DFF8D.DEF6E25A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> Why is it "necessary to work DX?"
>
>It isn't necessary for you to work DX.

"US Amateur radio is all about 'working DX on HF with CW."

>> With a ham license (an
>> amateur radio license grant, that is...). I did that a half
>> century ago on a 24/7 basis as part of ACAN, without any
>> license whatsoever.
>
>Whoopty-do.

Poor baby...all you got was some postings at some 3rd
world embassy..."using CW on an RTTY circuit as an
'order-wire.'"

>> Why is it "necessary" to demonstrate OOK CW skills in order
>> to "work DX on HF?"
>
>> Do you have any sane, rational reason
>> other than the obviously-political need for that in a HOBBY?
>
>It certainly isn't necessary with tropical fish or stamp collecting.
>Right now, the regs require it for HF amateur radio. Anything which
>proves to be a stumbling block for you is "obviously-political".

Oh? Everyone seems to be saying US amateur radio
"is a SERVICE!"

Are you now relenting from mumbling a mantra? :-)

Is everyone supposed to take up CW to be "politically
correct?!?"

819. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-22 05:50:48 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030122005048.05514.00000097@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 59949

In article <g0oX9.5560$bL4.546819@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
<kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
>: It acts as the Great Equalizer - which is why some people hate it so.
>
>Ah, yes, we must have an Equalizer!!!! Shades of Diana Moon Glompers!
>Damn, Jim, I expected MUCH better of you. Surely you don't dismiss the
>lessons of Harrison Bergeron?

He's too busy thanking for all the fish...

>Equalizer, INDEED!

Absolutely! Wild West thing and all that...J-38 six-gun!

>Gawd, I think I'm gonna be sick.

I TOLD you not to drink the water from that icehole...!

820. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-22 06:31:25 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E2E3A89.FD2DAEC4@earthlink.net>
Source record: 59852

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E2DFF8D.DEF6E25A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >> Why is it "necessary to work DX?"
> > >
> > >It isn't necessary for you to work DX.
> >
> > "US Amateur radio is all about 'working DX on HF with CW."

That leaves you out, doesn't it. You don't know morse and you aren't a
ham.

> >> With a ham license (an
> >> amateur radio license grant, that is...). I did that a half
> >> century ago on a 24/7 basis as part of ACAN, without any
> >> license whatsoever.
> > >
> > >Whoopty-do.
> >
> > Poor baby...all you got was some postings at some 3rd
> > world embassy..."using CW on an RTTY circuit as an
> > 'order-wire.'"

I'm neither poor nor a baby. Do your homework. I had two postings in
Finland, a non-third world country. I had four African postings. During
one of them, I used CW. You continue to attempt to equate your military
experience with amateur radio.

> >> Why is it "necessary" to demonstrate OOK CW skills in order
> >> to "work DX on HF?"
> > >
> > >> Do you have any sane, rational reason
> > >> other than the obviously-political need for that in a HOBBY?
> > >
> > >It certainly isn't necessary with tropical fish or stamp collecting.
> > >Right now, the regs require it for HF amateur radio. Anything which
> > >proves to be a stumbling block for you is "obviously-political".
> >
> > Oh? Everyone seems to be saying US amateur radio
> > "is a SERVICE!"

How does your comment relate to the above?

> Are you now relenting from mumbling a mantra? :-)

I don't mumble.

> Is everyone supposed to take up CW to be "politically
> correct?!?"

Pay attention. You brought up the peculiar "obviously-political"
comment.

Dave K8MN

821. Re: A famous 75 Meter personality has returned !!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-22 08:45:04 UTC
From: Dave <kji@liberty.net>
Message-ID: <v2smgobd3rsf0b@news.supernews.com>
Source record: 59853
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

I heard it...old NX gave kaydee 5 tea aye a radio whipping that almost made
me feel sorry for the guy.

Watch your step BLB or suffer the wrath of zero T.

"belcher" <derelstom@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:3e2b165e@snipnews.snip.net...
> Well, last night I was looking for the Liberty
> Net. Could not find them anyplace. The band
> was packed solid from 3.940 thru 3.970
> so I guess I's just forget about them and listen
> to k5blb and his group on 3.947.9 - when
> out of the blue a MIRACLE occurred.....
>
> I hear someone with an s-5 signal ranting in
> the background...he's going on and on and
> on in a tirade....quoting bible verses...making
> non-sensible rhymes.....talking to himself...and
> others.........like a demented Energizer Bunny
> on Crack or Speed.........
>
> No......!!!!......Yes......???........CAN IT REALLY
> BE???.....YES!!....OH SWEET JEEZUS STRAPPED
> DOWN ON A ROCKET POWERED SLED AT THE
> BONNEVILLE SALTFLATS.........IT...IS...REALLY..
> .....HIM.......WOOOOO...HOOOOOO!!!!!!!!!!!!!
>
> I nearly fell out of the chair. I had to pinch myself to
> be sure I was awake. Was it live or was it Memorex?
> No......IT'S REALLY HIM.....Hams of 75 meters
> and beyond........get ready once again people...for HAM
> RADIO FUN in it's ultra-purest virgin Bertolli olive-oil
> form.....because...(hope your sitting down reading this folks)...
>
> N X 0 T HAS RETURNED TO THE AIRWAVES !!!!!!!!
>
> Yes...I mean that NX0T people - the one and only!
>
> Jone was one of the few would drive David - WA9KJI absolutely
> INSANE and turn whatever frequency they bumped heads
> upon - into one big gigantic sandbox filled with 5 year-olds
> on a chocolate and sugartit high that made even the best days
> of the infamous "Mike and Judy Show" pale by comparason.
>

> Please, PLEASE will somebody please tell KJI that his old pal "NX" is
> back on 75 meters and was tearin up BLB's crew a new
> bunghole on 47.9 last night. Rest assured we ain't heard the last
> of our pal John folks! (I'm so happy over this development folks that
> I could just shit in my BVD's)
>
> WELCOME BACK JOHN!! We missed ya boy!
> Please get back in there and up on 14.275 to "straighten
> things out" (KJI bounces back in-between 275 and 313
> please be sure to say "hello" to him sometime)
>
>
>
>

822. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-22 09:43:14 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030122044314.01441.00000130@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 59854

>Subject: Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 1/21/03 8:43 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3E2E053D.55284A5D@earthlink.net>

After Scumbag Lennie said:

>> As a
>> result we get the continuing talk-downs, insults on the persons of
>> those who do not buy into their fantasy or agree with their grande
>> self-enobled opinions.

Dave folowed with:

>You mean you get the talk-downs and insults when you use terms like
>"fantasy" and "grand(e) self-enobled opinions". I feel your angst.

Actually, the talk-downs come after being called "thug", "Nazi",
"jackboot", "elitist", etc etc etc by Lennie. Can't imagine how Lennie can show
his twisted little face after making such slurs and then claiming to be a rear
area war hero on the honor of American KIA's.

Putz to the n'th degree.

And that's my LIBERAL opinion.

73

Steve, K4YZ

823. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-22 09:48:55 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030122044855.01441.00000131@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 59855

>Subject: Re: NR-1 Book
>From: "Kï¿½HB" kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG
>Date: 1/21/03 11:20 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <kjfX9.4413$Sv3.475131@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>

>Must be a damned slow news day at Newington! The book has nothing whatever
>to do with Amateur Radio.

Thanks for the update, Lennie.

Steve, K4YZ

824. Re: This Is How KB1HMW "Supports" Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-22 09:58:54 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030122045854.01441.00000132@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 59856

>Subject: Re: This Is How KB1HMW "Supports" Amateur Radio
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 1/21/03 9:41 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030121224113.06736.00000129@mb-cv.aol.com>

>>From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
>>>I will try to be more sensitive.
>>
>>How about logical, too?
>
>I am logical. How about K4YZ? He can't even tell the difference between
>information and policy. That's illogical.

One cannot formulate policy without being informed, Vipul. THAT'S common sense.

>>How did you post here, then? "Demise" indicates that you're dead.

>Not dead, but wounded

Be still my heart.

>>> I could not see the light at the end of
>>> the tunnel. It was the longer pathway. I was too impatient and chose the
>>> shorter pathway.
>>
>>What the HECK is that supposed to mean?
>
>I wanted amateur radio instead of something else. If I chose the other item,
>I
>could have amateur radio later. Obviously I did not know this at the time. I
>know this now. I chose amateur radio and ended up with neither.

And Vipul says >>I<< am "illogical"...!

>>>Then, the train ran me over.

>The train is the system. (Another metaphor)

If you have to explain it....

>Had I done that, I may have changed my plans.

Simple fix, Vipul...Write "CANCEL" across the front of your license and mail it to Gettysburg. They'll take it from there. THEN stop posting to a newsgroup for a radio service for which you obviously have no interest or respect. Lastly, go to one of those "ham" fests and sell whatever Amateur Radio gear you possess and be done with it.

>This thing could be right out of the twilight zone. Unfortunately it actually
>did happen to me (and similar circumstances happened to a lot of other
>people).
>I was playing a high stakes game. I am not a gambler, but when ur in the
>situation, you MUST gamble. The thing is even with the best of intentions one
>may suffer the consequences.

Did anyone make any sense out of this?

Steve, K4YZ

825. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-22 10:02:35 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030122050235.01441.00000133@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 59857

>Subject: Re: NR-1 Book
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
>Date: 1/22/03 3:48 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030122044855.01441.00000131@mb-mk.aol.com>
>
>>Subject: Re: NR-1 Book
>>From: "Kï¿½HB" kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG
>>Date: 1/21/03 11:20 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <kjfX9.4413$Sv3.475131@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
>
>>Must be a damned slow news day at Newington! The book has nothing whatever
>>to do with Amateur Radio.
>
> Thanks for the update, Lennie.

OOOOOOOPS! My mistake. I just read the text and BOY, it sure SOUNDED
like Lennie!

Steve, K4YZ

826. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-22 11:36:45 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030122063645.27873.00000120@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 59858

In article <20030120141432.05773.00000092@mb-df.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

KB9TMP wrote:
>
>>I believe there is a good reason for keeping at least a 5WPM code
>>requirement for access to the HF bands.
>
>HF does not need code to transmit.

Nor does it take much technical knowledge, either. Hams today can buy everything they need for an HF station already manufactured, complete with instructions for assembly and use. Why should they have to learn all sorts of technical stuff to get the license?

A ham who just wants to operate CW on 3520 kHz has to pass three separate written tests covering a wide variety of technical and regulatory subjects. Most of those subjects are not needed to operate CW on 3520, but the tests must be passed anyway. Why?

>What is the "good reason" to keep the code requirement?

Here's one. There are lots more:

- It's a test of a skill widely used by hams. (Have you ever listened to the CW/digital parts of the HF ham bands?)

FCC doesn't agree, and the 5 wpm code test will probably disappear soon after the treaty changes. Until then, we're stuck with the code test.

N2EY

827. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-22 11:36:46 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030122063646.27873.00000121@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 59859

In article <g0oX9.5560$bL4.546819@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
>:
>: It acts as the Great Equalizer - which is why some people hate it so.
>:
>
>Ah, yes, we must have an Equalizer!!!! Shades of Diana Moon Glompers!
>Damn, Jim, I expected MUCH better of you. Surely you don't dismiss the
>lessons of Harrison Bergeron?
>
>Equalizer, INDEED!
>
>Gawd, I think I'm gonna be sick.

You misunderstand, Hans.

The "Equalizer" effect is simply that a prospective ham is not likely to have learned Morse elsewhere, and has to demonstrate his/her skill on an EQUAL basis with others, in an objective test. It's about equality of requirements.

Harrison Bergeron was about equality of result. Anybody with greater talent was handicapped down to the common level.

Perhaps I can state it another way:

One of the most common arguments against code testing I have read here is from people who list their accomplishments in non-amateur radio as some sort of reason why they should not be required to pass a Morse test. As if those accomplishments somehow made them experts at amateur radio and above the rest of us mere mortals. Their argument boiled down to this: Since they had credential X in non-amateur radio, they should not be required to learn something they didn't want to learn in order to get an amateur radio license.

Sorry if you were offended. I calls 'em as I sees 'em. I'm not electropolitically correct.

73 de Jim, N2EY

828. Re: Lets face it ... we're just communicators.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-22 12:49:34 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301220449.7a600a25@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59860

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<b0jfqr3q2l@enews1.newsguy.com>...
> (snippage)
>
> > Soem of us are even Red Cross 1st aid/CPR instructors.
>
>
> Now here is a point I believe in no matter what..... I beleive that most
> every person out there should know basic first aid, as well as CPR,
> regardless of what they are doing, radio related or not. Instructor status
> is great but at least having a basic functional knowledge of those skills is
> a positive asset to anyone.

Yup.

829. Re: Lets face it ... we're just communicators.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-22 12:56:27 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301220456.31c91100@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59861

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030120213133.00111.00000240@mb-mv.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0301201625.1667a639@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >> In times past Los Angeles City Civil Defense cross-trained each and
> >> every ham radio volunteer in other disaster-related specialties and
> >> we were far more than "radio-based message passers", capable of
> >> originating the message or acting upon it in addition to passing it
> >> competently.
> >>
> >> Don't kid YOURSELF - it can be done.
> >>
> >> ---
> >> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
> >
> >Soem of us are even Red Cross 1st aid/CPR instructors.
>
> Brian:
>
> Don't get me started on Red Cross 1st Aid/CPR instructors!

I didn't. You're a self-starter.

I think they're
> the biggest bunch of baloon-headed egomaniacs in the world -- and they
> are almost as dangerous as Ham Hero (tm) wannabes! They keep
> emphasizing that you MUST receive your CPR refresher training on an
> annual basis, you MUST carry your current CPR qualification card, you
> MUST do this, you MUST do that, and most importantly, you MUST
> glorify and venerate your local CPR instructor as a God of Lifesaving.

If you want to say you are American Red Cross trained, YOU MUST follow
their rules. If you let your license lapse, its on you.

> After completing my own First Aid/CPR Instructor training many years ago
> while stationed in Germany, I came to the conclusion that I wasn't going
> to adopt the mandatory asshole posture with my students.

I'm unfamiliar with the mandatory a$$hole posture. Is that where the
instructor says he's an Amateur Extra?

I just taught
> them how to do basic First Aid/CPR and let it go at that. If they encounter
> someone choking to death, or not breathing, or WHATEVER, I don't want
> them to think they have to stand by and let someone die just because it

> has been more than 12 months since their last refresher class! Nobody
> is going to get sued for trying to help -- that just doesn't happen!

Exactly. And the ARC doesn't want to get sued either. That's why
they want you to have current CPR training. I'm suprised that your
current employer doesn't require you to have the training also.

Too bad the ARS doesn't require periodic training and recertification.

830. Re: FCC tells ... whatever

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-22 13:06:17 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301220506.49cfedd7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59862

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030119234926.16177.00000184@mb-mo.aol.com>...
> >Bruce, please don't agree with me then tack on your hick philosophy as
>
> The Hick philosopy, was for your benefit,

It's not working.

the part of OHIO you live in is full
> of HICKS

There couldn't be that many. There's one less since you moved to
Louisianna, and it's made a huge difference. So go suck some crawdad
heads, intimidate some women, then fire up your CB and brag about
both.

Brian

831. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-22 13:53:49 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0301220553.2e305963@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59864

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030121230251.03858.00000297@mb-ba.aol.com>...
> In article <c2356669.0301210936.5be8a051@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> (N2EY) writes:
>
> >If you add up my age, years as a licensed ham, years as an ARRL
> >member, and years as a degreed EE, the total comes out in excess of
> >150.
>
> Is that why they call you "Old Man" on the radio?

HAW! That's a GOOD one!

But they were calling me "OM" at the age of 13. One of those
traditional things.

Say, Larry, you can play the "years" game, too. Add up your age, years
as a licensed ham, years of military service, years with a bachelor's
degree, years with a driver's license, years with a CDL, years as an
ARRL member, plus any other years you find usable and see what the
total is.

73 de Jim, N2EY

832. Re: FCC tells ... whatever

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-22 13:56:32 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030122085632.20005.00000287@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 59865

>There couldn't be that many. There's one less since you moved to
>Louisianna, and it's made a huge difference.

I didnt live in your Corn Belt, Sheep struck part of Ohio. I understand that the best looking women in your part of OHIO are Guernseys.

>So go suck some crawdad
>heads, intimidate some women, then fire up your CB and brag about
>both.
>
>Brian
>

You just wish you could. Oh by the way hows that really tough giveaway EXTRA comming?

833. Re: FCC tells ... whatever

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-22 14:23:09 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030122092309.06501.00000123@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 59866

>Subject: Re: FCC tells ... whatever
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 1/22/03 7:06 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0301220506.49cfedd7@posting.google.com>

>There couldn't be that many. There's one less since you moved to
>Louisianna, and it's made a huge difference. So go suck some crawdad
>heads, intimidate some women, then fire up your CB and brag about
>both.

Something we can whoelheartedly agree upon! Ohio had enough problems
without a creep like Loosie Brucie lowering the Gene Pool Curve.

73

Steve, K4YZ

834. Re: FCC tells ... whatever

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-22 15:06:50 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030122100650.20480.00000262@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 59867

>Something we can whoelheartedly agree upon! Ohio had enough problems
>without a creep like Loosie Brucie lowering the Gene Pool Curve.
>
>73
>
>Steve, K4YZ
>
Steve Tenn could do alot of good for its people by throwing your Butt out.
Little Stevie why do you keep reading stuff about me. Are you in love with me
Stevie? I hate to disapoint you Stevie, but I dont go that way, maybe you
should contact Brian, maybe he could help you out.

835. Re: This Is How KB1HMW "Supports" Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-22 15:39:14 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v2teogh64popb9@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 59868

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030122045854.01441.00000132@mb-mk.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: This Is How KB1HMW "Supports" Amateur Radio
> >From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
> >Date: 1/21/03 9:41 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20030121224113.06736.00000129@mb-cv.aol.com>

<SNIP>

> >Had I done that, I may have changed my plans.
>
> Simple fix, Vipul...Write "CANCEL" across the front of your license
and
> mail it to Gettysburg. They'll take it from there. THEN stop posting to
a
> newsgroup for a radio service for which you obviously have no interest or
> respect. Lastly, go to one of those "ham" fests and sell whatever Amateur
> Radio gear you possess and be done with it.
>

Steve, I've told Vipul that a couple of times and he just don't understand
it!

> >This thing could be right out of the twilight zone. Unfortunately it
actually
> >did happen to me (and similar circumstances happened to a lot of other
> >people).
> >I was playing a high stakes game. I am not a gambler, but when ur in the
> >situation, you MUST gamble. The thing is even with the best of intentions
one
> >may suffer the consequences.
>
> Did anyone make any sense out of this?

Nope, and I don't think Vipul could understand it either, AND HE WROTE IT!

>
> Steve, K4YZ

Vipul is proving Albert Einstein's lesser know theory true;
"Only two things are infinite, the universe and human stupidity,
and I'm not sure about the former."
--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."

-Groucho Marx

836. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-22 16:34:27 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <nKzX9.6344$bL4.633536@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 59869

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

:
: The "Equalizer" effect is simply that a prospective ham is not likely to
have
: learned Morse elsewhere, and has to demonstrate his/her skill on an EQUAL
basis
: with others, in an objective test. It's about equality of requirements.
:

You still sound like the Handicapper General.

Last time I checked, they had to pass EQUAL written examinations also. How
they learned the material is of no concern, simply that they know it at the
time of examination.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB
--
SOC #291
NCI # 4304
FISTS # 7419

837. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-22 16:44:00 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3E2ECA50.1040505@psu.edu>
Source record: 59870

Vshah101 wrote:
> "N2EY" wrote:
> Go hang out at an IEEE event and tell us about it. Are IEEE event
>
>>attendees
>>
>>>mostly "male, old, fat"?
>>
>
> Then "Carl R. Stevenson", wk3c replied:
>
>>Yes, the majority of attendees were male, but there were quite a few
>>females.
>>
>>Old ... a few, but the majority appeared to range from their late 20's to
>>early 50's,
>>with the bulk of that being in their 30's or 40's.
>>Fat ... a few, but in the minority
>
>
> As I suspected a lower percentage in each of the three categories
> (male,old,fat) are present than are present in Ham radio.
>
> N2EY, this answers your question.

SO WHAT?

Frankly Vipul, you seem to bear great prejudice against old and overweight people. I know many old and heavy people who are just wonderful and a joy to be around.

What exactly is wrong with them?

- Mike -

838. Re: Lets face it ... we're just communicators.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-22 16:49:53 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3E2ECBB1.1020705@psu.edu>
Source record: 59871

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> In article <f45722ac.0301201625.1667a639@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
>
>>> In times past Los Angeles City Civil Defense cross-trained each and
>>> every ham radio volunteer in other disaster-related specialties and
>>> we were far more than "radio-based message passers", capable of
>>> originating the message or acting upon it in addition to passing it
>>> competently.
>>>
>>> Don't kid YOURSELF - it can be done.
>>>
>>>---
>>> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>>
>>Soem of us are even Red Cross 1st aid/CPR instructors.
>
>
> Brian:
>
> Don't get me started on Red Cross 1st Aid/CPR instructors!

Oops, too late, Larry! 8^)

> I think they're
> the biggest bunch of baloon-headed egomaniacs in the world -- and they
> are almost as dangerous as Ham Hero (tm) wannabes! They keep
> emphasizing that you MUST receive your CPR refresher training on an
> annual basis, you MUST carry your current CPR qualification card, you
> MUST do this, you MUST do that, and most importantly, you MUST
> glorify and venerate your local CPR instructor as a God of Lifesaving.

Larry, I think you've been unlucky. For my certification, I had great
people. None of what you describe. Our istructor was a unassuming guy
who was great to be around.

- Mike KB3EIA -

839. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-22 16:56:25 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3E2ECD39.6070103@psu.edu>
Source record: 59872

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> In article <v2n37lt6kndu0d@corp.supernews.com>, "KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com>
> writes:
>
>
>>>>Have you tried Hellschriber? It looks interesting to me also.
>>>
>>>No, not yet -- but I'm game to give it a try if you are!
>>
>>Sounds good to me.
>>
>>
>>>The text display
>>>is very unusual!
>>
>>That's what has got my interest peaked, plus I read the history
>>of it and it's only second in age to CW itself, patented back
>>in 1929
>
>
> Hmmm. Where did you find that history? Got a URL? I'll do a
> search on it later.
>

1929 is a good date, but there are other older modes, so it isnt number two on the list.

I've been wanting to try it, I have the software, but there aren't huge numbers doing Hell.

I'd love it if a few rraper's were to give hell a try! Wait.. that didn't come out right. But if anyone is interested, let's get something going.

> How about 1700 UTC tomorrow (Tuesday, Jan 21) on 20 meters? I'm
> not sure what a proper frequency for Hellschreiber would be; let's start
> around 14.080 unless you have a better idea! If you want, we can first
> establish contact in RTTY and QSY to Hellschreiber. E-mail me with
> your preference. Looking forward to our QSO!

I'll be on psk31 just about any given evening. I'll watch for you guys.

- mike KB3EIA -

840. Re: This Is How KB1HMW "Supports" Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-22 18:02:01 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0301221002.136c6be0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59873

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030122045854.01441.00000132@mb-mk.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: This Is How KB1HMW "Supports" Amateur Radio
> >From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
> >Date: 1/21/03 9:41 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20030121224113.06736.00000129@mb-cv.aol.com>
>
> >>From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
> >>>I will try to be more sensitive.
> >>
> >>How about logical, too?
> >
> >I am logical.

HAW!!! That's funny!

> > How about K4YZ? He can't even tell the difference between
> >information and policy. That's illogical.
>
> One cannot formulate policy without being informed, Vipul. THAT'S common
> sense.

Which is sadly lacking in Vipul's case.
>
> >>How did you post here, then? "Demise" indicates that you're dead.
>
> >Not dead, but wounded

aw geez....
>
> Be still my heart.
>
> >>> I could not see the light at the end of
> >>> the tunnel. It was the longer pathway. I was too impatient and chose the
> >>> shorter pathway.
> >>
> >>What the HECK is that supposed to mean?
> >
> >I wanted amateur radio instead of something else.

So? You got it. Your license allows you to use a wide variety of
bands, modes and equipment, with no additional certifications or
approvals. What's the problem?

> > If I chose the other item,
> >I

> >could have amateur radio later. Obviously I did not know this at the time. I
> >know this now. I chose amateur radio and ended up with neither.

What is this "other item"?
>
> And Vipul says >>I<< am "illogical"...!
>
> >>>Then, the train ran me over.
>
> >The train is the system. (Another metaphor)
>
> If you have to explain it....
>
> >Had I done that, I may have changed my plans.
>
> Simple fix, Vipul...Write "CANCEL" across the front of your license and
> mail it to Gettysburg. They'll take it from there. THEN stop posting to a
> newsgroup for a radio service for which you obviously have no interest or
> respect. Lastly, go to one of those "ham" fests and sell whatever Amateur
> Radio gear you possess and be done with it.
>
> >This thing could be right out of the twilight zone. Unfortunately it actually
> >did happen to me (and similar circumstances happened to a lot of other
> >people).
> >I was playing a high stakes game. I am not a gambler, but when ur in the
> >situation, you MUST gamble. The thing is even with the best of intentions one
> >may suffer the consequences.
>
> Did anyone make any sense out of this?

Sounds to me like ol' Vipul used to be a freebander, then got a
license. Expected all sorts of Elmers to come out of the woodwork and
address his every question and suggestion with the utmost reverence.
(The "16 vestal virgins" mentioned in a post by Hans). Didn't happen
the way he planned. Thus all the weird posts and strange definitions.

Bottom line: Same basic situation as Mogadishu Slim. He claimed
operation from T5 but never gives any details such as rigs and
antennas used, stations/countries worked, bands and modes used, QSLs
sent and received, call used, etc.

End result: I don't give trolling bootleggers the time of day. Nor do
I respond to their posts.

73 de Jim, N2EY

841. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-22 18:02:45 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.h930wx7.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 59874

On 20 Jan 2003 19:31:58 GMT, Dennis Ferguson wrote:

>My feeling exactly. I've been wondering the same thing about cell phones,
>in fact. What is the point of using a wireless phone to access the wired
>telephone network when it would be so much easier to do the same thing
>with a phone directly wired to the network? I mean, if there are wires in
>the middle why would anyone want to use radio at the edges?

I sit on a committee that writes local cellphone tower ordinances,
and the big push that I detect from the representatives of both the
wired and the wireless telephone industry is to get rid of the wired
network between the "wire centers" (we used to call them Central
Offices) and subscribers entirely. "They" say that it is coming, and
it won't be too long before new connections and expansions will be
wireless only, copper wire and the necessary maintenance being very
expensive.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

842. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-22 18:02:46 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.h931kx8.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 59875

On Tue, 21 Jan 2003 14:46:26 -0500, Mike Coslo wrote:

>I don't know exactly where the law starts and stops on this, but if you
>can do VoIP, then you should be able to do PSK, etc over IP also.

IMNSHO - if this starts to be "popular" I predict that the FCC Rules
will be changed to require a licensed control operator in real-time
control of every amateur transmitter (no more automatic repeater or
packet relay) with said control operator making real-time go-no-go
decisions on appropriateness of content (just like the "entry-point"
operator 'sposed to do on packet forwarding). One more step down
the ladder for amateur radio.

I know just the communications law firm that would push such a
Petition for Rulemaking... <ggg>

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

Principal Attorney (retired)
Communications Law Center
San Francisco, CA

843. Re: Lets face it ... we're just communicators.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-22 18:02:46 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.h932tg9.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 59876

On 20 Jan 2003 23:57:18 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:

> I remember the 1994 Northridge Earthquake very well and
> saw NO evidence of this great "service to the country" at the
> eastern half of The Valley. Same thing in the Sylmar Quake
> of 1971. Or the Whittier Narrows quake in between those
> two. Or the big Wildfires we've had around these parts.
>
> I've seen/heard much of those individuals involved directly
> with all those emergencies/disasters...not a word on "hams."
>
> How can that be?

Because the idiots in City Hall dissolved the old Civil Defense Office structure with its cross-trained members "because it wasn't needed any more" just days before the Baldwin Hills Reservoir disaster in early December 1963 (my years as a volunteer in LA was 1958-1961). Most of the cross-training was in command-post operations and status reporting in addition to my service with the Sheriff's Reserve. The thought was that if someone was unavailable, there could be someone else with training to drop into the slot. Not being an amateur radio operator, you wouldn't have been clued in to this aspect of operations.

The present agency that I volunteer with - Washington County (Oregon) Emergency Services - uses RACES/ARES teams as communicators at served agencies (local EOCs and hospital facilities) but enables those of us who want to be cross-trained in other specialties to get that training and to participate in Citizens Emergency Response Teams (CERT), the volunteer part of the Emergency Services mix. Many non-ham CERT volunteers have gone through the amateur radio license course to get their own license as well, making them eligible to use tactical RACES facilities during an exercise or an actual incident for status reporting and resource requests (most of our exercises involve curtailment or unavailability of agency communivations during part or all of the exercise). Some folks even get on the air for "traditional" amateur radio activities.

Some agencies believe in it, some agencies don't. Mostly the decision depends on availability of staff and money and the personal bias of the agency's Emergency Management person towards encouraging or not encouraging cross-trained specialty volunteers.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

844. Re: Lets face it ... we're just communicators.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-22 18:02:47 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.h9335ka.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 59877

On Tue, 21 Jan 2003 01:11:12 -0500, KC8PMX wrote:

>Now here is a point I believe in no matter what..... I beleive that most
>every person out there should know basic first aid, as well as CPR,
>regardless of what they are doing, radio related or not. Instructor status
>is great but at least having a basic functional knowledge of those skills is
>a positive asset to anyone.

Instructor status is no big deal.

My ex-wife is the senior instructor/certifier for first aid and CPR
at a major medical center. When we were still married, we used to
team-teach it to the public for the American Red Cross. Even though
she's my ex, she's still one of the best in the field (helps to have
been a phys ed and health ed teacher before becoming a respiratory
specialist/nurse).

Instructor status is no big deal. <ggg>

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

845. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-22 18:36:42 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030122133642.07840.00000142@mb-mg.aol.com>
Source record: 59878

In article <3E2E3A89.FD2DAEC4@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> In article <3E2DFF8D.DEF6E25A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >> Why is it "necessary to work DX?"
>> >
>> >It isn't necessary for you to work DX.
>>
>> "US Amateur radio is all about 'working DX on HF with CW."
>
>That leaves you out, doesn't it. You don't know morse and you aren't a
>ham.

Actually, I do know morse. I haven't bothered to take any
amateur radio test. I have no desire to recreate the 1930s
or to "work DX." I did the "DX" thing professionally in the
military a half century ago...on a 24/7 basis.

>> Poor baby...all you got was some postings at some 3rd
>> world embassy..."using CW on an RTTY circuit as an
>> 'order-wire.'"
>
>I'm neither poor nor a baby.

I don't know your financial situation but your immaturity is noted.

>Do your homework. I had two postings in
>Finland, a non-third world country. I had four African postings. During
>one of them, I used CW. You continue to attempt to equate your military
>experience with amateur radio.

Oh! Oh! Oh! State Department postings = ham radio!!!!

Does Secretary Powell know this? :-)

>> Are you now relenting from mumbling a mantra? :-)
>
>I don't mumble.

It comes out a Snarling Mumble. :-)

>> Is everyone supposed to take up CW to be "politically
>> correct?!?"
>

>Pay attention. You brought up the peculiar "obviously-political"
>comment.

We can't possibly ignore Herr Robust poking his finger at us
"to get our attention." :-)

Everyone must follow Herr Robust's Newsgroup Rules... :-)

846. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-22 18:36:43 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030122133643.07840.00000143@mb-mg.aol.com>
Source record: 59879

In article <c2356669.0301220553.2e305963@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>Say, Larry, you can play the "years" game, too. Add up your age, years
>as a licensed ham, years of military service, years with a bachelor's
>degree, years with a driver's license, years with a CDL, years as an
>ARRL member, plus any other years you find usable and see what the
>total is.

He ought to add in all the years he was on FIDONET telling everyone how good he is, all the years he was on Internet telling everyone how good and superior he is/was, all the years he was in university getting all those good grades to guarantee his choice of human resources jobs he would get after graduation, plus all the Russian girlfriends he had, etc., etc.

:-)

847. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-22 18:36:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030122133644.07840.00000144@mb-mg.aol.com>
Source record: 59880

In article <20030122063646.27873.00000121@mb-mj.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <g0oX9.5560$bL4.546819@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
><kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG> writes:
>
>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>>
>>: It acts as the Great Equalizer - which is why some people hate it so.
>>:
>>Ah, yes, we must have an Equalizer!!!! Shades of Diana Moon Glompers!
>>Damn, Jim, I expected MUCH better of you. Surely you don't dismiss the
>>lessons of Harrison Bergeron?
>>
>>Equalizer, INDEED!
>>
>>Gawd, I think I'm gonna be sick.
>
>You misunderstand, Hans.
>
>The "Equalizer" effect is simply that a prospective ham is not likely to have
>learned Morse elsewhere, and has to demonstrate his/her skill on an EQUAL
>basis with others, in an objective test. It's about equality of requirements.

Translated: "Everyone has to do it like *I* did it..." :-)

Hello? The license is NOT granted on conformance to some
mythical "community." It is granted by the FCC, a government
agency chartered to regulate US civil radio.

The FCC does NOT mandate OOK CW transmission over and
above any other mode by US radio amateurs. There is NO
recommendation by any ITU-R that all the world's radio amateurs
must use OOK CW mode. The morse test is only a
recommendation on test methods to be granted an amateur
license by an administration.

>Harrison Bergeron was about equality of result. Anybody with greater talent
>was handicapped down to the common level.

So...all the argument is about a FICTIONAL person...who doesn't
get involved in amateur radio? Tsk, tsk.

>Perhaps I can state it another way:

...not very well, but continue...

>One of the most common arguments against code testing I have read here is
>from
>people who list their accomplishments in non-amateur radio as some sort of
>reason why they should not be required to pass a Morse test. As if those
>accomplishments somehow made them experts at amateur radio and above the >rest
of us mere mortals.

Ah, but the self-described "experts" in amateur radio keep
elevating themselves as "superior" in radio because of their
longevity/experience/tenure/callsign/class/etc. and also as
emulation models...and all the while sneering at the pros
(while not identifying their own alleged professional work).

No problem. It's a well-known double standard in here...

>Their argument boiled down to this: Since they had
>credential X in non-amateur radio, they should not be required to learn
>something they didn't want to learn in order to get an amateur radio license.

You keep getting it WRONG! Tsk, tsk.

The morse code test controversy is NOT about that. It is
about the illogic of mandating a skill test for ANYONE who
wishes an amateur license. ANYONE.

The morse code test controversy is fueled by the terrible
insistence of the already-morse-tested to do "just like they
had to do."

Those already-morse-tested keep wanting "the Great
Equalizer" when there is NO government requirement to
USE morse modes over and above any other mode.

>Sorry if you were offended. I calls 'em as I sees 'em. I'm not
>electropolitically correct.

You're just not correct. Keep trying, though, might be hope
for you.

848. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-22 21:31:23 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E2F0DA7.48BD0A0E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 59881

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E2E3A89.FD2DAEC4@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >> In article <3E2DFF8D.DEF6E25A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >> Why is it "necessary to work DX?"
> >> >
> >> >It isn't necessary for you to work DX.
> >>
> >> "US Amateur radio is all about 'working DX on HF with CW."
> >
> >That leaves you out, doesn't it. You don't know morse and you aren't a
> >ham.
>
> Actually, I do know morse. I haven't bothered to take any
> amateur radio test. I have no desire to recreate the 1930s
> or to "work DX." I did the "DX" thing professionally in the
> military a half century ago...on a 24/7 basis.

Right. I probably should have used the term "proficient in morse". We
certainly wouldn't want to see you "bothered" by those pesky amateur
radio license exams. You didn't do radio 24/7 ever and there is no
professional equivalent to DXing.

> >> Poor baby...all you got was some postings at some 3rd
> >> world embassy..."using CW on an RTTY circuit as an
> >> 'order-wire.'"
> >
> >I'm neither poor nor a baby.
>
> I don't know your financial situation but your immaturity is noted.

You're a hoot, Len. You are my senior in age but not in maturity.
>
> >Do your homework. I had two postings in
> >Finland, a non-third world country. I had four African postings. During
> >one of them, I used CW. You continue to attempt to equate your military
> >experience with amateur radio.
>
> Oh! Oh! Oh! State Department postings = ham radio!!!!

Where have I said any such thing?

> Does Secretary Powell know this? :-)

Don't know. Don't care. Never worked for him.

> >> Are you now relenting from mumbling a mantra? :-)
> >
> >I don't mumble.
>
> It comes out a Snarling Mumble. :-)

Your use of non-existent terms is masterful.

> >> Is everyone supposed to take up CW to be "politically
> >> correct?!?"
> >
> >Pay attention. You brought up the peculiar "obviously-political"
> >comment.
>
> We can't possibly ignore Herr Robust poking his finger at us
> "to get our attention." :-)
>
> Everyone must follow Herr Robust's Newsgroup Rules... :-)

Lack of response noted, Foghorn.

Dave K8MN

849. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-22 21:33:42 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E2F0E3D.7E3B0EE9@earthlink.net>
Source record: 59882

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <c2356669.0301220553.2e305963@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> (N2EY) writes:
>
> >Say, Larry, you can play the "years" game, too. Add up your age, years
> >as a licensed ham, years of military service, years with a bachelor's
> >degree, years with a driver's license, years with a CDL, years as an
> >ARRL member, plus any other years you find usable and see what the
> >total is.
>
> He ought to add in all the years he was on FIDONET telling
> everyone how good he is, all the years he was on Internet
> telling everyone how good and superior he is/was, all the years
> he was in university getting all those good grades to guarantee
> his choice of human resources jobs he would get after
> graduation, plus all the Russian girlfriends he had, etc., etc.
>
> :-)

Did it ever dawn on you that the numbers being used are poking fun at
you?
You seem oblivious. Tell us again about adding your age to your number
of tales in order to get free magazines.

Dave K8MN

850. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-22 21:43:15 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E2F105E.E4214B70@earthlink.net>
Source record: 59883

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20030122063646.27873.00000121@mb-mj.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:
>
> >In article <g0oX9.5560$bL4.546819@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
> ><kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG> writes:
> >
> >>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

> >Harrison Bergeron was about equality of result. Anybody with greater talent
> >was handicapped down to the common level.
>
> So...all the argument is about a FICTIONAL person...who doesn't
> get involved in amateur radio? Tsk, tsk.

Righto. Why bother with old Harrison when we have Leonard Anderson, a
real person who doesn't get involved in amateur radio.

> >Perhaps I can state it another way:
>
> ...not very well, but continue...
>
> >One of the most common arguments against code testing I have read here is
> >from
> >people who list their accomplishments in non-amateur radio as some sort of
> >reason why they should not be required to pass a Morse test. As if those
> >accomplishments somehow made them experts at amateur radio and above the >rest
> of us mere mortals.
>
> Ah, but the self-described "experts" in amateur radio keep
> elevating themselves as "superior" in radio because of their
> longevity/experience/tenure/callsign/class/etc. and also as
> emulation models...and all the while sneering at the pros
> (while not identifying their own alleged professional work).

Oh--I get it! You're back to pecking about trying to find out where Jim
works.
I think you might have misstated the rest of it.

> No problem. It's a well-known double standard in here...
>
> >Their argument boiled down to this: Since they had
> >credential X in non-amateur radio, they should not be required to learn
> >something they didn't want to learn in order to get an amateur radio license.
>

> You keep getting it WRONG! Tsk, tsk.
>
> The morse code test controversy is NOT about that. It is
> about the illogic of mandating a skill test for ANYONE who
> wishes an amateur license. ANYONE.

Uh-huh. A number of us must have misunderstood your comments in the
past.

> The morse code test controversy is fueled by the terrible
> insistence of the already-morse-tested to do "just like they
> had to do."

Nobody has to or even can do what I did. The maximum morse testing
speed for HF privileges is now a measly five words per minute. Even you
could do that.

> Those already-morse-tested keep wanting "the Great
> Equalizer" when there is NO government requirement to
> USE morse modes over and above any other mode.

The FCC, in its great wisdom, probably figures that most of us have
mastered that speaking stuff.

> >Sorry if you were offended. I calls 'em as I sees 'em. I'm not
> >electropolitically correct.
>
> You're just not correct. Keep trying, though, might be hope
> for you.

I have great hope for Jim. I don't hold forth the same hope for you.

Dave K8MN

851. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-22 21:47:32 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030122164732.06410.00000096@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 59884

>Subject: Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 1/22/03 12:36 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030122133642.07840.00000142@mb-mg.aol.com>

>Actually, I do know morse.

Perhaps Robert Morse, the actor. I doubt you know Morse Code.

>I haven't bothered to take any amateur radio test.

Afraid some grade-schooler will out-score you?

>I have no desire to recreate the 1930s
> or to "work DX." I did the "DX" thing professionally in the
> military a half century ago...on a 24/7 basis.

The nice thing about Amateur Radio is that you don't have to. You can do what you want with it. But you know that. Your "response" is just more vile trolling.

>I don't know your financial situation but your immaturity is noted.

Pot/kettle/black.

>>I don't mumble.
>
>It comes out a Snarling Mumble.

Kinda like YOURS comes out hateful rhetoric.

Spiteful Putz.

852. Re: EMERGENCY K1MAN BULLETIN - K030122A

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-22 21:48:52 UTC
From: Milo's cat hairs <fraggertts3@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <3e2f11bf@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 59885
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Found this posted on: http://members.aol.com/jcunham/
Seems to refer to the alleged k1man broadcast
posted in the original message....make of it what you will
it is amazing is not how both sides in this ham radio operators and stuff
like it
expend all so much wasted energy on nothing but bluster and
posturing? They should all be working for North Korea's Ministry
of Propaganda! I hope I have this much free time when I am an
old fart with nothing but ham radio to play with...

(and the band plays on while the angels sing high-hyms!)

---------- cut here ---------

Email from Brian Crow:

*****To Prevent Panic and Unnecessary Frequency Abuse*******

Regarding the Mexican Earthquake in the Colima and Jalisco region:

After conferring with Carlos Gelista, Mexico's Director of Emergency
Management for the Civil Protection Agency, the Mexican Embassy, in
Washington D.C. reported to this writer at 10 AM this morning, that "no
international assistance is required, requested, or needed," for the recent
Mexican earthquake occurring on the Pacific coast west of Mexico city,
Tuesday evening at 9PM EST.

Salvation Army Team Emergency Radio Network on 14.265 mHz is
monitoring, but not activated, in case assistance is required. Satern
reports,
"Communications there are up and operative. The situation there is under
control."

The SATERN net control reported, and I quote, "The Mexican government is not
requesting International assistance. Stay away from the operator on 14.275
mHz with the 1 call. That station is illegal and has been fined by the FCC
on numerous occasions. He must be a millionaire, to have gotten all those
fines and still have his license," end quote.

Yes folks, the credibility gap continues to widen ... And that's the way it
is.

"K3VR reporting on Wednesday morning, January 22, 2003."

---------- cut ----------

853. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-22 21:54:07 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030122165407.06410.00000097@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 59886

>Subject: Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 1/22/03 3:43 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3E2F105E.E4214B70@earthlink.net>

>Nobody has to or even can do what I did. The maximum morse testing
>speed for HF privileges is now a measly five words per minute. Even you
>could do that.

Naaaaah...Cowards always call taunts from the darkenss but never come into the light, Dave. This is the only promise Lennie will ever keep...He'll never be an FCC licensee in teh Amateur Radio Service. And all I can say is thank goodness and good riddance.

And I still haven't heard any reports of his Part 15 efforts on any Amateur allocation, his assertions tha he can operate there notwithstanding. Guess he's still trying to talk across town on 11 meters with Vipul.

73

Steve, K4YZ

854. Re: EMERGENCY K1MAN BULLETIN - K030122A

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-23 01:36:50 UTC
From: Tom <SEE@nospam.com>
Message-ID: <7nhu2vsqd10f8jg8bugrd15b1u96gp5157@4ax.com>
Source record: 59887
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

On Wed, 22 Jan 2003 08:45:39 -0800, "Lloyd, N0VFP"
<brother_lloyd_99@yahoo.com> wrote:

Get your General ticket or shut the fuck up.

855. Re: Lets face it ... we're just communicators.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-23 03:27:26 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@att.net>
Message-ID: <yiJX9.8555$zF6.698392@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 59888

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:b0m6at3184m@enews4.newsguy.com...
> if you render aid to someone else,
> as long as you act up to the level of your training and not otherwise
> negligent in other actions you are in a better shape if there is some type
> of lawsuit. I say this because when doing CPR, there is a great
possibility
> of injury to ribs etc. due to the force applied to the chest.
>
> With refresher training, what is wrong with that?
>

It has been a while but I believe the Pro's at a nearby Cat III ER told me
that, because the point is to massage the heart through the rib cage--a
difficult task at best, a few cracked ribs are forgiven. I think the idea
was to be careful to apply sufficient force, otherwise you are wasting the
patient's time, which at this point is precious little.

73,
Clay N4AOX

856. Re: This Is How KB1HMW "Supports" Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-23 04:12:37 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030122231237.01510.00000141@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 59889

I know this seems like I am going back on my promise to be nice, but...

From: anla@mindspring.com (a)
>> Now that it turned out that hams had nothing to do with your problem,
>> are hams still "dorks"?

>All one needs to form an opinion for this question is attend the Ham
>Fest at the NC State Fair grounds.

So, someone else agrees. This is exactly what I've been saying. Social misfit is so apparent, one just needs to attend a random Hamfest and you will see. Operating radios in a bar is NOT the normal activity to do. If the amateur rock band that was scheduled at Boxboro Hamfest actually played, I might have stuck around for the Wouff Hong ceremony. Although it was funny those people in costumes chanting "Wouff Hong, Wouff Hong, Wouff Hong, …" at the dinner buffet.

I know it has been said that Hams that go to Hamfests is representative of all Hams. Apparently no place that Hams get together represents Hams.
You know this does not make sense. Yet, the 1% of EEs represent the technical achievement of the hobby for publicity purposes, when polls indicate Hams are not interested in technical topics except antennas. Same goes for "service". It's in QST, but not mentioned in my local paper.

This is not illogical because I provided supporting evidence.

857. Re: Lets face it ... we're just communicators.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-23 11:05:08 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301230305.5d9ec64e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59890

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.h9335ka.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> On Tue, 21 Jan 2003 01:11:12 -0500, KC8PMX wrote:
>
> >Now here is a point I believe in no matter what..... I beleive that most
> >every person out there should know basic first aid, as well as CPR,
> >regardless of what they are doing, radio related or not. Instructor status
> >is great but at least having a basic functional knowledge of those skills is
> >a positive asset to anyone.
>
> Instructor status is no big deal.
>
> My ex-wife is the senior instructor/certifier for first aid and CPR
> at a major medical center. When we were still married, we used to
> team-teach it to the public for the American Red Cross. Even though
> she's my ex, she's still one of the best in the field (helps to have
> been a phys ed and health ed teacher before becoming a respiratory
> specialist/nurse).
>
> Instructor status is no big deal. <ggg>
>
> ---
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

DEpending on who your talking to, it could be a bigger deal than amateur status.

858. Re: EMERGENCY K1MAN BULLETIN - K030122A

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-23 12:50:10 UTC
From: signalchaser <williamsmith208@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <v2vp887njgu47@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 59891
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Lloyd, when are you going to grow up and act like the Christian you claim to be.

"Lloyd, N0VFP" <brother_lloyd_99@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:3e2f6b6a$1_7@server....
>
> "Tom" <SEE@nospam.com> wrote in message
> news:7nhu2vsqd10f8jg8bugrd15b1u96gp5157@4ax.com...
> > On Wed, 22 Jan 2003 08:45:39 -0800, "Lloyd, N0VFP"
> > <brother_lloyd_99@yahoo.com> wrote:
> >
> > Get your General ticket or shut the fuck up.
>
> no call, no balls!
>
>
>

859. Re: This Is How KB1HMW "Supports" Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-23 13:12:20 UTC
From: Jackie <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.comm>
Message-ID: <USRX9.8175$_s4.7751@rwcrnsc54>
Source record: 59892

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030122231237.01510.00000141@mb-mk.aol.com...

> I know it has been said that Hams that go to Hamfests is representative of
all
> Hams. Apparently no place that Hams get together represents Hams.
> You know this does not make sense. Yet, the 1% of EEs represent the
technical
> achievement of the hobby for publicity purposes, when polls indicate Hams
are
> not interested in technical topics except antennas.

I sense a touch of prejudice against non-EE hams in your post; am I wrong? Sorry, Vipul, but I wasn't interested in electronics back in high school, so I made the decision to become a chemist instead. Never worked in the field, but science has always been interesting to me, as I am sure it is to many hams.

I have some EE friends. They have hobbies as diverse as skydiving, skiing and flying. Not all tech-types necessarily want to have tech-hobbies. Depends on the person. I'd say that if you think antennas and propagation are interesting, then ham radio is a good hobby for you. If you aren't an EE by trade but still like to tinker with electronics, it's a good place too. There aren't many women in this hobby, but I don't feel uncomfortable here because most of my hobbies have been more male-oriented. Who cares? I don't.

Vipul, I just don't see evidence of this crowd of losers you keep referring to. The last hamfest I went to had a good representation of young and old, and there were quite a few women there too.

Jackie KC0ODY

860. Re: Lets face it ... we're just communicators.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-23 14:59:24 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030123095924.02295.00000157@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 59893

>Subject: Re: Lets face it ... we're just communicators.....
>From: "Clay N4AOX" wyn@att.net
>Date: 1/22/03 9:27 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <yiJX9.8555$zF6.698392@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>

>It has been a while but I believe the Pro's at a nearby Cat III ER told me
>that, because the point is to massage the heart through the rib cage--a
>difficult task at best, a few cracked ribs are forgiven. I think the idea
>was to be careful to apply sufficient force, otherwise you are wasting the
>patient's time, which at this point is precious little.

As an ER Nurse I can tell you that if you did NOT break ribs during CPR,
you were either (1) very lucky, (2) NOT applying sufficent pressure (3) Doing
CPR on someone with rubber ribs.

To be accurate, we don't "massage" the heart, but aggressively compress it.
The point is to mechanically cycle the heart by squeezing it between the
sternum and the spine. The "textbook" depth for an adult is 1.5 to 2 inches.
On the average adult, that's 35% of the thckness of the chest.

73 and hope none of you ever need CPR...

Steve, K4YZ

861. Re: This Is How KB1HMW "Supports" Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-23 15:17:05 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030123101705.02295.00000163@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 59894

>Subject: Re: This Is How KB1HMW "Supports" Amateur Radio
>From: "Jackie" buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.comm
>Date: 1/23/03 7:12 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <USRX9.8175$_s4.7751@rwcrnsc54>

>I have some EE friends. They have hobbies as diverse as skydiving, skiing
>and flying. Not all tech-types necessarily want to have tech-hobbies.

It's ironic you mention skydiving and flying, Jackie. I certainly can't speak about every concievable avocation, but persons involved in the aviation industry (airline pilots, mechs, etc...) have been one of the few groups I have ever known that also partake in it as a "hobby".

I try to get some of the folks I know at work to partake in weekend clinics to rural areas but very few want to do that "on my days off".

>There aren't many women in this hobby, but I don't feel uncomfortable here
>because most of my hobbies have been more male-oriented. Who cares? I don't.

You go girl! I often get quizzed about why I am in Nursing. Some think it's to be around lot's of women. Trust me, it's not all it would seem cracked up to be! And others ask me if I don't feel "out of place" in a mostly female enviroment. Hardly...When we are knee deep in body parts and puking patients, the LAST thing on my mind is whether or not I might "get lucky" with my partner.

Ham Radio would certainly be a more colorful place with more lady operators, but it appears the interest is just not there. The doors are open, however, and here's hoping they stop by and take a look!

>Vipul, I just don't see evidence of this crowd of losers you keep referring
>to. The last hamfest I went to had a good representation of young and old,
>and there were quite a few women there too.

If you go into any enviroment looking for something, chances are you'll find it to the exclusion of evidence that balances your expectations. Vipul goes to hamfests looking for for overweight, "old" males. He finds some.

Me? I go to hamfests looking for radios, friends and rot-gut hot dogs. I find plenty of all three!

73

Steve, K4YZ

862. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-23 17:59:40 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0301230959.7e90d9d0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59895

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E2F105E.E4214B70@earthlink.net>...
> Why bother with old Harrison when we have Leonard Anderson, a
> real person who doesn't get involved in amateur radio.

Hold on a sec, Dave....

How do we know that Leonard Anderson is "a real person"? All we really know is that someone using that name has posted here since at least 1997, using a variety of screen names. Some posts are signed, others are not. There has even been a half-hearted attempt to conceal who the poster was. Not to mention his sending unsolicited email with obscene attachments, then refusing email replies from tose spammed.

Whoever the person behind those posts really is, he/she obviously has no real interest in amateur radio beyond newsgroup arguments and insults toward radio amateurs. Remember the claims of VEC fraud (based solely on prejudice against young hams), ARRL "dishonesty" (no evidence of any kind presented) and "going for the Extra right out of the box" (three years ago, no license yet)? Says it all, really.

And since Mr. Anderson obviously has no intention of ever getting an amateur license, why is he so interested in things like age limits for ham licenses?

Ask his motivation, and you won't get a credible answer.
>
> > >Perhaps I can state it another way:
> >
> > ...not very well, but continue...
> >
> > >One of the most common arguments against code testing I have read here is
> > >from
> > >people who list their accomplishments in non-amateur radio as some sort of
> > >reason why they should not be required to pass a Morse test. As if those
> > >accomplishments somehow made them experts at amateur radio and above the >rest
> > of us mere mortals.
> >
> > Ah, but the self-described "experts" in amateur radio keep
> > elevating themselves as "superior" in radio because of their
> > longevity/experience/tenure/callsign/class/etc. and also as
> > emulation models...and all the while sneering at the pros
> > (while not identifying their own alleged professional work).
>
> Oh--I get it! You're back to pecking about trying to find out where Jim
> works.

Bingo.

Some questions to ponder:

Since I don't work at the FCC, the ARRL, or a communications law
practice, what does it matter where I work? It's simply not relevant
to amateur radio policy.

Why does Mr. Anderson want to know that information so much?

How has he behaved towards others when such information has been
presented? Has he been appreciative of the work of medical
professionals, for example? Or career State Department employees?

Ever notice that Mr. Anderson demands all sorts of information and
proof from others, but rarely if ever provides any of his own, except
to brag about decades-old experiences paid for by others?

Reminds me of someone who claims to have operated a ham station in T5
about a decade ago, but who does not answer straightforward questions
like:

What bands and modes were used?
What antennas and equipment were used?
What callsign was used?
About how many other hams were worked?
How were the QSLs handled?
How many countries/continents/states/QSOs were worked?

Why bother to respond to someone who won't or can't answer such basic
questions, yet demands irrelevant information from others?

> I think you might have misstated the rest of it.
>
> > No problem. It's a well-known double standard in here...

Exactly. Mr. Anderson has one standard for himself, another for those
who disagree with him.
> >
> > >Their argument boiled down to this: Since they had
> > >credential X in non-amateur radio, they should not be required to learn
> > >something they didn't want to learn in order to get an amateur radio license.
> >
> > You keep getting it WRONG! Tsk, tsk.
> >
> > The morse code test controversy is NOT about that. It is
> > about the illogic of mandating a skill test for ANYONE who
> > wishes an amateur license. ANYONE.
>
> Uh-huh. A number of us must have misunderstood your comments in the
> past.

Actually, we understood them perfectly well. That's the problem.
>
> > The morse code test controversy is fueled by the terrible

> > insistence of the already-morse-tested to do "just like they
> > had to do."
>
> Nobody has to or even can do what I did. The maximum morse testing
> speed for HF privileges is now a measly five words per minute.

Exactly. Same with sending tests, secret written tests, FCC office
testing, etc. All long gone. Not coming back, either.

> Even you could do that.
>
Maybe...IF he wanted an amateur radio license above the Technician
level. But he does not want an amateur radio license. So why bother
with such a person?

> > Those already-morse-tested keep wanting "the Great
> > Equalizer" when there is NO government requirement to
> > USE morse modes over and above any other mode.
>
> The FCC, in its great wisdom, probably figures that most of us have
> mastered that speaking stuff.

There is also no requirement to use any particular mode, band or
technology, yet the written tests are full of questions on things most
hams will never do, and which hams are not required to do.

Why is it logical to require hams to pass a written test full of
questions on things hams are not required to do? Why did I have to
learn about UHF/VHF, transistors, SSB, FM, and a variety of other
things just so I could work Morse on 7010?

> I have great hope for Jim.

Thanks. Perhaps we will have an on-air QSO again soon. Been too long
since the last one...

>I don't hold forth the same hope for you.
>
Then why bother to respond to him?

Mike Deignan had the guy nailed years ago.

73 de Jim, N2EY

863. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-23 18:17:20 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030123131720.06461.00000210@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 59896

>Subject: Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade
>From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
>Date: 1/23/03 11:59 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <c2356669.0301230959.7e90d9d0@posting.google.com>

>Mike Deignan had the guy nailed years ago.

He didn't nail hard enough or in enough places.

73

Steve, K4YZ

864. Re: This Is How KB1HMW "Supports" Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-23 19:11:19 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301231111.e22a76@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59897

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030123101705.02295.00000163@mb-bk.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: This Is How KB1HMW "Supports" Amateur Radio
> >From: "Jackie" buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.comm
> >Date: 1/23/03 7:12 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <USRX9.8175$_s4.7751@rwcrnsc54>
>
> >I have some EE friends. They have hobbies as diverse as skydiving, skiing
> >and flying. Not all tech-types necessarily want to have tech-hobbies.
>
> It's ironic you mention skydiving and flying, Jackie. I certainly can't
> speak about every concievable avocation, but persons involved in the aviation
> industry (airline pilots, mechs, etc...) have been one of the few groups I have
> ever known that also partake in it as a "hobby".

I had a great hobby career, made even better by everyone's favorite
hobby: weather prediction. But when they invited me to jump out of
airplanes for a living I had to decline.

73, Brian
AF Weather, ret.

865. Re: Inside the Baxter Story, in his own words ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-23 19:21:10 UTC
From: The red hairy one <assplonkr69@arrl.us>
Message-ID: <3e3040a7@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 59898
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Bob Sherin" <Trebb@WebTV.Net> wrote in message
news:61c26b4c.0301211828.2efafe0e@posting.google.com...
> Covering the latter-day, ham history of Glenn Baxter a/k/a K1MAN a/k/a
> IARN a/k/a AARU et al, the following exchange of emails is the
> definitive word on Baxter, his operations and his mental state.
>
> ---

>
> Answering W4ASX editorials, today Baxter fired back. In the
> attachment which follows, we learn that he equates himself to Bill
> Gates and Ted Turner, that people in Dayton ask for his autograph,
> that AARU is a registered trademark and that www.K1MAN.com had 64,582
> hits during the month of December. But more to the point: "My wife
> Bonnie says I am a narcissist."
>
> Bonnie is on the money. DSM, the internationally accepted manual of
> mental disorders, defines narcissism as "An all-pervasive pattern of
> grandiosity (in fantasy or behavior), need for admiration or adulation
> and lack of empathy, usually beginning by early adulthood and present
> in variety of contexts."

Perhaps......

> We all have characteristics that track DSM, but the difference between
> an order and disorder is dysfunction. If the characteristics give
> rise to a "presenting problem," then the person is said to have a
> disorder.
>
> Quite simply, the issue comes down to whether Glenn's narcissism is
> all pervasive, invading, penetrating, and molding every aspect, nook,
> and cranny of the personality, which is, granted, a subjective
> judgment.

OyVey!...now he's analyzing them from afar.........

> The moment I witnessed the forays into foreign policy in Bougainville,
> I thought that line had been crossed. And now listening to Sam and
> Glenn talk about operations in Iraq, Jordan, Israel and Somalia, I
> know they've entered forbidden territory.
>
> Their activity violates the Logan Act, which prevents private citizens
> from conducting foreign policy. Glenn's response: "And we have done
> some wild things around the world over the years. But in violation of

> the Logan Act? Come on Bob, who is deluded now?" In fact, Glenn
> embraces some of the same people we, worried about homeland security,
> oppose. Shouldn't a responsible leader be open, in the very least, to
> the possibility of adverse consequences?

Baxter DOES NOT consider himself to be a "Privare Citizen".
As the self-appointed CEO of the IARN which is a *registered
NGO* under IRS and other US Code Law, he is now legally a
"Public Citizen". (anyone can do this provided they register their
Org properly, hold proper Credentials and maintain Board of
Directors)

> As Brian, K3VR, who has compiled an amazing dossier on Baxter
> operations in the arena of foreign policy, writes: "Whether he is ill,
> naive, stupid, or a bona-fide spy, won't matter one iota to the
> agencies who have questions about his actions. They will want
> satisfactory answers to significant questions." Our security demands
> no less.
>
> As to his respected Wife's assessment of narcissistic mental state,
> Baxter drops one more hint in the attachment. "Anyway, I sent Bob the
> $25 and he said he never got it. It did not come back so, being
> paranoid, I figured Bob was stiffing me." Unbelievable, this after
> the closest working relationship where I had proved my honesty time
> and again. Characteristic of Baxter, he does not disclose in the
> attachment whether the $25 check ever came back, leaving, for the
> readers, that cloud of suspicion remaining, a classic Baxter tactic.
>
> DSM identifies the narcissist as " 'interpersonally exploitive,'
> i.e., uses others to achieve his or her own ends." It gives us closeup
> insight into his apparent view of himself: of the omnipotent,
> worldwide, IARN Network with offices girding the globe engaged in
> missions befitting Mother Teresa, his views sought out by leaders of
> the free and non-free worlds as well as important media, such as the
> Wall Street Journal and major TV Networks.
>
> We are left with an impression of grandeur, when, in fact, this is but
> one person, Glenn Baxter, and his Radio Shack recorder on timers and a
> loop. We would be less than honest if we didn't acknowledge a certain
> value in the production and distribution of such a bulletin.
>
> To read the DSM criteria for narcissistic disorder is to gain full
> insight into Baxter. Having 5 of the following qualifies him: 1)
> Feels grandiose and self-importance (e.g., exaggerates achievements
> and talents to the point of lying, demands to be recognized as
> superior without commensurate achievements), 2) Is obsessed with
> fantasies of unlimited success, fame, fearsome power or omnipotence,
> unequaled brilliance ..., 3) Firmly convinced that he or she is unique
> and, being special, can only be understood by, should only be treated
> by, or associate with, other special or unique, or high-status people
> (or institutions), 4) Requires excessive admiration, adulation,

> attention and affirmation -- or, failing that, wishes to be feared and
> to be notorious (narcissistic supply), 5) Feels entitled. Expects
> unreasonable or special and favorable priority treatment. Demands
> automatic and full compliance with his or her expectations, 6)
> 'interpersonally exploitive' ..., 7) Devoid of empathy. Is unable or
> unwilling to identify with or acknowledge the feelings and needs of
> others, 8) Constantly envious of others or believes that they feel the
> same way about him or her, and 9) Arrogant, haughty behaviors or
> attitudes coupled with rage when frustrated, contradicted, or
> confronted."
>
> Quoting Baxter: "He (meaning me) has been on Prozac for several years
> now and recently a mood regulator as well ... . While apparently
> making him happier, I now find Bob to be a different functioning human
> being with regard to his great intellectual abilities."

I just KNEW that eventually, Prozac or some other related
legal mind-altering drug, would factor in all of this somehow.....

:) :) :) :) - wheeeeee!!!

> For sure, Glenn; thanks for the kudos. Deprakote, a mood regulator,
> prevents those leaps into grandiosity, bad judgment, irritable
> episodes, pressured speech. The intellect remains, albeit, for more
> productive pursuits. There isn't a person in my inner circle,
> including myself, who has failed to notice a vast change for the
> better. For some, Deprakote can be a miracle drug.

I prefer a good old fashoned Chivas Regal, Jageimeister or
Seagrams 7 plus 7Up every now and then, plus seein the old
lady in a "naughty nightie" or better yet a Wicked Weasel
Swimsuit (Wooo - Hooo!!!!!!) every now and then is good too..

> Consider it Glenn. Just a bit of harmless Deprakote can make you the
> achiever you've only imagined thus far.
>
> Bob Sherin, W4ASX

Bob, Glen needs to turn off his tape player and fly down to
Miami to meet you. I highly suggest Spring Break when all those
cute College Girls head down to Key West and South Beach
and dance an show off ("show me yer t-ts!") like they do
in that Girls Gone Wild video. It's an all-night party which really
re-vitalizes the ole male testoserone glans and can give the
both of you a whole new perspective on life apart from all
this 20 Meter Ham Radio bull shit. Airfare is quite reasonable
now and Glen can get a non-stop from Portland to Miami and
be at you home for dinner on the same day if he leaves early!
Afterward you can both go bar-crusing in South Beach or simil;ar
venues and have yerselves one heck of a good time! Consider it
OK?

Check it out---> http://www.southbeach-usa.com/

866. Re: Inside the Baxter Story, in his own words ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-23 20:16:46 UTC
From: Trebb@webtv.net
Message-ID: <7611-3E304DAE-245@storefull-2277.public.lawson.webtv.net>
Source record: 59899

Clever story, but I'm afraid I'm past that age of partying.

As to "Public Citizen" under the law you quote, and "Private Citizen," as defined by the Logan Act, the two are mutually exclusive. Remember, in law, you must first look at the definitions under the specific statute. You can't necessarily take one definition in one statute and apply it to another.

As to the Logan Act, I read yesterday that no one has been prosecuted under it in 200 years. The Patriot Act, enacted as a result of terrorism, is more apropos.

Analysis from afar where we have such a long history of bizarre behavior doesn't take a rocket scientist. Does anyone doubt that Napoleon and Hitler were megalomaniacs? Yet this is judgment from afar, for sure.

Yesterday, with tape loop rolling on 14275, Baxter staged a phony emergency. He purportedly was rendering assistance in the wake of the Mexico earthquake. Yet Brian, K3VR, who contacted Mexican authorities, was told that communications were intact and no help was needed.

Is this "normal" behavior?

Bob Sherin, W4ASX

Get to know us; visit our Web Site
http://community.webtv.net/AllAmericn/BobW4ASXandMaryAnn/

867. Re: Inside the Baxter Story, in his own words ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-23 22:04:27 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b0pp0e$u1d$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 59900

For him? YES.

Dan/W4NTI

> Is this "normal" behavior?
>
> Bob Sherin, W4ASX
>
> Get to know us; visit our Web Site
> http://community.webtv.net/AllAmericn/BobW4ASXandMaryAnn/
>

868. Re: EMERGENCY K1MAN BULLETIN - K030122A

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-23 22:46:39 UTC
From: Jon Van Allen <kf7yn@qwest.net>
Message-ID: <Yg_X9.160$KJ2.114588@news.uswest.net>
Source record: 60001
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Yep, that's "Brother" Lloyd, down yonder in Athens, AL. I heard a tornado recently went thru his town and caused $10,000,000 in improvements. He might be a dumbshit, but he is OUR dumbshit.

Just wondering Lloyd, does K1MAN pay you to be his groupie and newsgroup spokesman? Sheeit, I wouldn't be spewin' no trash talk for nobody without a kickback! You need to smarten up boy, don't make me come down yonder and open up a can of whoop-ass...

Jon
KF7YN

"signalchaser" <williamsmith208@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:v2vp887njgu47@corp.supernews.com...
> Lloyd, when are you going to grow up and act like the Christian you claim
to
> be.
>
> "Lloyd, N0VFP" <brother_lloyd_99@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:3e2f6b6a$1_7@server....
> >
> > "Tom" <SEE@nospam.com> wrote in message
> > news:7nhu2vsqd10f8jg8bugrd15b1u96gp5157@4ax.com...
> > > On Wed, 22 Jan 2003 08:45:39 -0800, "Lloyd, N0VFP"
> > > <brother_lloyd_99@yahoo.com> wrote:
> > >
> > > Get your General ticket or shut the fuck up.
> > >
> > > no call, no balls!
> > >
> > >
> > >
> >
> >

869. Re: This Is How KB1HMW "Supports" Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-24 00:20:50 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030123192050.24933.00000131@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 60002

>Subject: Re: This Is How KB1HMW "Supports" Amateur Radio
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 1/23/03 1:11 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0301231111.e22a76@posting.google.com>

>But when they invited me to jump out of
>airplanes for a living I had to decline.

Was the lack of an offer of a parachute a clue?

Steve, K4YZ

870. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-24 00:44:19 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <b0q293tsi1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 60003

Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote:
>On 20 Jan 2003 19:31:58 GMT, Dennis Ferguson wrote:
>>My feeling exactly. I've been wondering the same thing about cell phones,
>>in fact. What is the point of using a wireless phone to access the wired
>>telephone network when it would be so much easier to do the same thing
>>with a phone directly wired to the network? I mean, if there are wires in
>>the middle why would anyone want to use radio at the edges?
>
> I sit on a committee that writes local cellphone tower ordinances,
> and the big push that I detect from the representatives of both the
> wired and the wireless telephone industry is to get rid of the wired
> network between the "wire centers" (we used to call them Central
> Offices) and subscribers entirely. "They" say that it is coming, and
> it won't be too long before new connections and expansions will be
> wireless only, copper wire and the necessary maintenance being very
> expensive.

I'll bet you are in a fairly rural area. In Palo Alto they love wires so much that AT&T is in the process, as we speak, of becoming the third company to install fiber optic cables on the street behind the house, but in the Santa Cruz mountains I've noticed cell towers with directional antennas for backhaul as well as substantial resistance to do anything about fixing a shortage of copper to a place where I wanted DSL service, which leaves me the option of a wireless link to Loma Prieta. Wire still rules where the number of subscribers per mile of wire is high enough, but the subscriber-density barrier seems to be increasing.

But notice that still only makes the wireless access segment a little longer, relatively speaking. My cell phone's log says I've called as far as Guangzhou, Hong Kong and Port of Spain, Trinidad in its short memory, and I know which medium was used for most of the distance. There is clearly some utility in being able to use an untethered radio handset with a range of a few miles as access to communicate over much greater distances, and it seems to me this is true whether the handset is a cell phone or a 2 meter H/T.

Dennis Ferguson

871. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-24 01:36:46 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030123203646.00690.00000152@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 60004

In article <nKzX9.6344$bL4.633536@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG> writes:

>N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
>:
>: The "Equalizer" effect is simply that a prospective ham is not likely to
>: have
>: learned Morse elsewhere, and has to demonstrate his/her skill on an EQUAL
>: basis
>: with others, in an objective test. It's about equality of requirements.
>:
>You still sound like the Handicapper General.

Sorry - that's not my intent.
>
>Last time I checked, they had to pass EQUAL written examinations also. How
>they learned the material is of no concern, simply that they know it at the
>time of examination.

Yup.

But there are plenty of folks who know enough radio to pass the writtens without much, if any, preparation. Except for a few who learned Morse in, say, the military of years ago, most new hams start from scratch with the code.

I'm not saying the code test must be kept because of this "Great Equalizer" effect. All I'm saying is that the reason SOME folks hate it so much is because they do not want to have to learn a new and different skill just to get the ham license.
Particularly when that skill has relatively little application outside of amateur radio, and cannot be learned by reading a book or watching a video.

When somebody makes a lot of noise about their non-amateur radio activities as some sort of qualification to judge amateur radio license requirements, it's pretty clear what their message is.
>
>With all kind wishes,

You, too!

73 de Jim, N2EY

872. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-24 02:05:56 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030123210556.00690.00000153@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 60005

In article <b0i8camnj1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030120115147.05739.00000107@mb-df.aol.com...
>> From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
>> >You are the only person I have ever known to use the term "cult" to
>> >describe the ARS.
>>
>> Someone else asked me if its a cult.
>>
>> >The word implies
>> >mindless acceptance of illogical beliefs.
>>
>> >> Change the nature of the clubs.
>> >
>> >How? Clubs usually reflect the interest of the members.
>>
>> Start new specialty clubs.
>
>WHY? Just to serve your interests? If you want a new specialty club,
>then start one yourself. Free enterprise, free choice...hey what a concept.

Exactly.
>
>> >Are you willing to do the work necessary to effect changes?
>>
>> Yes.
>
>Not based on anything I've seen from you here.

There's an old tale about a group of mice trying to figure out what to do about
a cat that is making life difficult for them. One mouse comes up with the idea
that they should tie a bell on the cat's tail, so they can hear the cat coming.
Everyone thinks it's a great idea - but nobody wants to have the job of tying
the bell on the cat.
>
>> >"Less code"
>> >What is wrong with live and let live?
>>
>> Nothing. And as soon as they stop tying the code test to the license
>> classes, this will occur.
>
>The only one doing that today is the FCC.

And only because ITU S25.5 requires it. FCC has specifically said that the treaty requirement (yes, it's a treaty, and yes, it's a requirement) forces them to have the code test for amateur licenses with privileges below 30 MHz. In other words, FCC isn't going to ignore a requirement of a ratified treaty.

>Others that wish to keep
>it that way are free to take that position. If you believe otherwise,
>then support the change when it is proposed. It won't be proposed
>until after the international treaty is changed.

And there's no point in proposing it until the treaty changes, because we know what FCC's answer would be.

My bet is that as soon as the treaty is changed, FCC will just dump Element 1. No NPRM or comment period, just an announcement that Element 1 is waived for all applicants until a formal proposal can be acted upon to change the rules. Reading FCC's Report and Order to 98-143, plus FCC's responses to various petitions for reconsideration convinces me that FCC won't keep code testing without S25.5.

>> >Are YOU volunteering to do the work to make those things happen? For
>> >example, what have YOU built that would be a good program for a club
>> >meeting?
>>
>> I have put in suggestions, but no interest in the club. I would volunteer
>> if there were interest.
>
>Translation: IF someone else does all the formative work, then
>maybe I'll join and help.
>
Once again, Bill, you have clearly expressed the facts in a few words.

73 de Jim, N2EY

873. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-24 02:13:53 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030123211353.21366.00000467@mb-mu.aol.com>
Source record: 60006

In article <c2356669.0301220553.2e305963@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>Say, Larry, you can play the "years" game, too. Add up your age, years
>as a licensed ham, years of military service, years with a bachelor's
>degree, years with a driver's license, years with a CDL, years as an
>ARRL member, plus any other years you find usable and see what the
>total is.
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

Jim:

OK, here goes:

Age: 50
Years as a ham: 21 (Just received Old Timer's Club certificate)
Years as an Extra: 20
Years as an ARRL member: 22
Years of military service: 19 (took early retirement in the mid-90's downsizing)
Years with a CDL: 2.5
Years on rrap: 12
Let's see, that makes me 146.5 years old. Shouldn't I be in a nursing home by now?

73 de Larry, K3LT

874. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-24 02:13:53 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030123211353.21366.00000466@mb-mu.aol.com>
Source record: 60007

In article <20030122005047.05514.00000096@mb-df.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>>I think you're right. The only thing that needs to be fixed is to undo
>>the Restructuring and bring more meaningful licensing requirements
>>back into the system.
>
> Go catch that bus, Larrah...you're late again!

Lennie:

Don't look now, but my bus NEVER goes anywhere without me!

73 de Larry, K3LT

875. Lloyd's problem finally revealed!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-24 03:01:29 UTC
From: dafirebottle@aol.comnojunk
Message-ID: <20030123220129.26496.00000131@mb-fd.aol.com>
Source record: 60008

After Lloyd's last jail stay, he complained of a pain in the rectal area.

(Be careful Lloyd, one of the first signs of AIDS is a sharp jabbing pain in your rectal area)

After being examined by Dr. Seymour Butts, Lloyd's rectal passage was found to be as large as a # 4 washtub. Lloyd's cellmate Big Bubba claimed full responsibility. Big Bubba said, "Lloyd likes it and I know he's a queer, 'cause when I was poking him, he had a boner".

Lloyd was told he has PBDS by Dr. Butts.

Lloyd was at first ecstatic at having something to blame his erratic behaviour on.

Recently however, Lloyd found out what PDBS meant.

PIZZA BOY DELIVERY SYNDROME

Firebottle

876. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-24 03:57:29 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0301231957.5d93cd92@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60009

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E2F105E.E4214B70@earthlink.net>...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > In article <20030122063646.27873.00000121@mb-mj.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> > writes:
> >

> > Ah, but the self-described "experts" in amateur radio keep
> > elevating themselves as "superior" in radio because of their
> > longevity/experience/tenure/callsign/class/etc. and also as
> > emulation models...and all the while sneering at the pros
> > (while not identifying their own alleged professional work).
>
> Oh--I get it! You're back to pecking about trying to find out where Jim
> works.
> I think you might have misstated the rest of it.

Jeez, I know exactly what James does and exactly where he churns his
daily bread, he has lives in his hands hourly and he's a well-known
MSEE pro in that biz. No mystery at all.

Can't imagine why The Putz isn't up to speed on all of it, he
obviously knows everything else. He must be losing his surfing skills.

> > The morse code test controversy is fueled by the terrible
> > insistence of the already-morse-tested to do "just like they
> > had to do."
>
> Nobody has to or even can do what I did. The maximum morse testing
> speed for HF privileges is now a measly five words per minute. Even you
> could do that.

I seriously doubt that.

In this vein I can't find a peep abt S25.5 being on the WRC agenda so
far, seems to have been shoved aside to concentrate IARU & ARRL
firepower on the 40M realignmnt issue.

>
> Dave K8MN

w3rv

877. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-24 04:19:33 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0301232019.6c330766@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60010

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0301220510.75688e4a@posting.google.com>...
> "K HB" <k hb@arrl.DOTORG> wrote in message
news:<kjfX9.4413$Sv3.475131@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>...
> > "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
> >
> > : See:
> > :
> > : http://www.remote.arrl.org/news/features/2003/01/20/?nc=1
> > :
> > : 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> > Must be a damned slow news day at Newington! The book has nothing whatever
> > to do with Amateur Radio.
> >
> > ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
> Perhaps its about a civilian ham who has vast military background.

Want me to tell ya more about my days as the C.O. of my USN LDB & SMD?
Hit me on the RRAP Back Channel and we can get into it.

I noticed you din spend much time in dot antennas. At least yer smart
enough not to do that.

w3rv

878. Re: Lets face it ... we're just communicators.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-24 06:38:35 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b0sedp12fuu@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 60047

Thanks for the "backup" Steve. As I was instructed, the fact that a rib fracture "could" occur, was not a reason to not do CPR, just a consequence.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

"Symbolism is for the simple minded....."

> As an ER Nurse I can tell you that if you did NOT break ribs during CPR,
> you were either (1) very lucky, (2) NOT applying sufficent pressure (3) Doing
> CPR on someone with rubber ribs.
>
> To be accurate, we don't "massage" the heart, but aggressively compress it.
> The point is to mechanically cycle the heart by squeezing it between the
> sternum and the spine. The "textbook" depth for an adult is 1.5 to 2 inches.
> On the average adult, that's 35% of the thckness of the chest.
>
> 73 and hope none of you ever need CPR...
>
> Steve, K4YZ

879. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-24 06:50:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030124015037.07681.00000246@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 60011

In article <3E2F0DA7.48BD0A0E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Right. I probably should have used the term "proficient in morse". We
>certainly wouldn't want to see you "bothered" by those pesky amateur
>radio license exams. You didn't do radio 24/7 ever and there is no
>professional equivalent to DXing.

"DX" is a worldwide term, long in use by the radio world, an
abbreviation for "distance." ADA, as part of the Army
Command and Administrative Network, did communications
for the United Nations Far East Headquarters and for Army
Forces Far East from 1946 through 1963...on HF 24 hours a
day, 7 days a week.

>Where have I said any such thing?

All the time. Untrue, but you keep hoping that someone
believes your fantasy.

>> Does Secretary Powell know this? :-)
>
>Don't know. Don't care. Never worked for him.

You never worked 24/7 in your life...

>> >> Are you now relenting from mumbling a mantra? :-)
>> >
>> >I don't mumble.
>>
>> It comes out a Snarling Mumble. :-)
>
>Your use of non-existent terms is masterful.

Heil SNARLS, then. There is no "mumbling" in his text.

>> >Pay attention. You brought up the peculiar "obviously-political"
>> >comment.
>>
>> We can't possibly ignore Herr Robust poking his finger at us
>> "to get our attention." :-)
>>
>> Everyone must follow Herr Robust's Newsgroup Rules... :-)
>
>Lack of response noted, Foghorn.

Pay attention. You just replied to a "lack of response" and all
that reply was just another personal insult instead of talking
about the subject. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

880. Re: Lets face it ... we're just communicators.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-24 06:50:38 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030124015038.07681.00000247@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 60012

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.h932tg9.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 20 Jan 2003 23:57:18 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>> I remember the 1994 Northridge Earthquake very well and
>> saw NO evidence of this great "service to the country" at the
>> eastern half of The Valley. Same thing in the Sylmar Quake
>> of 1971. Or the Whittier Narrows quake in between those
>> two. Or the big Wildfires we've had around these parts.
>>
>> I've seen/heard much of those individuals involved directly
>> with all those emergencies/disasters...not a word on "hams."
>>
>> How can that be?
>
> Because the idiots in City Hall dissolved the old Civil Defense
> Office structure with its cross-trained members "because it
> wasn't needed any more" just days before the Baldwin Hills
> Reservoir disaster in early December 1963 (my years as a
> volunteer in LA was 1958-1961). Most of the cross-training was
> in command-post operations and status reporting in addition to
> my service with the Sheriff's Reserve. The thought was that if
> someone was unavailable, there could be someone else with
> training to drop into the slot. Not being an amateur radio
> operator, you wouldn't have been clued in to this aspect of
> operations.

A small earthen-wall dam failure was a "disaster" of city-wide
proportions? I don't think so. It was a most SLOW disaster
if so and all TV viewers here in Greater Los Angeles could
watch it happen all afternoon. At most it wiped out some
houses on a cul-de-sac street. I don't remember any fatalities.
Nice coverage by channel 5 and their new telecopter.

1963 is over 40 years ago, Phil.

Los Angeles County has a good REAL disaster center now
and it was proven effective in 1994, nine years ago.

881. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-24 06:50:39 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030124015039.07681.00000248@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 60013

In article <d22b54c3.0301231957.5d93cd92@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3E2F105E.E4214B70@earthlink.net>...
>> Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >
>> > In article <20030122063646.27873.00000121@mb-mj.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>> > writes:
>
>> > Ah, but the self-described "experts" in amateur radio keep
>> > elevating themselves as "superior" in radio because of their
>> > longevity/experience/tenure/callsign/class/etc. and also as
>> > emulation models...and all the while sneering at the pros
>> > (while not identifying their own alleged professional work).
>>
>> Oh--I get it! You're back to pecking about trying to find out where Jim
>> works.
>> I think you might have misstated the rest of it.
>
>Jeez, I know exactly what James does and exactly where he churns his
>daily bread, he has lives in his hands hourly and he's a well-known
>MSEE pro in that biz. No mystery at all.

Not to you. To everyone else it is still a Mystery.

"Has lives in his hands hourly?!?" :-)

>Can't imagine why The Putz isn't up to speed on all of it, he
>obviously knows everything else. He must be losing his surfing skills.

I know that Kellie sure as hell doesn't have any "26 patents."
I know that Kellie sure as hell doesn't have any military
experience. I know that Kellie sure as hell doesn't know
much electronic theory as it applies to radio communication.

So does everyone else. :-)

>> > The morse code test controversy is fueled by the terrible
>> > insistence of the already-morse-tested to do "just like they
>> > had to do."
>>
>> Nobody has to or even can do what I did. The maximum morse testing
>> speed for HF privileges is now a measly five words per minute. Even you
>> could do that.

>
>I seriously doubt that.

No problem. Everyone else seriously doubts Kellie. :-)

>In this vein I can't find a peep abt S25.5 being on the WRC agenda so
>far, seems to have been shoved aside to concentrate IARU & ARRL
>firepower on the 40M realignmnt issue.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Can't even surf the FCC website?

Look for items 1.7.1, 1.7.2, 1.7.3, all handled by IWG-6. All kinds
of documentation there on it.

The IARU came out with "firepower" over a year ago, that "big gun"
being a Very good PDF document, excellently illustrated, without
any apparent influence by ARRL. It's on the IARU website. :-)

882. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-24 06:50:41 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030124015041.07681.00000249@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 60014

In article <c2356669.0301230959.7e90d9d0@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3E2F105E.E4214B70@earthlink.net>...
>> Why bother with old Harrison when we have Leonard Anderson, a
>> real person who doesn't get involved in amateur radio.
>
>Hold on a sec, Dave....
>
>How do we know that Leonard Anderson is "a real person"? All we really
>know is that someone using that name has posted here since at least
>1997, using a variety of screen names. Some posts are signed, others
>are not. There has even been a half-hearted attempt to conceal who the
>poster was. Not to mention his sending unsolicited email with obscene
>attachments, then refusing email replies from tose spammed.

Who has ever seen a "signed" message in any newsgroup?
Include newsgroups that allow binaries. This newsgroup does
not have binaries. The closest one can get to a "signature" is
to use one of several public-key encrypted authenticators.

What is all this about "obscene attachments?!?" Is a mistake
"obscene?" Is a lack of humor about it "obscene?" Is a frightful
enormous ego on the part of the recipient and a demonstrated
rage afterwards "obscene?" :-)

>Whoever the person behind those posts really is, he/she obviously has
>no real interest in amateur radio beyond newsgroup arguments and
>insults toward radio amateurs.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Insult by innuendo. That badly becomes
someone who has "lives in his hands hourly."

"Interest in radio" is NOT confined to possession of an amateur
radio license grant...regardless of what Miccolis and others
imply.

>Remember the claims of VEC fraud (based
>solely on prejudice against young hams), ARRL "dishonesty" (no
>evidence of any kind presented) and "going for the Extra right out of
>the box" (three years ago, no license yet)?

No such "claims" were made. Some things were pointed out
about the "six-year-old hams" as pictured on the ARRL news
page. Apparently some fortysomething long-timers have very
touchy egos about two children getting their first ticket seven

years before they did... :-)

Oh, dear, another fantasy or lack of reading skills. I was
definitely going for extra-out-of-the-box? No. What I wrote
was that I "could." That's a "maybe" condition. A positive
declaration is to say "I shall." I have never "shalled," not
even "shilly-shalled." :-)

So far, there has been little presented in here to encourage
joining a bunch of key-beeping little boys masquerading as
grown, mature men to "be as good as they." :-) :-) :-)

>Says it all, really.

Says nothing, Miccolis. All it demonstrates is that you
cannot take any strong opposition without letting your ego
ruin your judgement.

>And since Mr. Anderson obviously has no intention of ever getting an
>amateur license, why is he so interested in things like age limits for
>ham licenses?

Just who is this Miccolis person to ask?

Who has "made an issue" of age limits? Not I. One mention in
a Reply to Comments on NPRM 98-143 of 13 January 1999 and
some in here seize on that (the last item of 14 text pages) as a
"cause celebre" or some sort of "world crisis!" :-)

>Ask his motivation, and you won't get a credible answer.

Oh, my, now "Judge" Miccolis defines credulity! :-)

>Since I don't work at the FCC, the ARRL, or a communications law
>practice, what does it matter where I work? It's simply not relevant
>to amateur radio policy.

Ah, so Miccolis is ashamed of what he does for living?

>How has he behaved towards others when such information has been
>presented? Has he been appreciative of the work of medical
>professionals, for example?

You must mean Nursie Putz, the Kildare-wannabe?

> Or career State Department employees?

...who was never on any "key lists" of State in public view?
...or acted like they were the archtypical "ugly American?"
Harf! :-)

>Ever notice that Mr. Anderson demands all sorts of information and
>proof from others, but rarely if ever provides any of his own, except
>to brag about decades-old experiences paid for by others?

Oh, my, selective amnesia! I've given names of all my former
employers in here. I've given names and callsigns of licensed
radio amateurs still living as references. Is more required? :-)

Perhaps so...since Miccolis will NOT accept any credibility
until all agree with Miccolis' opinions. He is "Judge." :-)

Miccolis lives in the state of Pennsylvania according to his
information on the public FCC database. From there on
there is nothing except the testimony of W3RV (the "man of
26 patents"). Is that anything like one Michael Deignan
who gave a Hawaiian PO Box address and was a "good
person-friend" to one fella named Herman? :-)

Miccolis must not like what he does for a living. He doesn't
talk about it. Who knows, maybe he doesn't work for a
living? There's no way for anyone to know...

>Exactly. Mr. Anderson has one standard for himself, another for those
>who disagree with him.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. :-)

There's no "double standard" going on, yet Miccolis looks in the
mirror and thinks the reflection is someone else. :-)

Give PROOF, not fantasy. Things don't become "true" just
because you imagine them...or worse, WANT them to be
like the imagination. Tsk, tsk, tsk...

If given proof, research it, determine if it is true...the ACCEPT
it if so based on those references. Do NOT accept hearsay
as "evidenciary." Except maybe in fishing...

>Maybe...IF he wanted an amateur radio license above the Technician
>level. But he does not want an amateur radio license. So why bother
>with such a person?

Miccolis cannot "accept" anyone unless they agree with His
Way of Doing Things! :-)

>There is also no requirement to use any particular mode, band or
>technology, yet the written tests are full of questions on things most
>hams will never do, and which hams are not required to do.
>
>Why is it logical to require hams to pass a written test full of
>questions on things hams are not required to do? Why did I have to
>learn about UHF/VHF, transistors, SSB, FM, and a variety of other
>things just so I could work Morse on 7010?

For questions on the "why" of US amateur radio written test
content, contact your friendly neighborhood VEC QPC.
The VEC Question Pool Committee determine written test
content, the FCC quit doing that some time back. The FCC
quit specifying a minimum number of question subjects, too.

All the FCC specifies is a minimum number of questions per
written test element, the minimum number of correct answers.

>Mike Deignan had the guy nailed years ago.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Deignan bailed, didn't nail.

In fact, Mikey D lost a number of his "Hawaiian club calls," too.

"Cross your legs, Jimmie, I have only one nail left..." :-)

883. Re: This Is How KB1HMW "Supports" Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-24 13:26:42 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301240526.16e9a8e8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60015

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030123192050.24933.00000131@mb-bh.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: This Is How KB1HMW "Supports" Amateur Radio
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 1/23/03 1:11 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0301231111.e22a76@posting.google.com>
>
> >But when they invited me to jump out of
> >airplanes for a living I had to decline.
>
> Was the lack of an offer of a parachute a clue?
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Welp, the little chest pin shows a parachute. What do you think?

884. Re: This Is How KB1HMW "Supports" Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-24 13:54:19 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030124085419.14275.00000065@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 60016

>Subject: Re: This Is How KB1HMW "Supports" Amateur Radio
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 1/24/03 7:26 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0301240526.16e9a8e8@posting.google.com>

>> >But when they invited me to jump out of
>> >airplanes for a living I had to decline.
>>
>> Was the lack of an offer of a parachute a clue?
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>Welp, the little chest pin shows a parachute. What do you think?

Then I'd say your comment about declining further service because of Airborne duty was misleading, at best. Obviously you DIDN'T decline since jump school is voluntary, unless you are training for SpecFor or RANGER.

I'd also say that, considering your past performance in THIS forum, I am not surprised at that revelation. Being direct and accurate are not your forte.

I'd furthermore add that I doubt the chestpin ever adorned your regulation Army uniform...At least not where anyone who knew you might see it and know better.

Lastly, I'd say it was PROBABLY a set of those "Jr Birdman" wings the kids can pick up at a lot of airshows. Or perhaps a set of wings purchased from Brigade Quartermaster or other such outfitter. The REAL Armed Forces are kinda particular about who get's to wear those wings.

Steve, K4YZ

(BTW...I have a set of USN/USMC jump wings too...Never wore them since I never earned them, but they sure do look good in the collection)

885. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-24 14:10:26 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030124091026.14275.00000066@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 60017

>Subject: Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 1/24/03 12:50 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030124015037.07681.00000246@mb-fk.aol.com>

>You didn't do radio 24/7 ever and there is no
>>professional equivalent to DXing.

>ADA, as part of the Army
> Command and Administrative Network, did communications
> for the United Nations Far East Headquarters and for Army
> Forces Far East from 1946 through 1963...on HF 24 hours a
> day, 7 days a week.

Ah ahhh ahhhhhhh LENNIE! You said YOU did HF radio 24/7.

I quote your comments to Mike Coslo of four days ago:

Why is it "necessary to work DX?" With a ham license (an
amateur radio license grant, that is...). I did that a half
century ago on a 24/7 basis as part of ACAN, without any
license whatsoever.

FOR EMPHASIS :"I did that a half century ago on a 24/7 basis..."

There you go again, Lennie...Thinking we wouldn't see through yet another
of your attempts to substitute a "Lennism" for the truth.

>>Where have I said any such thing?
>
> All the time. Untrue, but you keep hoping that someone
> believes your fantasy.

As pointed out above, I think WE have a clear picture of who is
fantasizing here and who is telling the truth.

>>Don't know. Don't care. Never worked for him.
>
> You never worked 24/7 in your life...

And YOU have...?!?!

BBBBWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! !

>>Lack of response noted, Foghorn.
>
> Pay attention. You just replied to a "lack of response" and all
> that reply was just another personal insult instead of talking

> about the subject.

YOU pay attention, you lying sack of fermented barnyard excrement...You have absolutely NO credibility here...You make vile, ugly accusations you never back up with facts or evidence, your attempts to embellish your Army service are shameful, and YOUR personal attacks on anyone who dares to "engage" you in what YOU term "debate" are nothing less than cowardly and demeaning.

Whatever contributions you THINK you made to radiocommunications has been long ago blunted by your ego, your lies and your self-serving tirades in this forum.

Now crawl off to where ever it is you sequester yourself when you've made a fool of yourself again...And stay there.

Putz.

886. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-24 14:19:50 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030124091950.14275.00000067@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 60018

>Subject: Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 1/24/03 12:50 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030124015039.07681.00000248@mb-fk.aol.com>

>I know that Kellie sure as hell doesn't know
> much electronic theory as it applies to radio communication.

And YOU do? Can't pass a test that grade school kids pass, yet you're in
here making THESE kinds of accusations..?!?!

BBBWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! ! !

>No problem. Everyone else seriously doubts Kellie

Wrong. In spades. As usual.

Putz.

887. Re: Lets face it ... we're just communicators.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-24 14:24:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030124092400.14275.00000068@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 60019

>Subject: Re: Lets face it ... we're just communicators.....
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 1/24/03 12:50 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030124015038.07681.00000247@mb-fk.aol.com>

>1963 is over 40 years ago, Phil

OK...So if Phil is to not regress to 1963, can we assume that WE have head the last from YOU about 19-FIFTY-three?

>Los Angeles County has a good REAL disaster center now
> and it was proven effective in 1994, nine years ago

And still "employs" Amateur Radio operators in it, as do nearly all of the "served" agencies therein. That they don't take out full-page ads in the LA Times does not negate the truth.

Sorry it ruins the LennieRant.

888. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-24 14:58:27 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030124095827.01401.00000140@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 60020

>Subject: Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 1/24/03 12:50 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030124015041.07681.00000249@mb-fk.aol.com>

>What is all this about "obscene attachments?!?" Is a mistake
> "obscene?" Is a lack of humor about it "obscene?" Is a frightful
> enormous ego on the part of the recipient and a demonstrated
> rage afterwards "obscene?"

To consider anything you do as humourous is obscene.

To hold yourself out as some sort of technology-smart professional when
you make such a simple "faux pas" with an e mail attachment is obscene.

The thought of you with an FCC Form 660 with your name on it is obscene.

>"Interest in radio" is NOT confined to possession of an amateur
> radio license grant...regardless of what Miccolis and others
> imply.

In THIS forum it is AMATEUR Radio. A program you have publicly scorned and
ridiculed. The (implication) is that you are a liar. But THAT doesn't take
much imagination to accept as plausible. YOU provide reams of evidence to
SUPPORT it.

>>Remember the claims of VEC fraud (based
>>solely on prejudice against young hams), ARRL "dishonesty" (no
>>evidence of any kind presented) and "going for the Extra right out of
>>the box" (three years ago, no license yet)?
>
> No such "claims" were made.

And there you go and prove me right! AGAIN!

>No such "claims" were made. Some things were pointed out
> about the "six-year-old hams" as pictured on the ARRL news
> page. Apparently some fortysomething long-timers have very
> touchy egos about two children getting their first ticket seven
> years before they did

The "touchy ego" here does NOT belong to any licensed Amateur, but rather
to an egotistical lying ex-radio technician by the name of Leonard H. Anderson,
ex-Army radio station clerk of 1950's era...The SAME lying Leonard H. Anderson
that formulated an idea to the FCC to impose AGE RESTRICTIONS to a radio
service that has not had any reason to do so in over 80 years of existence.

>Oh, dear, another fantasy or lack of reading skills. I was
> definitely going for extra-out-of-the-box? No. What I wrote
> was that I "could." That's a "maybe" condition. A positive
> declaration is to say "I shall." I have never "shalled," not
> even "shilly-shalled."

Another untruth, but in the light of so many, what does it matter now?

>So far, there has been little presented in here to encourage
> joining a bunch of key-beeping little boys masquerading as
> grown, mature men to "be as good as they."

Yeah...Decades of accolades bestowed by private and governmental agencies alike is not much inducement...Nor is the potential value of a license that grants privileges far-in-excess of what ever "commerical" license held by Lennie. The one-and-only priviledge granted by Lennie's GROL is the one to hire one's self out as a radio technician.

Whoooopie dooo.

>>Says it all, really.
>
> Says nothing, Miccolis. All it demonstrates is that you
> cannot take any strong opposition without letting your ego
> ruin your judgement.

Thee is nothing "strong" about Leonard H Anderson except for the stench of decay and disease as he litters the Internet with his demeaning and denigrating bile.

> Who has "made an issue" of age limits? Not I.

Caught in ANOTHER lie. Anderson is priceless.

>>Ask his motivation, and you won't get a credible answer.
>
> Oh, my, now "Judge" Miccolis defines credulity!

He doesn't have to. It's in the very fabric of lies YOU weave. The post this one quotes alone is rampant with them. So how can you call ANYTHING you write "credible", Lennie? YOU don't give us anything to base trust in...

>>How has he behaved towards others when such information has been
>>presented? Has he been appreciative of the work of medical
>>professionals, for example?
>
> You must mean Nursie Putz, the Kildare-wannabe?

How many times have YOU be cited for lifesaving, Lennie?

>There's no "double standard" going on, yet Miccolis looks in the
> mirror and thinks the reflection is someone else.

Sure there is, Lennie. YOU set THAT "standard". You lie, you call names, you make untruthful assertions you cannot verify or back up, then you CLAIM that YOU are somehow the injured party.

> "Cross your legs, Jimmie, I have only one nail left..."

Sounds like a threat to me.

Putz.

889. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-24 15:02:13 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030124100213.01401.00000141@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 60021

>Subject: Re: NR-1 Book
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 1/24/03 7:18 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0301240518.184ce709@posting.google.com>

>RRAA is full of character assassination

It's not "character assassination" if it's true, Brain.

Steve

890. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-24 15:41:22 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E315EEA.5CDF08E1@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60022

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E2F0DA7.48BD0A0E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Right. I probably should have used the term "proficient in morse". We
> >certainly wouldn't want to see you "bothered" by those pesky amateur
> >radio license exams. You didn't do radio 24/7 ever and there is no
> >professional equivalent to DXing.
>
> "DX" is a worldwide term, long in use by the radio world, an
> abbreviation for "distance." ADA, as part of the Army
> Command and Administrative Network, did communications
> for the United Nations Far East Headquarters and for Army
> Forces Far East from 1946 through 1963...on HF 24 hours a
> day, 7 days a week.

So your outfit worked distance. Super. There is no professional or
military equivalent of DXing.

Regardless of what ADA did, you never worked 24/7 anywhere. Your claim
is ludicrous.

> >Where have I said any such thing?
>
> All the time. Untrue, but you keep hoping that someone
> believes your fantasy.

Convenient snip. You've not confirmed anything.

> >> Does Secretary Powell know this? :-)
> >
> >Don't know. Don't care. Never worked for him.
>
> You never worked 24/7 in your life...

That's right. Nobody works 24/7. The very idea is preposterous.

> >> >> Are you now relenting from mumbling a mantra? :-)
> >> >
> >> >I don't mumble.
> >>
> >> It comes out a Snarling Mumble. :-)
> >
> >Your use of non-existent terms is masterful.
>

> Heil SNARLS, then. There is no "mumbling" in his text.

Then why'd you state otherwise?

> >> >Pay attention. You brought up the peculiar "obviously-political"
> >> >comment.
> >>
> >> We can't possibly ignore Herr Robust poking his finger at us
> >> "to get our attention." :-)
> >>
> >> Everyone must follow Herr Robust's Newsgroup Rules... :-)
> >
> >Lack of response noted, Foghorn.
>
> Pay attention. You just replied to a "lack of response" and all
> that reply was just another personal insult instead of talking
> about the subject. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

Uh.....tsk, tsk, tsk, Foghorn. You'd previously begun using your "Herr
Robust"
term and didn't respond to the comments. You still haven't.

Dave K8MN

891. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-24 16:18:57 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <RHdY9.502$N5.345696@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 60023

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030120213133.00111.00000241@mb-mv.aol.com...
> In article <v2n2278niedv6f@corp.supernews.com>, "KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com>
>writes:
>
>[snip]
>
> NCI stands for No Code International. No Code means no code at
> all! If you pass a code test, you're immediately disqualified! Send
> an E-mail to Carl Stevenson and his cohorts and tell them you
> grew up!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Larry,

Please refrain from spreading deliberate misinformation.

A very large percentage of NCI's membership have passed Morse
tests ... many are Extras, or other countries' equivalents thereof.

Most of NCI's Board of Directors have passed Morse tests and
hold higher classes of license ...

And, once again, we do NOT oppose the (voluntary) learning
and use of Morse, nor do we have any intention to ban or restrict
the use of Morse in any way ... we simply oppose the Morse TEST
as an unnecessary requirement for licensure in today's world.

--
Carl R. Stevenson - wk3c
Grid Square FN20fm
<mailto:wk3c@fast.net> (general personal e-mail and NCI e-mail)
<mailto:wk3c-shack@fast.net> (QSO, QSL, skeds, only, please)
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wk3c>

NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, QCWA (31424)
Member, ARRL
Member, TAPR
Member, The SETI League

Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

892. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-24 16:26:57 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b0rpkg$nl0$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 60025

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.h930wx7.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On 20 Jan 2003 19:31:58 GMT, Dennis Ferguson wrote:
>
> >My feeling exactly. I've been wondering the same thing about cell
phones,
> >in fact. What is the point of using a wireless phone to access the wired
> >telephone network when it would be so much easier to do the same thing
> >with a phone directly wired to the network? I mean, if there are wires
in
> >the middle why would anyone want to use radio at the edges?
>
> I sit on a committee that writes local cellphone tower ordinances,
> and the big push that I detect from the representatives of both the
> wired and the wireless telephone industry is to get rid of the wired
> network between the "wire centers" (we used to call them Central
> Offices) and subscribers entirely. "They" say that it is coming, and
> it won't be too long before new connections and expansions will be
> wireless only, copper wire and the necessary maintenance being very
> expensive.
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

Depending on who you talk to, that's one viewpoint.
The perspective Phil offers is narrowband (voice) centric for the
most part.

The other driver of new home
connections is increased demand for bandwidth and new services which
consume significant bandwidth. Try delivering 200 channels of TV
via wireless. Look at the proliferation of cable modem connectivity
to internet, DSL, etc.

More likly for suc bandwidth demands we will eventually see fiber optic
delivery direct to the home at some point. Alternatively, fiber can deliver
the services to an area focal point and then the "last mile" could be
via cable (RG-59 or the like).

My point in adding this info is to suggest that the future network(s) won't
end up
as a "one technology fits all" topology. Odds are there will be a mixed
environment with different costing and revenue models that drive the choice
for any
particular area.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

893. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-24 16:27:01 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <pPdY9.520$N5.346260@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 60024

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3E2CE4EF.59AFFC80@earthlink.net...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> >
> > And KB9TMP will note that I promptly replied to his message, indicating
that
> > his request would be promptly handled.
> >
> > That's the difference between NCI and some of the fanatical procoders
who
> > frequent this newsgroup ... unlike the fanatical procoders, NCI believes
in,
> > and supports, freedom of choice, rather than forcing views on others.
>
> It isn't your freedom to bestow. You haven't given KB9TMP anything
> which wasn't already his.

I never said I gave him anything that wasn't already his ... I said we
support
his freedom of choice.

> You have demonstrated repeatedly that you are as fanatical toward doing
> away with code testing as anyone who supports continued testing. If you
> suupported "freedom of choice" you'd have no problem supporting the view
> of those who believe that testing should remain.

The logic fails, Dave ... supporting the view that Morse testing should be
forced on all, like it or not, is NOT supporting freedom of choice.

I recognize that those who want to keep Morse testing have a right to
hold that opinion ... but they don't have the right to force it on everyone
else. NCI doesn't try to force its view on anyone ... nobody twists
anyone's
arm to join NCI, and members are not held captive, as the previous exchange
demonstrates.

So, don't try to assert that we are somehow violating the rights of those
who
believe Morse testing should remain, because we are not ... we acknowledge
that there is a minority that feels that way AND that they have the right to
those
views. On the other hand, we (NCI and its members) have an equal right to
our views.

--
Carl R. Stevenson - wk3c

Grid Square FN20fm
mailto:wk3c@wk3c.com (general personal e-mail and NCI e-mail)
mailto:wk3cqth@wk3c.com (QSO, QSL, skeds, only, please)

NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, QCWA (31424)
Member, ARRL
Member, TAPR
Member, The SETI League

Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

894. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-24 16:32:38 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <GUdY9.532$N5.345124@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 60026

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030123203646.00690.00000152@mb-fm.aol.com...
> In article <nKzX9.6344$bL4.633536@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>,
"Kï¿½HB"
> <kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG> writes:
>
> >N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
> >
> >:
> >: The "Equalizer" effect is simply that a prospective ham is not likely
to
> >: have
> >: learned Morse elsewhere, and has to demonstrate his/her skill on an
EQUAL
> >: basis
> >: with others, in an objective test. It's about equality of requirements.
> >:
> >You still sound like the Handicapper General.
>
> Sorry - that's not my intent.
> >
> >Last time I checked, they had to pass EQUAL written examinations also.
How
> >they learned the material is of no concern, simply that they know it at
the
> >time of examination.
>
> Yup.
>
> But there are plenty of folks who know enough radio to pass the writtens
> without much, if any, preparation.

So what? If they are qualified, they are qualified ... period.

Your argument goes back to the "work ethic" philosophy where folks
argue that people shouldn't get a license without having to "demonstrate
their dedication by working hard (jumping through hoops) for it."

Carl - wk3c

895. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-24 16:33:06 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030124113306.04712.00000327@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 60027

>we acknowledge
>that there is a minority that feels that way

Your so full of SHIT, lets see you minority figures and the source for these figures

896. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-24 16:42:14 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b0rqgrilp1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 60028

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:pPdY9.520$N5.346260@nnrp1.ptd.net...
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3E2CE4EF.59AFFC80@earthlink.net...
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > >
> > > And KB9TMP will note that I promptly replied to his message,
indicating
> > > that his request would be promptly handled.
> > >
> > > That's the difference between NCI and some of the fanatical procoders
> > > who frequent this newsgroup ... unlike the fanatical procoders, NCI
believes
> > > believes in, and supports, freedom of choice, rather than forcing
views on others.
> >
> > It isn't your freedom to bestow. You haven't given KB9TMP anything
> > which wasn't already his.
>
> I never said I gave him anything that wasn't already his ... I said we
> support his freedom of choice.
>
> > You have demonstrated repeatedly that you are as fanatical toward doing
> > away with code testing as anyone who supports continued testing. If you
> > suupported "freedom of choice" you'd have no problem supporting the view
> > of those who believe that testing should remain.
>
> The logic fails, Dave ... supporting the view that Morse testing should be
> forced on all, like it or not, is NOT supporting freedom of choice.
>
> I recognize that those who want to keep Morse testing have a right to
> hold that opinion ... but they don't have the right to force it on
everyone
> else. NCI doesn't try to force its view on anyone ... nobody twists
> anyone's arm to join NCI, and members are not held captive, as the
previous
> previous exchange demonstrates.
>
> So, don't try to assert that we are somehow violating the rights of those
> who believe Morse testing should remain, because we are not ... we
> acknowledge that there is a minority that feels that way AND that
> they have the right to those views.
>

> On the other hand, we (NCI and its members) have an equal right
> to our views.
> Carl R. Stevenson - wk3c

More to the point, there is nothing in NCI's efforts or charter that is targeted at ending USE of morse. THAT is the bottom line to those that want to see morse continued as a mode on ham radio. One does NOT need a test to be able to learn and use morse on the air.

The major concern/fear (IMHO) of pro-code test advocates is that without any test at all, new devotees to the use of morse won't just happen to appear because they were mandated to learn morse just to gain HF access. Without the mandated CW test process, those that want to see morse continue in use will actually have to market their reasons why they use code in the open marketplace of mode competition to new (and existing) hams.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

897. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-24 16:54:50 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <udeY9.5268$IN1.3658@nwrddc02.gnilink.net>
Source record: 60029

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:GUdY9.532$N5.345124@nnrp1.ptd.net...
> Your argument goes back to the "work ethic" philosophy where folks
> argue that people shouldn't get a license without having to "demonstrate
> their dedication by working hard (jumping through hoops) for it."
>
> Carl - wk3c

Is "working hard (jumping through hoops)" in reference to the 5-wpm exam?

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

898. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-24 17:27:58 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0301240927.110b95f5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60030

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0301231957.5d93cd92@posting.google.com>...

> > Oh--I get it! You're back to pecking about trying to find out where Jim
> > works.
> > I think you might have misstated the rest of it.
>
> Jeez, I know exactly what James does and exactly where he churns his
> daily bread, he has lives in his hands hourly and he's a well-known
> MSEE pro in that biz.

Nice turn of phrase but obviously way above the receptive language
skills of at least one reader. Plainer to say "his work involves
safety-critical EE stuff, among other things" and leave it at that.

>No mystery at all.

Not to those who have the need to know.

Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior.

So there's no reason to go into anyone's qualifications, because they
don't count for a thing with Mr. Anderson if that person disagrees
with his views on amateur radio. All those who disagree with him are
one and the same to him.

If you need any evidence of this, just look through posts here by any
of his many screen names.

> Can't imagine why

(Mr. Anderson)

> isn't up to speed on all of it, he
> obviously knows everything else.

You are mistaken about the last part. Lack of knowledge on his part
has been proved again and again, here in rrap and on other newsgroups.
Not that he will ever admit being mistaken on anything.

>He must be losing his surfing skills.

Indeed.
>
> > > The morse code test controversy is fueled by the terrible
> > > insistence of the already-morse-tested to do "just like they
> > > had to do."
> >
> > Nobody has to or even can do what I did. The maximum morse testing
> > speed for HF privileges is now a measly five words per minute. Even you
> > could do that.
>
> I seriously doubt that.

Who knows? That Extra is still in the box, after more than three
years. That's a good thing.
>
> In this vein I can't find a peep abt S25.5 being on the WRC agenda so
> far, seems to have been shoved aside to concentrate IARU & ARRL
> firepower on the 40M realignmnt issue.
>
Not a major issue anymore. I'll be surprised if it takes any more
agenda time than the minimum required to propose elimination of S25.5
and do the vote. Of course I hope I am mistaken about this and that
S25.5 survives WRC-2003, but I doubt very much that will happen. And
once the treaty (yes, it's a genuine treaty) changes and is ratified,
FCC will most probably dump Element 1 ASAP.

40 meters is actually a much more important issue for HF amateur
radio, for a bunch of reasons. The real question is: can a better deal
be struck with the SWBC folks?

73 de Jim, N2EY

899. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-24 17:36:38 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <GQeY9.689$hP2.55@nwrddc04.gnilink.net>
Source record: 60031

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0301240927.110b95f5@posting.google.com...
> Not a major issue anymore.

True.

> I'll be surprised if it takes any more
> agenda time than the minimum required to propose elimination of S25.5
> and do the vote.

I'm not so sure about that, Jim. Perhaps we may see some European "ringers"
in there. ;-)

> Of course I hope I am mistaken about this and that
> S25.5 survives WRC-2003

Me too!

> , but I doubt very much that will happen. And
> once the treaty (yes, it's a genuine treaty) changes and is ratified,
> FCC will most probably dump Element 1 ASAP.

Last hope?

> 40 meters is actually a much more important issue for HF amateur
> radio, for a bunch of reasons. The real question is: can a better deal
> be struck with the SWBC folks?

True true, I hope that deal can come to fruition.

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

P.S. Man, it's COLD!

900. Another loony rant from lardass lloyd!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-24 18:21:00 UTC
From: dafirebottle@aol.comnojunk
Message-ID: <20030124132100.26530.00000213@mb-fd.aol.com>
Source record: 60032

I cant help but listen to you guys all admire me all day on 14.275. You people make me sick Don’t you have anything else better to do than jamm Glenn? You are all going to jail. The Legal standing on K1MAN was settled long ago. Don’t you people ever read? I may call my Congressman and the Governor of Alabama, besides, I voted for both of them. Maybe they can get Mr. Hollingsworth to get you all of 14.275! Remember, You are all being RECORDED! Lloyd, N0VFP BARF/AARA/IARN

"I cant help but listen to you guys all admire me all day on 14.275."

Where in the hell did you learn how to structure a sentence?

More.....

"Maybe they can get Mr. Hollingsworth to get you all of 14.275!"

I'm sure you meant to say "off 14.275"

Go back to school you goddamn moron!

Firebottle

901. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-24 20:04:00 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.h988qxi.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 60033

On 24 Jan 2003 00:44:19 GMT, Dennis Ferguson wrote:

>I'll bet you are in a fairly rural area.

Not hardly...it's urban metro Portland, where gobs of what used to be protected open space 20 miles away are being developed into low to medium density occupancies.

The area that I live in was developed 40 years ago, and is as wired as Qwest ex-US Worst ex-Pacific NW Bell is going to. ATT Cable just fiberized their system (forced to by the area cable franchiser) so I have cable modem service. I tried to get DSL several years ago but I'm 22,000 cable feet from a Portland CO literally at the end of the US Worst cable plant - the Verizon ex-GTE territory starts two houses to the west - and they didn't say no, they said hell no, we're not putting in any more wire plant. I had to jump up and down (and cash in a few industry IOUs) to get them to replace the "we don't have any more good pairs" cable to give me a pair quiet enough to sustain a 56K modem at 33K in dial-up service until ATT got around to upgrading this neighborhood a year ago.

Fun and games....

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

902. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-24 20:04:00 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.h989a3j.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 60034

On Fri, 24 Jan 2003 11:26:57 -0500, Bill Sohl wrote:

>Depending on who you talk to, that's one viewpoint.
>The perspective Phil offers is narrowband (voice) centric for the
>most part.
>
>The other driver of new home
>connections is increased demand for bandwidth and new services which
>consume significant bandwidth. Try delivering 200 channels of TV
>via wireless. Look at the proliferation of cable modem connectivity
>to internet, DSL, etc.

For this purpose, "wireless" is via satellite, and it's being done
every day all over the world. A goof friend of ours (and an
active ham) lives so far out in the boonies that he can't get cable
or DSL service, and he connects to the world through satellite. He
loves it. He got that idea from the American Red Cross (he's a
retired disaster communications officer - paid professional
staff) where he was in charge of the switchover of their
long-haul communications network to the PanAmSat system.

>More likly for suc bandwidth demands we will eventually see fiber optic
>delivery direct to the home at some point.

It's already to the cable node pedestal in front of my house. If
they want to dig up my lawn for the third time to put a fiber drop
in, tell me when and I'll put on the coffee....

>Alternatively, fiber can deliver
>the services to an area focal point and then the "last mile" could be
>via cable (RG-59 or the like).

My "last mile" is about 100 feet of quad-shield RG-6....
>
>My point in adding this info is to suggest that the future network(s)
>won't end up as a "one technology fits all" topology. Odds are there
>will be a mixed environment with different costing and revenue models
>that drive the choice for any particular area.

No argument there.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

903. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-24 20:24:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030124152428.27873.00000163@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 60035

In article <f45722ac.0301240518.184ce709@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> I noticed you din spend much time in dot antennas. At least yer smart
>> enough not to do that.
>>
>> w3rv
>
>Aw joos fuggit. I dinah wanna tawk injunearing wid yous jeannios guys.
>
>RRAA is full of character assassination. Same stuff, different year.

Be careful, Brian. You are replying to a tuff-tawkin hoagie
muncher who knows all about radios, was "in military
service" as a civilian catapult expert, did "intelligence duty"
taking pictures of overflying USSR aircraft and has "26 patents."
:-)

He doan wan no tecknikal stuf ta inter-fear wid his dreamin...

904. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-24 20:24:29 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030124152429.27873.00000164@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 60038

In article <3E315EEA.5CDF08E1@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> In article <3E2F0DA7.48BD0A0E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >Right. I probably should have used the term "proficient in morse". We
>> >certainly wouldn't want to see you "bothered" by those pesky amateur
>> >radio license exams. You didn't do radio 24/7 ever and there is no
>> >professional equivalent to DXing.
>>
>> "DX" is a worldwide term, long in use by the radio world, an
>> abbreviation for "distance." ADA, as part of the Army
>> Command and Administrative Network, did communications
>> for the United Nations Far East Headquarters and for Army
>> Forces Far East from 1946 through 1963...on HF 24 hours a
>> day, 7 days a week.
>
>So your outfit worked distance. Super. There is no professional or
>military equivalent of DXing.

So...24/7 multiple circuit HF communications across the
Pacific is not "DX?!?"

Oh, yes...no QSL cards traded and no "DX Buro" run by
ARRL, an amateur organization. But...wait...

The ACAN Pacific net DID "trade" a form of QSL in the
regular 3-a-day circuit operating reports between stations
and the FAX test patterns were autographed pin-up
pictures used in once-a-week test transmissions... :-)

>Regardless of what ADA did, you never worked 24/7 anywhere. Your claim
>is ludicrous.

Now, now, little colonel, don't pop a plate cap...you are glowing
a cherry red... :-)

You must have forgotten military service...which IS 24/7...unless
it is certain "USAF units who worked with NASA." No doubt
they operated equivalent to unionized civilian contractors while
the REAL USAF communications units (such as the 16th
Communications Squadron next to ADA on Tuskishima) did
definitely work 24/7.

>That's right. Nobody works 24/7. The very idea is preposterous.

In the 1950s the US Army Medical Corps had a rule that all
personnel must be allowed 4 hours sleep in a 48-hour period
to maintain functionability. That meant 44 hour awake times.
I did a mere 35 hours (plus-minus one) twice...which exceeds
24 hours.

>> Heil SNARLS, then. There is no "mumbling" in his text.
>
>Then why'd you state otherwise?

Small sounds from small people sound to me like "mumbling."
Sort of like trolls who emerge from under bridges waving their
J-38s as a badge, saying "worship me, I am superior to you
because I am an extra amateur!" :-)

>Uh.....tsk, tsk, tsk, Foghorn. You'd previously begun using your "Herr
>Robust"
>term and didn't respond to the comments. You still haven't.

"Oberst" is a German military rank equivalent to colonel.
"Herr" is an honorific term of Germanic origin equivalent to
the English "mister." "Herr Robust" is a play on words, an
honorific for the robust manner in which Heil engages in his
Teurtonic Tantrums of Talk-down to "inferiors." :-)

For an audio-visual aid, see Otto Preminger's performance
in the motion picture "Stalag 17."

905. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-24 20:24:31 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030124152431.27873.00000165@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 60039

In article <c2356669.0301240927.110b95f5@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
>news:<d22b54c3.0301231957.5d93cd92@posting.google.com>...
>
>> > Oh--I get it! You're back to pecking about trying to find out where Jim
>> > works.
>> > I think you might have misstated the rest of it.
>>
>> Jeez, I know exactly what James does and exactly where he churns his
>> daily bread, he has lives in his hands hourly and he's a well-known
>> MSEE pro in that biz.
>
>Nice turn of phrase but obviously way above the receptive language
>skills of at least one reader. Plainer to say "his work involves
>safety-critical EE stuff, among other things" and leave it at that.

Aw, heck, mighty morseman...I rather LIKED the phrasing of "having lives in his hands hourly!" One could almost laminate that and keep it in a wallet... :-)

>Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

[in Miccolis' world view, that is...]

>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior.

If chastisement about ignorance of the rest of the radio world is an "insult," then I am guilty of "insulting the ignorant."

If refusal to bow down to claims of "superiority" by those favoring morse code modes, then I am guilty of "ridiculing the self-proclaimed "superiors." :-)

If creativity in naming certain correspondents according to their appearance in this newsgroup, then I am guilty of "name-calling." Of course, the "extra double-standard" is at work there such as another constantly using "Putz" and "creep."

"Factual errors?" Surely the mighty morseman jests. Individual OPINIONS are not "fact." Disagreement with certain traditions (particularly of the standards and practices

of the 1930s) is NOT "factual error." Disagreement with
certain individuals' INTERPRETATION of publicly-known
statistics is NOT "factual error." :-)

No doubt the mighty morseman Miccolis is unnerved and
irritated by the rather absolute non-veneration of his
amateur superiority. Tsk, tsk, tsk. Sic transit gloria mundi.

>So there's no reason to go into anyone's qualifications, because they
>don't count for a thing with Mr. Anderson if that person disagrees
>with his views on amateur radio. All those who disagree with him are
>one and the same to him.

If the above means equal-opportunity commentary about
anyone puffing themselves up as the Absolute Amateur
Authority, then fine.

I enjoy such equal opportunity. Follows democratic principles.

It's the American Way. Does the mighty morseman Miccolis
disagree with the American Way?

>If you need any evidence of this, just look through posts here by any
>of his many screen names.

Ooooo! Ooooo! :-)

How is it "evidenciary" of anything other than AOL not allowing
some full legal names as "screen names?" :-) :-) :-)

My full name (the "payroll signature" variety) and current
mailing address has been published in Ham Radio and
BYTE and Microcomputing magazines as well as the
Call-A.P.P.L.E. monthly news periodical in article bylines
over 20 years ago, on the FCC web site in 1999 about
public comments on NPRM 98-143. The "payroll signature"
and the city residence name and then-current corporate
identification has been published by the US Patent Office
(visible on the Delphion patent website), McGraw-Hill
Electronics biweekly magazine, RCA Corporation and
Rockwell International corporate reports (some available in
the larger technical libraries).

How can mighty morseman Miccolis claim that is somehow
akin to "anonymity?" :-) :-) :-)

>You are mistaken about the last part. Lack of knowledge on his part
>has been proved again and again, here in rrap and on other newsgroups.
>Not that he will ever admit being mistaken on anything.

That is, obviously and by evidence of Google archives,
WRONG.
WRONG, Jimmie.
W-R-O-N-G !

Lack of APPRECIATION for certain mythical fantasies,
certainly!

Lack of WORSHIP in the Godliness of Morse, absolutely!

Lack of ass-kissing of self-proclaimed masters of the
radio universe (ham radio division) guaranteed!

Go thee to Google, grasshopper, you have much to learn
and atone for thy attempts at character assassination.

>Not a major issue anymore. I'll be surprised if it takes any more
>agenda time than the minimum required to propose elimination of S25.5
>and do the vote. Of course I hope I am mistaken about this and that
>S25.5 survives WRC-2003, but I doubt very much that will happen. And
>once the treaty (yes, it's a genuine treaty) changes and is ratified,
>FCC will most probably dump Element 1 ASAP.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...not even June in Geneva and ALREADY a
Sore Loser!

Pity that.

>40 meters is actually a much more important issue for HF amateur
>radio, for a bunch of reasons. The real question is: can a better deal
>be struck with the SWBC folks?

The TWENTY-FOUR YEAR suspense must be overwhelming
to mighty morseman Miccolis! [that small issue has been on
the books since WARC-79!]

The "SWBC folks" have had digital audio transmission on HF
for three years. Some radio amateurs still say "it won't work!"
It works. Some radio amateurs still insist that mighty morse
modes are the "best" and "get through when other modes fail!"

Status quo, circa 1930 among some amateurs... :-)

Leonard H. Anderson
- alleged anonymous person using screen names
"LenOf21," "AveryFineman," and a couple others
on AOL, an alleged heinous "crime." :-) :-) :-)

"Payroll signature" is a common term for first name, middle
initial, last name as required in the US military to sign for a
monthly pay. Those who've never served in the US military
will be unfamiliar with the term.

906. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-24 20:24:32 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030124152432.27873.00000166@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 60036

In article <udeY9.5268$IN1.3658@nwrddc02.gnilink.net>, "Bert Craig"
<wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> writes:

>"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
>news:GUdY9.532$N5.345124@nnrp1.ptd.net...
>> Your argument goes back to the "work ethic" philosophy where folks
>> argue that people shouldn't get a license without having to "demonstrate
>> their dedication by working hard (jumping through hoops) for it."
>>
>> Carl - wk3c
>
>Is "working hard (jumping through hoops)" in reference to the 5-wpm exam?

Absolutely!

US amateur radio is an AVOCATION, not an occupation.

907. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-24 20:24:33 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030124152433.27873.00000167@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 60040

In article <b0rqgrilp1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
>news:pPdY9.520$N5.346260@nnrp1.ptd.net...
>>
>> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>> news:3E2CE4EF.59AFFC80@earthlink.net...
>> > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>> > >
>> > > And KB9TMP will note that I promptly replied to his message,
>indicating
>> > > that his request would be promptly handled.
>> > >
>> > > That's the difference between NCI and some of the fanatical procoders
>> > > who frequent this newsgroup ... unlike the fanatical procoders, NCI
>believes
>> > > believes in, and supports, freedom of choice, rather than forcing
>views on others.
>> >
>> > It isn't your freedom to bestow. You haven't given KB9TMP anything
>> > which wasn't already his.
>>
>> I never said I gave him anything that wasn't already his ... I said we
>> support his freedom of choice.
>>
>> > You have demonstrated repeatedly that you are as fanatical toward doing
>> > away with code testing as anyone who supports continued testing. If you
>> > suupported "freedom of choice" you'd have no problem supporting the view
>> > of those who believe that testing should remain.
>>
>> The logic fails, Dave ... supporting the view that Morse testing should be
>> forced on all, like it or not, is NOT supporting freedom of choice.
>>
>> I recognize that those who want to keep Morse testing have a right to
>> hold that opinion ... but they don't have the right to force it on
>everyone
>> else. NCI doesn't try to force its view on anyone ... nobody twists
>> anyone's arm to join NCI, and members are not held captive, as the
>previous
>> previous exchange demonstrates.
>>
>> So, don't try to assert that we are somehow violating the rights of those
>> who believe Morse testing should remain, because we are not ... we

>> acknowledge that there is a minority that feels that way AND that
>> they have the right to those views.
>>
>> On the other hand, we (NCI and its members) have an equal right
>> to our views.
>> Carl R. Stevenson - wk3c
>
>More to the point, there is nothing in NCI's efforts or charter that
>is targeted at ending USE of morse. THAT is the bottom line
>to those that want to see morse continued as a mode on ham
>radio. One does NOT need a test to be able to learn and use morse
>on the air.
>
>The major concern/fear (IMHO) of pro-code test advocates
>is that without any test at all, new devotees to the use of morse
>won't just happen to appear because they were mandated to learn
>morse just to gain HF access. Without the mandated CW test process,
>those that want to see morse continue in use will actually have to
>market their reasons why they use code in the open marketplace
>of mode competition to new (and existing) hams.

Bill, doesn't it really boil down to the PCTA's whining of
"everyone has to do it like I did it?" They all come across
that way.

Call the PCTA statements like they are: Rationalization City.

908. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-24 20:24:34 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030124152434.27873.00000168@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 60037

In article <pPdY9.520$N5.346260@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:3E2CE4EF.59AFFC80@earthlink.net...
>> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>> >
>> > And KB9TMP will note that I promptly replied to his message, indicating
>that
>> > his request would be promptly handled.
>> >
>> > That's the difference between NCI and some of the fanatical procoders
>who
>> > frequent this newsgroup ... unlike the fanatical procoders, NCI believes
>in,
>> > and supports, freedom of choice, rather than forcing views on others.
>>
>> It isn't your freedom to bestow. You haven't given KB9TMP anything
>> which wasn't already his.
>
>I never said I gave him anything that wasn't already his ... I said we
>support
>his freedom of choice.
>
>> You have demonstrated repeatedly that you are as fanatical toward doing
>> away with code testing as anyone who supports continued testing. If you
>> suupported "freedom of choice" you'd have no problem supporting the view
>> of those who believe that testing should remain.
>
>The logic fails, Dave ... supporting the view that Morse testing should be
>forced on all, like it or not, is NOT supporting freedom of choice.
>
>I recognize that those who want to keep Morse testing have a right to
>hold that opinion ... but they don't have the right to force it on everyone
>else. NCI doesn't try to force its view on anyone ... nobody twists
>anyone's
>arm to join NCI, and members are not held captive, as the previous exchange
>demonstrates.
>
>So, don't try to assert that we are somehow violating the rights of those
>who
>believe Morse testing should remain, because we are not ... we acknowledge
>that there is a minority that feels that way AND that they have the right to
>those

>views. On the other hand, we (NCI and its members) have an equal right to
>our views.

I disagree. It is quite obvious that "we" (NCI and its members)
are NOT allowed any sort of "equal right" according to some
mighty morsemen.

Mighty morsemen are superior in all respects and they expect
respect in all things.

To them the morse test MUST STAY! It is a divine thing, never
to be removed (heresy)!

All must do as the mighty morsemen did. Period.

909. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-24 20:26:49 UTC
From: lbudney-google@nb.net
Message-ID: <417b917a.0301241226.709d0be1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60041

dennis@wawa.juniper.net (Dennis Ferguson) wrote:
>
> Absolutely! And we've had wired telephones for 75 years
> or more, so why anyone would think that wireless phones
> were a technology advance is beyond me.

It's a real advance in Finland (home of Nokia), where they don't have anything close to our wire infrastructure. Something like 50% of phones in Finland are wireless. In developing countries down the road, it's more than possible that they never will have a copper infrastructure; it won't be needed.

--Len.

910. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-24 20:36:09 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E31A3A6.B874E842@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60042

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <c2356669.0301230959.7e90d9d0@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> (N2EY) writes:

>
> Ah, so Miccolis is ashamed of what he does for living?
>
> >How has he behaved towards others when such information has been
> >presented? Has he been appreciative of the work of medical
> >professionals, for example?
>
> You must mean Nursie Putz, the Kildare-wannabe?
>
> > Or career State Department employees?
>
> ...who was never on any "key lists" of State in public view?
> ...or acted like they were the archtypical "ugly American?"
> Harf! :-)

Don't you ever tire of sticking your foot in your mouth? You can start
with:

http://dosfan.lib.uic.edu/ERC/travel/kofficers/kofficers_94spring.html

If you don't feel like looking it up and sifting through the material,
I'll help you out. quote

BOTSWANA
Gaborone (E), P.O. Box 90; Tel [267] 353-982; FAX [267] 356-
947
AMB:-- Howard F. Jeter
AMB SEC:-- Margie Jeanne Douglas
DCM:-- Jimmy J. Kolker
POL/ECO:-- Alexander M. Laskaris
POL/MIL:-- Michael Winograd
CON/COM:-- Timothy Scherer
ADM:-- Alphonso G. Marquis
RSO:-- Thomas J. Colin
PAO:-- Dudley Sims
CPO:-- David E. Heil
AID:-- Howard R. Handler
AGR:-- James M. Benson
-- (resident in Pretoria)
FAA:-- Ronald L. Montgomery
-- (resident in Dakar)

FAA/FSIDO:-- Jim Coffey (res. in Frankfurt)
LAB:-- Thomas A. Shannon, Jr.
-- (resident in Johannesburg)
OMC:-- Ltc Dan Pike, USA
ODA:-- Col. Daniel Henk, USA
-- (resident in Harare)
VOA:-- Dennis Brewer
IRS:-- Stanley Beesley (res. in London) unquote

Not enough for you? Try:
http://www.umsl.edu/services/govdocs/keyoff/kofs0024.htm

This one says quote

BOTSWANA
Gaborone (E), P.O. Box 90, Tel [267] 353-982, afterhours 357-111, Fax
356-947
AMB: Howard F. Jeter
AMB SEC: Margie Jeanne Douglas
DCM: Gillian M. Milovanovic
POL/ECO: Alexander M. Laskaris
POL/MIL: Stacey K. Kazacos
CON/COM: Theodore J. Craig
ADM: Alphonso G. Marquis
RSO: Thomas J. Colin
PAO: Dudley Sims
CPO: David E. Heil
AID: Howard R. Handler
AGR: Besa L. Kotati (resident in Pretoria)
FAA: Ronald L. Montgomery (resident in Dakar)
LAB: Thomas A. Shannon, Jr. (resident in Johannesburg)
OMC : Ltc. Rodney Low, USA
ODA: Col. Daniel Henk, USA (resident in Harare)
VOA: Dennis Brewer
IRS: Stanley Beesley (resident in London) unquote

I'll do one more for you, this from 1999:

http://www.state.gov/www/about_state/contacts/key_officers99/tanzania.html

quote

TANZANIA

Dar Es Salaam (E), 140 Msese Road, Kinondoni District -- P.O.
Box 9123, Tel [255] (51)
666010-5, Fax 666701. Internet address:
usembassy-dar2@cats-net.com

AMB:
Charles R. Stith
AMB SEC:
Catherine M. Lawton

DCM:
Wanda L. Nesbitt
POL/ECO:
(Vacant)
ECO:
Colin Green
COM:
Benjamin R. Winford
CON:
Mark T. Hill
ADM:
Harlow J. Carpenter, Jr.
RAO:
Mark S. Sparkman
RSO:
Jeffery W. Culver
IRM:
David E. Heil
PAO:
Dudley O. Sims
AID:
Lucretia Taylor
AGR:
Fred Kessel (resident in Nairobi)
LAB:
Ralph D. Anske (resident in
Nairobi)
ODA:
(Vacant)
FAA:
Ronald L. Montgomery (resident in
Dakar)
PC:
Joel Wallach
DEA:
Larry W. Frye (resident in
Pretoria)
unquote

Now, Len, I'm going to tell you that I appear in each of the Key Officers lists from 1988 through 1995 and from 1998 through 2000. Any possible exceptions are through the error of an Admin officer to update by the deadline date or because I was between posts on consultations when the list was submitted. Feel free to do your own research on the rest of historical material. This is simply another instance in which you've not known what the hell you were talking about.

Oh, and if you are worrying about my being an ugly American towards you, kindly furnish information as to your nationality. If you are other than a United States citizen, I'll provide a personal apologize promptly.

Dave K8MN

911. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-24 20:41:09 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <FxhY9.618$cJ6.312@nwrddc02.gnilink.net>
Source record: 60043

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030124152432.27873.00000166@mb-mj.aol.com...
> In article <udeY9.5268$IN1.3658@nwrddc02.gnilink.net>, "Bert Craig"
> <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> writes:
>
> >"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> >news:GUdY9.532$N5.345124@nnrp1.ptd.net...
> >> Your argument goes back to the "work ethic" philosophy where folks
> >> argue that people shouldn't get a license without having to
"demonstrate
> >> their dedication by working hard (jumping through hoops) for it."
> >>
> >> Carl - wk3c
> >
> >Is "working hard (jumping through hoops)" in reference to the 5-wpm exam?
>
> Absolutely!

Seems to me that the "hard"est part was actually deciding to get one's butt
in gear and then sit down and just do it. Fifteen minutes to a half-an-hour
daily for as long as it takes hardly constitutes "working hard (jumping
through hoops)" to me.

> US amateur radio is an AVOCATION, not an occupation.

I'm thoroughly underwhelmed.

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

912. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-24 21:49:00 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.h98exek.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 60044

On 24 Jan 2003 20:24:29 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:

> For an audio-visual aid, see Otto Preminger's performance
> in the motion picture "Stalag 17."

Otto Preminger was a movie producer. Were you thinking of Werner Klemperer, who was also a symphonic orchestral conductor as was his father, Otto...??

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

913. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-24 22:35:06 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <ucjY9.1321$U27.120985@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 60045

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.h98exek.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
: On 24 Jan 2003 20:24:29 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:
:
: > For an audio-visual aid, see Otto Preminger's performance
: > in the motion picture "Stalag 17."
:
: Otto Preminger was a movie producer. Were you thinking of Werner
: Klemperer, who was also a symphonic orchestral conductor as was his
: father, Otto...??

Lennie is correct. In "Stalag 17", starring Bill Holden and produced by
Billy Wilder, Otto Preminger played the part of Oberst Von Scherbach.

You have it mixed up with Stalag 13, the home of Oberst Klink, Sgt Schultz,
Colonel Hogan, et. al.

73, de Hans, K0HB

914. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-24 22:38:51 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b0sfddaga1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 60046

```
"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030124152433.27873.00000167@mb-mj.aol.com...
> In article <b0rqgr$ilp$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> >news:pPdY9.520$N5.346260@nnrp1.ptd.net...
> >>
> >> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >> news:3E2CE4EF.59AFFC80@earthlink.net...
> >> > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> >> > >
> >> > > And KB9TMP will note that I promptly replied to his message,
> >indicating
> >> > > that his request would be promptly handled.
> >> > >
> >> > > That's the difference between NCI and some of the fanatical
procoders
> >> > > who frequent this newsgroup ... unlike the fanatical procoders, NCI
> >believes
> >> > > believes in, and supports, freedom of choice, rather than forcing
> >views on others.
> >> >
> >> > It isn't your freedom to bestow. You haven't given KB9TMP anything
> >> > which wasn't already his.
> >>
> >> I never said I gave him anything that wasn't already his ... I said we
> >> support his freedom of choice.
> >>
> >> > You have demonstrated repeatedly that you are as fanatical toward
doing
> >> > away with code testing as anyone who supports continued testing. If
you
> >> > suupported "freedom of choice" you'd have no problem supporting the
view
> >> > of those who believe that testing should remain.
> >>
> >> The logic fails, Dave ... supporting the view that Morse testing should
be
> >> forced on all, like it or not, is NOT supporting freedom of choice.
> >>
> >> I recognize that those who want to keep Morse testing have a right to
> >> hold that opinion ... but they don't have the right to force it on
> >everyone
```

> >> else. NCI doesn't try to force its view on anyone ... nobody twists
> >> anyone's arm to join NCI, and members are not held captive, as the
> >previous
> >> previous exchange demonstrates.
> >>
> >> So, don't try to assert that we are somehow violating the rights of
those
> >> who believe Morse testing should remain, because we are not ... we
> >> acknowledge that there is a minority that feels that way AND that
> >> they have the right to those views.
> >>
> >> On the other hand, we (NCI and its members) have an equal right
> >> to our views.
> >> Carl R. Stevenson - wk3c
> >
> >More to the point, there is nothing in NCI's efforts or charter that
> >is targeted at ending USE of morse. THAT is the bottom line
> >to those that want to see morse continued as a mode on ham
> >radio. One does NOT need a test to be able to learn and use morse
> >on the air.
> >
> >The major concern/fear (IMHO) of pro-code test advocates
> >is that without any test at all, new devotees to the use of morse
> >won't just happen to appear because they were mandated to learn
> >morse just to gain HF access. Without the mandated CW test process,
> >those that want to see morse continue in use will actually have to
> >market their reasons why they use code in the open marketplace
> >of mode competition to new (and existing) hams.
>
> Bill, doesn't it really boil down to the PCTA's whining of
> "everyone has to do it like I did it?" They all come across
> that way.
>
> Call the PCTA statements like they are: Rationalization City.

Makes no difference to me or NCI what they are called. The only
thing that counts is that not one of the arguments, statements
and/or rationalizations has convinced the FCC of any need to
retain code testing...other than to stay compliant for now with the
current ITU treaty.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

915. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-24 22:43:35 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b0sg4euis1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 60048

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030124152434.27873.00000168@mb-mj.aol.com...
> In article <pPdY9.520$N5.346260@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
> >"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >news:3E2CE4EF.59AFFC80@earthlink.net...
> >> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> >> >
> >> > And KB9TMP will note that I promptly replied to his message,
indicating
> >that
> >> > his request would be promptly handled.
> >> >
> >> > That's the difference between NCI and some of the fanatical procoders
> >who
> >> > frequent this newsgroup ... unlike the fanatical procoders, NCI
believes
> >in,
> >> > and supports, freedom of choice, rather than forcing views on others.
> >>
> >> It isn't your freedom to bestow. You haven't given KB9TMP anything
> >> which wasn't already his.
> >
> >I never said I gave him anything that wasn't already his ... I said we
> >support
> >his freedom of choice.
> >
> >> You have demonstrated repeatedly that you are as fanatical toward doing
> >> away with code testing as anyone who supports continued testing. If
you
> >> suupported "freedom of choice" you'd have no problem supporting the
view
> >> of those who believe that testing should remain.
> >
> >The logic fails, Dave ... supporting the view that Morse testing should
be
> >forced on all, like it or not, is NOT supporting freedom of choice.
> >
> >I recognize that those who want to keep Morse testing have a right to
> >hold that opinion ... but they don't have the right to force it on
everyone
> >else. NCI doesn't try to force its view on anyone ... nobody twists
> >anyone's

> >arm to join NCI, and members are not held captive, as the previous
exchange
> >demonstrates.
> >
> >So, don't try to assert that we are somehow violating the rights of those
> >who
> >believe Morse testing should remain, because we are not ... we
acknowledge
> >that there is a minority that feels that way AND that they have the right
to
> >those
> >views. On the other hand, we (NCI and its members) have an equal right
to
> >our views.
>
> I disagree. It is quite obvious that "we" (NCI and its members)
> are NOT allowed any sort of "equal right" according to some
> mighty morsemen.

While some in the PCTA group might wish that is so, the
reality is that we have that right and we have excersized
that right without being silenced by anyone.

The war of ideas and opinions on morse testing is over
and the only thing standing in the way of a total demise of
morse testing is the treaty. That's why I don't bother
engaging in the arguments anymore.

> Mighty morsemen are superior in all respects and they expect
> respect in all things.

They can believe whatever they want...its a free country.

> To them the morse test MUST STAY! It is a divine thing, never
> to be removed (heresy)!

Opinions of such have failed the test of time and analysis by
the FCC.

> All must do as the mighty morsemen did. Period.

The end of that era is not far off.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

916. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-24 22:51:09 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b0sg4fuis2@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 60049

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.h989a3j.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Fri, 24 Jan 2003 11:26:57 -0500, Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> >Depending on who you talk to, that's one viewpoint.
> >The perspective Phil offers is narrowband (voice) centric for the
> >most part.
> >
> >The other driver of new home
> >connections is increased demand for bandwidth and new services which
> >consume significant bandwidth. Try delivering 200 channels of TV
> >via wireless. Look at the proliferation of cable modem connectivity
> >to internet, DSL, etc.
>
> For this purpose, "wireless" is via satellite, and it's being done
> every day all over the world. A goof friend of ours (and an
> active ham) lives so far out in the boonies that he can't get cable
> or DSL service, and he connects to the world through satellite. He
> loves it. He got that idea from the American Red Cross (he's a
> retired disaster communications officer - paid professional
> staff) where he was in charge of the switchover of their
> long-haul communications network to the PanAmSat system.

DBS has its shortcomings too. Most that I know of require separate
decoder boxes for every TV. My basic cable service (some
70 odd channels) requires no onsite boxes at all unless I opt for
a premium channel. That allows every TV to be its own
tuner. No boxes to rent. If you are in the boonies as you note, satellite
is probably your only option even with the shortcomings.

> >More likly for suc bandwidth demands we will eventually see fiber optic
> >delivery direct to the home at some point.
>
> It's already to the cable node pedestal in front of my house. If
> they want to dig up my lawn for the third time to put a fiber drop
> in, tell me when and I'll put on the coffee....

Yep, us telco folks have been deploying it for years.

> >Alternatively, fiber can deliver
> >the services to an area focal point and then the "last mile" could be
> >via cable (RG-59 or the like).
>
> My "last mile" is about 100 feet of quad-shield RG-6....

Yup.

> >My point in adding this info is to suggest that the future network(s)
> >won't end up as a "one technology fits all" topology. Odds are there
> >will be a mixed environment with different costing and revenue models
> >that drive the choice for any particular area.
>
> No argument there.

I suspect we are in violent agreement here then!

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

917. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-24 22:56:03 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b0sgdk$10r$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 60050

"Len Budney" <lbudney-google@nb.net> wrote in message
news:417b917a.0301241226.709d0be1@posting.google.com...
> dennis@wawa.juniper.net (Dennis Ferguson) wrote:
> >
> > Absolutely! And we've had wired telephones for 75 years
> > or more, so why anyone would think that wireless phones
> > were a technology advance is beyond me.
>
> It's a real advance in Finland (home of Nokia), where they don't have
> anything close to our wire infrastructure. Something like 50% of
> phones in Finland are wireless. In developing countries down the road,
> it's more than possible that they never will have a copper
> infrastructure; it won't be needed.

Wireless phones allow many folks (myself included) to
essentially have an office on their belt. We are no longer
tethered to a fixed location. Likewise I have found
traveling with cellphones to be an outstanding communication
and logistics capability when traveling with others.

And, as noted above, sme countries won't likly ever have
a hardwired infrastructure. Several years ago
I worked on a proposal for a 3rd world
country that had as a requirement NO copper cable because
theft of cable for the copper was too prevalent.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

918. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-24 23:07:47 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030124180747.04712.00000348@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 59951

>The end of that era is not far off.
>
>Cheers,
>Bill K2UNK
>

And the beginning of a NEW CB SERVICE.

919. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-24 23:16:07 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0301241516.3ad79e35@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59952

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030123211353.21366.00000467@mb-mu.aol.com>...
> In article <c2356669.0301220553.2e305963@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> (N2EY) writes:
>
> >Say, Larry, you can play the "years" game, too. Add up your age, years
> >as a licensed ham, years of military service, years with a bachelor's
> >degree, years with a driver's license, years with a CDL, years as an
> >ARRL member, plus any other years you find usable and see what the
> >total is.
> >
> >73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Jim:
>
> OK, here goes:
>
> Age: 50
> Years as a ham: 21 (Just received Old Timer's Club certificate)
> Years as an Extra: 20
> Years as an ARRL member: 22
> Years of military service: 19 (took early retirement in the mid-90's
> downsizing)
> Years with a CDL: 2.5
> Years on rrap: 12

I'll play this sillyass game.

Age: 65
Years as a Ham: 50
Years as an Extra: 35
Years as an ARRL member: Spotty, maybe 25 out of my 50
Years of Military Service: Zip for purposes of this discussion
Years driving long-haul 18-wheelers long before there were CDLs: Had
to do with flatbed 40 foot stake bodies fulla Joisy tomatoes and the
nonsense ya get into to pay yer way thru injuneering collitch. Gimmee
3.
Years on RRAP: 5??

183 "RRAP Age Points" for Romeo Victor.

> Let's see, that makes me 146.5 years old. Shouldn't I be in a nursing home
> by now?

I hate to break the news to you good buddy but this IS an online
nursing home.

>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

w3rv

920. Re: This Is How KB1HMW "Supports" Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-24 23:52:32 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301241552.4441642a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59953

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030124085419.14275.00000065@mb-fx.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: This Is How KB1HMW "Supports" Amateur Radio
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 1/24/03 7:26 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0301240526.16e9a8e8@posting.google.com>
>
> >> >But when they invited me to jump out of
> >> >airplanes for a living I had to decline.
> >>
> >> Was the lack of an offer of a parachute a clue?
> >>
> >> Steve, K4YZ
> >
> >Welp, the little chest pin shows a parachute. What do you think?
>
> Then I'd say your comment about declining further service because of
> Airborne duty was misleading, at best. Obviously you DIDN'T decline since jump
> school is voluntary, unless you are training for SpecFor or RANGER.

Who says it wasn't voluntary??? I didn't say that? And I didn't say
I declined further service.

Where did you get that idea?

Where do you get any idea?

Maybe you got it on the rrap backchannel where that civilian with
"vast military experience" hangs out.

It was offered, I declined. Nothing misleading in my statement,
nothing about being forced, nothing about being voluntary or
involuntary. And nothing about declining further service.

You must have a bending jig attached to your computer.

> I'd also say that, considering your past performance in THIS forum, I am
> not surprised at that revelation. Being direct and accurate are not your
> forte.

Completely direct and accurate.

You can have a second try if you wish. Really. I'm up to it.

> I'd furthermore add that I doubt the chestpin ever adorned your regulation
> Army uniform...At least not where anyone who knew you might see it and know
> better.

I never wore an Army uniform. Did have to sew a 2ID patch on my uniform, though. Really screwed up the correct placement of my chevrons, however. They were practically on my elbow, even with the bottom of the shield nestled into "V" of my chevron.

> Lastly, I'd say it was PROBABLY a set of those "Jr Birdman" wings the kids
> can pick up at a lot of airshows. Or perhaps a set of wings purchased from
> Brigade Quartermaster or other such outfitter. The REAL Armed Forces are kinda
> particular about who get's to wear those wings.

Where did you get wings from? I didn't say wings. I said p-a-r-a-c-h-u-t-e. How could you confuse wings with parachute? Oh, I forgot. You were a marine, where you had to learn little ditties to keep things straight (this is my rifle, this is my gun...).

> Steve, K4YZ
>
> (BTW...I have a set of USN/USMC jump wings too...Never wore them since I
> never earned them, but they sure do look good in the collection)

??? Point ???

I did have an Air Medal pinned on me at an awards ceremony about 1991. The only problem was that I earned an Army Commendation. But the awards/dec office screwed up and sent the wrong medal, and they needed something to pin on me, so an Air Medal it was. Well, it was pretty funny at the time. You had to be there. Got a picture of it somewhere, but I'm just a has-been now and don't live in the past.

Of course, I never wore an Air Medal again, don't even have one in my "collection." The only things in my "collection" are the awards I earned. Someday when you go SK, someone is likely to see those wings in your collection and try to bury you in Arlington. Wonder if you've got a Medal of Honor in there. If you're not already making up tales of bravery now.

921. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 00:01:21 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.h98l12l.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 59954

On Fri, 24 Jan 2003 22:35:06 GMT, KØHB wrote:

>: > For an audio-visual aid, see Otto Preminger's performance
>: > in the motion picture "Stalag 17."
>:
>: Otto Preminger was a movie producer. Were you thinking of Werner
>: Klemperer, who was also a symphonic orchestral conductor as was his
>: father, Otto...??
>
>Lennie is correct. In "Stalag 17", starring Bill Holden and produced by
>Billy Wilder, Otto Preminger played the part of Oberst Von Scherbach.
>
>You have it mixed up with Stalag 13, the home of Oberst Klink, Sgt Schultz,
>Colonel Hogan, et. al.

I stand corrected - I could never keep my Obersts straight...

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

922. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 00:03:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030124190325.27873.00000173@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 59957

In article <GUdY9.532$N5.345124@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030123203646.00690.00000152@mb-fm.aol.com...
>> In article <nKzX9.6344$bL4.633536@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>,
>"Kï¿½HB"
>> <kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG> writes:
>>
>> >N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>> >
>> >:
>> >: The "Equalizer" effect is simply that a prospective ham is not likely
>to
>> >: have
>> >: learned Morse elsewhere, and has to demonstrate his/her skill on an
>EQUAL
>> >: basis
>> >: with others, in an objective test. It's about equality of requirements.
>> >:
>> >You still sound like the Handicapper General.
>>
>> Sorry - that's not my intent.
>> >
>> >Last time I checked, they had to pass EQUAL written examinations also.
>How
>> >they learned the material is of no concern, simply that they know it at
>the
>> >time of examination.
>>
>> Yup.
>>
>> But there are plenty of folks who know enough radio to pass the writtens
>> without much, if any, preparation.
>
>So what? If they are qualified, they are qualified ... period.
>
>Your argument goes back to the "work ethic" philosophy where folks
>argue that people shouldn't get a license without having to "demonstrate
>their dedication by working hard (jumping through hoops) for it."
>
Nope.

What I'm talking about is why SOME (not all) folks dislike the code test so
much. Particularly folks for whom the written test presents no challenge at

all.

Some (not all!) just don't like the idea of having to learn a skill specifically for the ham license - particularly since that skill usually cannot be learned in bits and pieces by reading a book or watching a video.

Why is it "jumping through hoops" to learn Morse at 5 wpm (even if someone never intends to use the mode), but not "jumping through hoops" to learn all the theory and regs necessary to pass the written exams (even though someone never intends to use 99% of the privileges allowed by the license)? Seems like a double standard.

Since the FCC has determined that the 35 question Tech test is adequate to allow Techs to use all authorized amateur bands and modes above 30 MHz, and to design/build/adjust/repair/align and operate equipment for those bands and modes without further certification, aren't the higher class theory questions really a form of "hoop jumping"?

Why is a new Tech allowed to design/build/adjust/repair/align and operate a 1500 W transmitter on 50.020 CW, (or any other authorized band/mode above 50 MHz), but if said Tech wants to use a 1.5 watt transmitter on 3.520 MHz CW, he/she must take two more written tests totalling 85 questions?

73 de Jim, N2EY

73 de Jim, N2EY

923. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 00:03:26 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030124190326.27873.00000174@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 59956

In article <pPdY9.520$N5.346260@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:3E2CE4EF.59AFFC80@earthlink.net...
>> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>> >
>> > And KB9TMP will note that I promptly replied to his message, indicating
>that
>> > his request would be promptly handled.
>> >
>> > That's the difference between NCI and some of the fanatical procoders
>who
>> > frequent this newsgroup ... unlike the fanatical procoders, NCI believes
>in,
>> > and supports, freedom of choice, rather than forcing views on others.
>>
>> It isn't your freedom to bestow. You haven't given KB9TMP anything
>> which wasn't already his.
>
>I never said I gave him anything that wasn't already his ... I said we
>support
>his freedom of choice.
>
>> You have demonstrated repeatedly that you are as fanatical toward doing
>> away with code testing as anyone who supports continued testing. If you
>> suupported "freedom of choice" you'd have no problem supporting the view
>> of those who believe that testing should remain.
>
>The logic fails, Dave ... supporting the view that Morse testing should be
>forced on all, like it or not, is NOT supporting freedom of choice.

Apply that logic to forcing written testing beyond the basics of rules & regs
on all.....

>I recognize that those who want to keep Morse testing have a right to
>hold that opinion ... but they don't have the right to force it on everyone
>else.
>NCI doesn't try to force its view on anyone ... nobody twists
>anyone's
>arm to join NCI, and members are not held captive, as the previous exchange
>demonstrates.

If NCI's opinion holds sway with the FCC, then that opinion is forced on
everyone. Simple logic.

>
>So, don't try to assert that we are somehow violating the rights of those
>who
>believe Morse testing should remain, because we are not ... we acknowledge
>that there is a minority that feels that way AND that they have the right to
>those
>views. On the other hand, we (NCI and its members) have an equal right to
>our views.

WHOA - I lost ya there.

"we acknowledge that there is a minority that feels that way"

Feels what way? That code testing should go, or should stay? It's really not clear what's being said. Who is the minority being discussed?

Note that when the comments to 98-143 were categorized and tabulated (by an NCI staffer, btw), the majority of those who commented not only wanted code testing to continue, but wanted at least two code test speeds. But FCC agreed with the minority opinion.

73 de Jim, N2EY

924. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 00:03:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030124190327.27873.00000175@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 59955

In article <GQeY9.689$hP2.55@nwrddc04.gnilink.net>, "Bert Craig"
<wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> writes:

>> I'll be surprised if it takes any more
>> agenda time than the minimum required to propose elimination of S25.5
>> and do the vote.
>
>I'm not so sure about that, Jim. Perhaps we may see some European "ringers"
>in there. ;-)

Perhaps, but not enough to stop the process. And the opposition may simply use the S25.5 elimination as a bargaining tool.

Think about this deal: Suppose some countries who don't want to give up 7100-7300 SWBC and who want to keep S25.5 offer to accept the end of one or the other, but not both. IOW, suppose the offer is "leave 40 alone and we'll support the end of S25.5". Or maybe the reverse. What will the rest of the world do?

>
>> Of course I hope I am mistaken about this and that
>> S25.5 survives WRC-2003
>
>Me too!

But let's be realistic. Most of the world's governments have already lowered their code test requirements to levels far below what they required only a few years ago, even though ham use of Morse continues unabated. An obvious move in anticipation of complete elimination of the code test.

>
>> , but I doubt very much that will happen. And
>> once the treaty (yes, it's a genuine treaty) changes and is ratified,
>> FCC will most probably dump Element 1 ASAP.
>
>Last hope?

Not the FCC! Read the Report and Order that eliminated all code tests in the USA except Element 1, and the responses to various Petitions for Reconsideration. FCC makes it very clear they see "no regulatory purpose" in any code test for any ham license, EXCEPT compliance with S25.5. Without the treaty requirement, that means no regulatory purpose at all.

If/when S25.5 goes and the new treaty is ratified, what's to stop FCC from simply issuing an order that Element 1 is hereby waived for all applicants for a ham license? Nothing that I can see. FCC can simply say that the issue was adequately discussed and commented on in preparation for the 2000 restructuring, and that they are acting on their earlier decision.

>> 40 meters is actually a much more important issue for HF amateur
>> radio, for a bunch of reasons. The real question is: can a better deal
>> be struck with the SWBC folks?
>
>True true, I hope that deal can come to fruition.

Been that way for 55+ years. We're lucky to have 40 at all.
>
>P.S. Man, it's COLD!

Waddya mean? This isn't cold. Just a bit of a chill in the air.

Savannah, NY, winter of 1977-78, working outside alone at 3 AM and it's 17
below in Syracuse (which means Savannah is a lot colder) - that's cold. And
it's not the coldest I've experienced, by a long shot.
>
10 degrees here this AM - ran 32 minutes in it and didn't feel cold.

73 de Jim, N2EY

925. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 00:05:12 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030124190512.08956.00000215@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 59958

>Subject: Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 1/24/03 2:24 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030124152429.27873.00000164@mb-mj.aol.com>

>>So your outfit worked distance. Super. There is no professional or
>>military equivalent of DXing.
>
> So...24/7 multiple circuit HF communications across the
> Pacific is not "DX?!?"

"DX" is distance. "DXing" (in the Amatuer Radio application) is the
pursuit of contacting as many FOREIGN stations in as many modes and bands as
possible.

Lennie was NEVER a "DXer".

>You must have forgotten military service...which IS 24/7...unless
> it is certain "USAF units who worked with NASA."

However YOU never worker "24/7". YOUR asertion that (you) worked on a
"24/7" basis previously cited and dismissed as usual Lennism.

More usual Leonard H Anders BS. Silly and dismissed with ease.

Steve, K4YZ

926. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 00:17:00 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <0IkY9.1440$U27.126502@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 59959

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

:
: Why is a new Tech allowed to design/build/adjust/repair/align and operate
a
: 1500 W transmitter on 50.020 CW, (or any other authorized band/mode above
50
: MHz), but if said Tech wants to use a 1.5 watt transmitter on 3.520 MHz
CW,
: he/she must take two more written tests totalling 85 questions?
:

Are you laying the groundwork for NTI ("No Theory International")?

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

927. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 01:14:09 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030124201409.13482.00000311@mb-fe.aol.com>
Source record: 59960

>Are you laying the groundwork for NTI ("No Theory International")?
>
>With all kind wishes,
>
>de Hans, K0HB
>

I hope someone does, because as soon as the CW goes, theres not much reason
left for the DUMBED DOWN WRITTENS we have now.

928. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 01:22:34 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <uFIY9.609$N5.388816@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 59961

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:udeY9.5268$IN1.3658@nwrddc02.gnilink.net...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> news:GUdY9.532$N5.345124@nnrp1.ptd.net...
> > Your argument goes back to the "work ethic" philosophy where folks
> > argue that people shouldn't get a license without having to "demonstrate
> > their dedication by working hard (jumping through hoops) for it."
> >
> > Carl - wk3c
>
> Is "working hard (jumping through hoops)" in reference to the 5-wpm exam?
>
> --
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI

Bert,

It's in reference to any unnecessary requirement. Some folks think that the tests are "way easier" today than they were "in the good old days."

I don't want to put words in his mouth, but IIRC, my good friend Ed Hare, W1RFI, of the ARRL, has stated the ease with which he got his general "back when" (as have others).

The written tests aren't an EE final ... never were, never were meant to be, never should be.

The issue is that some folks are PO'd that people who already know all the radio stuff don't have to work as hard as they did (because they didn't know the radio stuff ... hell, many still don't ... I know other extras
who don't have a clue on the technical side.

The point is that that the reason for licensing (and the tests) is NOT to "control the population" or to "keep out the 'unworthy' " ... it's simply to make sure that people have a reasonable minimum level of qualification to operate safely and with a minimum potential for interference to other radio services ... nothing more, nothing less. It is NOT to "make someone prove they are 'dedicated enough' by making them 'work hard' for their license."

Too damned many people value their license for what they perceive as some sort of epic, heroic effort that they made to get it, rather than for what it allows them to do (and the latter is where the value of the license lies).

73,
Carl - wk3c

929. Why Dave has such a p*ss poor attitude

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 01:34:06 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <iQlY9.610$N5.391723@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 59962

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3E31A3A6.B874E842@earthlink.net...
> Don't you ever tire of sticking your foot in your mouth? You can start
> with:

URLs deleted ...

Dave, you really got stuck with some s**t assignments, didn't you?

Maybe that's why your attitude is so lousy ... you seem to have
spent your entire career in backwater places of little importance
and with none of the "glamor and excitement" of more "significant"
postings ...

Now I understand why you're such a cranky old fart.

Carl - wk3c

930. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 01:48:13 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <x1mY9.611$N5.393593@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 59963

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030124190326.27873.00000174@mb-mj.aol.com...
> In article <pPdY9.520$N5.346260@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
> >The logic fails, Dave ... supporting the view that Morse testing should
be
> >forced on all, like it or not, is NOT supporting freedom of choice.
>
> Apply that logic to forcing written testing beyond the basics of rules &
regs
> on all.....

Not the same ... not knowing how to copy Morse by ear (all that's
tested for) harms nobody ... not knowing some of the technical
aspects can:

result in interference to other services

get you killed when you do stupid things with
your fingers inside a radio

expose your family/neighbors/passersby to RF
radiation above the established limits

etc., etc.

> >I recognize that those who want to keep Morse testing have a right to
> >hold that opinion ... but they don't have the right to force it on
everyone
> >else.
> >NCI doesn't try to force its view on anyone ... nobody twists
> >anyone's
> >arm to join NCI, and members are not held captive, as the previous
exchange
> >demonstrates.
>
> If NCI's opinion holds sway with the FCC, then that opinion is forced on
> everyone. Simple logic.

The FCC makes the decisions on what best serves the public interest,
convenience, and necessity ... as the expert agency charged with managing
the non-federal-govt. use of the radio spectrum that belongs to all of us,
if they agree with NCI's logical, factual, well-reasoned arguments, we are
gratified :-)

> >So, don't try to assert that we are somehow violating the rights of those
> >who

> >believe Morse testing should remain, because we are not ... we
acknowledge
> >that there is a minority that feels that way AND that they have the right
to
> >those
> >views. On the other hand, we (NCI and its members) have an equal right
to
> >our views.
>
>
> WHOA - I lost ya there.
>
> "we acknowledge that there is a minority that feels that way"
>
> Feels what way? That code testing should go, or should stay? It's really
not
> clear what's being said. Who is the minority being discussed?

Sorry ... I was talking about the minority that still favors forcing Morse
tests on everyone for access to HF ...

> Note that when the comments to 98-143 were categorized and tabulated (by
an NCI
> staffer, btw), the majority of those who commented not only wanted code
testing
> to continue, but wanted at least two code test speeds. But FCC agreed with
the
> minority opinion.

I believe a reasonable analysis would show that the demographics of ham
radio
in terms of the issue have changed dramatically over the past couple of
years.

If I had a buck for every e-mail I've received thanking me for NCI's
work, I could HIRE someone to install the towers I plan to put up
in the spring, rather than doing the work myself ... (but NCI is PURELY
not for profit, and neither I nor any other NCI officer makes or has
made a single cent for the work we've put in ... in fact, the NCI treasury
owes me about $1k for NCI expenses that I've paid out of my own pocket,
but have not yet bothered to get reimbursed for ...)

73,
Carl - wk3c

931. Re: Why Dave has such a p*ss poor attitude

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 02:00:38 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E31EFB4.5B96876@earthlink.net>
Source record: 59964

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3E31A3A6.B874E842@earthlink.net...
> > Don't you ever tire of sticking your foot in your mouth? You can start
> > with:
>
> URLs deleted ...
>
> Dave, you really got stuck with some s**t assignments, didn't you?
>
> Maybe that's why your attitude is so lousy ... you seem to have
> spent your entire career in backwater places of little importance
> and with none of the "glamor and excitement" of more "significant"
> postings ...

Perhaps you, like Len, consider Finland a third world posting. Helsinki was my first posting. I didn't bid on the assignment, I was sent there. I liked it well enough to bid on it again and was reassigned there in the nineties for three years. Except for that third assignment, I bid on all of the others.
Why not give us the benefit of your experience and tell us please, Carl, what makes for a significant foreign service posting? I wanted to see some of the places which the "See European Capitals in Ten Days" crowd never saw. How would three years in a paper mill like Rome equate to three years in Gaborone with the pay not being equal (ever hear of hardship differential?)?

Maybe you figured that Leonard H. was lonely--being the only fellow with brogan inserted in mouth. Your contribution indicates that you have no idea how Foreign Service members are assigned. That aside, Len's comment was one of his typical digs at my Foreign Service assignments, Steve's job as a male nurse and at N2EY for not telling Len who he works for.

> Now I understand why you're such a cranky old fart.

Mark it down as just another thing you don't understand. Have you figured out what explains your behavior? How's the "experimentation" with chasing DX on SSB coming along?

Dave K8MN

932. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 02:17:21 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <b0ss3h$65k$1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 59966

Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote:
>And, as noted above, sme countries won't likly ever have
>a hardwired infrastructure. Several years ago
>I worked on a proposal for a 3rd world
>country that had as a requirement NO copper cable because
>theft of cable for the copper was too prevalent.

Not only in third world countries either. The phone company I worked for 9 years ago used to have a recurring problem with major circuit outages, in particular in the vicinity of their junction in West Orange, New Jersey, from people cutting chunks out of fiber optic cables where they came out of the ground at railway bridges. I think they got some relief by gluing labels which said "Fiber Optics" all over the exposed stuff, since people were mistaking the glass for copper.

Dennis Ferguson

933. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 02:23:19 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E31F4FE.B0842680@earthlink.net>
Source record: 59965

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E315EEA.5CDF08E1@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >> In article <3E2F0DA7.48BD0A0E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> writes:

> >Regardless of what ADA did, you never worked 24/7 anywhere. Your claim
> >is ludicrous.
>
> Now, now, little colonel, don't pop a plate cap...you are glowing
> a cherry red... :-)
>
> You must have forgotten military service...which IS 24/7...unless
> it is certain "USAF units who worked with NASA."

No, I didn't forget military service. I did four years and was never called upon on even one occasion to work 24 hours per day, seven days per week. I knew no one who did that ever.

> No doubt
> they operated equivalent to unionized civilian contractors while
> the REAL USAF communications units (such as the 16th
> Communications Squadron next to ADA on Tuskishima) did
> definitely work 24/7.

Ah, there's your confusion. You've equated yourself with the entire ADA operation. You said YOU worked 24/7. You meant that the unit operated 24 hours per day each day of the week. So you didn't work 24/7.

> >That's right. Nobody works 24/7. The very idea is preposterous.
>
> In the 1950s the US Army Medical Corps had a rule that all
> personnel must be allowed 4 hours sleep in a 48-hour period
> to maintain functionability. That meant 44 hour awake times.
> I did a mere 35 hours (plus-minus one) twice...which exceeds
> 24 hours.

...but you never found yourself working 24 hours per day for seven days? I once did 45 hours in a CQ Worldwide DX contest but OH2MM routinely does all 48 hours. He never does seven days in a row. You didn't either.

> >> Heil SNARLS, then. There is no "mumbling" in his text.
> >
> >Then why'd you state otherwise?
>
> Small sounds from small people sound to me like "mumbling."

Then I don't know what you're talking about. I'm not a small person and
I don't make small sounds. You've now said I'm snarling. How does one
make a snarl come out like a small sound?

> Sort of like trolls who emerge from under bridges waving their
> J-38s as a badge, saying "worship me, I am superior to you
> because I am an extra amateur!" :-)

Have you encountered such? Maybe you should tell your doc.

> >Uh.....tsk, tsk, tsk, Foghorn. You'd previously begun using your "Herr
> >Robust"
> >term and didn't respond to the comments. You still haven't.
>
> "Oberst" is a German military rank equivalent to colonel.
> "Herr" is an honorific term of Germanic origin equivalent to
> the English "mister." "Herr Robust" is a play on words, an
> honorific for the robust manner in which Heil engages in his
> Teurtonic Tantrums of Talk-down to "inferiors." :-)

Wow! Thanks for the language lesson, Leonard. You picked up German in
Korea?
"Foghorn" is a play on Foghorn Leghorn, the blustery cartoon rooster who
knows everything about everything. He is consistently bested by those
he considers mere children. I use it whenever you exhibit such
charactersistics or whenever you begin using cutesy names for others.

> For an audio-visual aid, see Otto Preminger's performance
> in the motion picture "Stalag 17."

For an audio-visual aid, see some Warner Brothers cartoons or if you
prefer just the audio, try
http://www.home.earthlink.net/~k8mn/Tokyo_53.wav

Dave K8MN

934. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 02:29:05 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030124212905.27873.00000176@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 59967

In article <0IkY9.1440$U27.126502@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
>:
>: Why is a new Tech allowed to design/build/adjust/repair/align and operate
>a
>: 1500 W transmitter on 50.020 CW, (or any other authorized band/mode above
>50
>: MHz), but if said Tech wants to use a 1.5 watt transmitter on 3.520 MHz
>CW,
>: he/she must take two more written tests totalling 85 questions?
>:
>
>Are you laying the groundwork for NTI ("No Theory International")?

Nope. In fact, I think the written tests are not well-matched to the privileges granted.

My point is simply that when terms like "jumping through hoops" are used wrt license tests, the same criteria should apply to all license tests.

Why are the writtens a sacred cow but the code a scapegoat?

73 de Jim, N2EY

935. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 02:49:56 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E31FB3F.499D0542@earthlink.net>
Source record: 59968

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E315EEA.5CDF08E1@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >> In article <3E2F0DA7.48BD0A0E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> writes:

> "Oberst" is a German military rank equivalent to colonel.
> "Herr" is an honorific term of Germanic origin equivalent to
> the English "mister." "Herr Robust" is a play on words, an
> honorific for the robust manner in which Heil engages in his
> Teurtonic Tantrums of Talk-down to "inferiors." :-)
>
> For an audio-visual aid, see Otto Preminger's performance
> in the motion picture "Stalag 17."

Oh, what the heck. For a visual aid, try
http://www.home.earthlink.net/~k8mn/foghorn.jpg

936. Re: Lets face it ... we're just communicators.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 02:55:56 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301241855.4580892@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59969

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030123095924.02295.00000157@mb-bk.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Lets face it ... we're just communicators.....
> >From: "Clay N4AOX" wyn@att.net
> >Date: 1/22/03 9:27 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <yiJX9.8555$zF6.698392@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
>
> >It has been a while but I believe the Pro's at a nearby Cat III ER told me
> >that, because the point is to massage the heart through the rib cage--a
> >difficult task at best, a few cracked ribs are forgiven. I think the idea
> >was to be careful to apply sufficient force, otherwise you are wasting the
> >patient's time, which at this point is precious little.
>
> As an ER Nurse I can tell you that if you did NOT break ribs during CPR,
> you were either (1) very lucky, (2) NOT applying sufficent pressure (3) Doing
> CPR on someone with rubber ribs.
>
> To be accurate, we don't "massage" the heart, but aggressively compress it.
> The point is to mechanically cycle the heart by squeezing it between the
> sternum and the spine. The "textbook" depth for an adult is 1.5 to 2 inches.
> On the average adult, that's 35% of the thckness of the chest.
>
> 73 and hope none of you ever need CPR...

...And all you have around is a guy who knows the code.

937. Walter Cronkite's Lawyer sends Glenn Baxter a Letter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 03:22:52 UTC
From: rfburns2003@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <634e00e4.0301241922.4860eb6c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59970
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

If you've ever wondered why Walter Cronkite would ever allow Glenn Baxter to use his name or likeness, or have anything to do with Glenn Baxter, read on.

A good question for Glenn Baxter might be this: If Walter Cronkite has requested that you NOT use his likeness and his voice and he CLEARLY is saying he wants NOTHING to do with you, why are you STILL doing it?

Those requiring verification of authenticity should call Walter Cronkite's office and ask his secretary Julie to verify that this letter has been sent. This letter is now in the public domain and you may freely distribute it to anyone anywhere.

Walter Cronkite's Attorney, Ronald S. Konecky, Attorney at Law, 488 Madison Avenue, NY, NY, writes to Baxter:

"Dear Mr. Baxter, we are the Attorneys for Mr. Walter Cronkite. Mr. Cronkite, as an accomodation, previously furnished an audio recording, to be used by you merely as a station ID.

Since your use of the recording extended beyond the agreed upon and intended limited station I.D., Mr. Cronkite previously requested that you refrain from any further use of the audiotape or from any suggestion that he endorses your station, operation, or other Associations. You have improperly refused to comply with such request and have continued to use the tape for purposes beyond its intended use.

We have now been advised that without Mr. Cronkite's permission or authorization, you have produced and are now distributing an approximately six minute CD video using Mr. Cronkite and the station identification which he previously furnished.

Such Video constitutes a violation of Mr. Cronkite's rights, is totally improper, and is in addition to your use of the audio identification, a cause of serious damage to his name and reputation.

We accordingly demand that you immediately cease and desist from any use of the audio station I.D.; from the production, publication and distribution of the CD video, and from the use of Mr. Cronkite's name and likeness; in any medium, and on any basis whatsoever."

(signed) Attorney for Walter Cronkite

938. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 03:47:39 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030124224739.16889.00000182@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 59971

In article <d22b54c3.0301241516.3ad79e35@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message >news:<20030123211353.21366.00000467@mb-mu.aol.com>...
>> In article <c2356669.0301220553.2e305963@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
>> (N2EY) writes:
>>
>> >Say, Larry, you can play the "years" game, too. Add up your age, years
>> >as a licensed ham, years of military service, years with a bachelor's
>> >degree, years with a driver's license, years with a CDL, years as an
>> >ARRL member, plus any other years you find usable and see what the
>> >total is.
>> >
>> >73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>> Jim:
>>
>> OK, here goes:
>>
>> Age: 50
>> Years as a ham: 21 (Just received Old Timer's Club certificate)
>> Years as an Extra: 20
>> Years as an ARRL member: 22
>> Years of military service: 19 (took early retirement in the mid-90's
>> downsizing)
>> Years with a CDL: 2.5
>> Years on rrap: 12
>
>I'll play this sillyass game.
>
>Age: 65
>Years as a Ham: 50
>Years as an Extra: 35
>Years as an ARRL member: Spotty, maybe 25 out of my 50
>Years of Military Service: Zip for purposes of this discussion
>Years driving long-haul 18-wheelers long before there were CDLs: Had
>to do with flatbed 40 foot stake bodies fulla Joisy tomatoes and the
>nonsense ya get into to pay yer way thru injuneering collitch. Gimmee
>3.
>Years on RRAP: 5??
>
>183 "RRAP Age Points" for Romeo Victor.
>

You're not palying it right.

You left out:

- Years as a degreed engineer (count each degree seperately)
- Years with DXCC
- Years with 5BDXCC
- Years present callsign
- Years with previous callsign
- Years with other radio service licenses (expired or not)
- Years your favorite Scotch is aged

Etc.

73 de jim, N2EY

939. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 03:47:41 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030124224741.16889.00000183@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 59972

In article <x1mY9.611$N5.393593@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030124190326.27873.00000174@mb-mj.aol.com...
>> In article <pPdY9.520$N5.346260@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>> >The logic fails, Dave ... supporting the view that Morse testing should
>> >be forced on all, like it or not, is NOT supporting freedom of choice.
>>
>> Apply that logic to forcing written testing beyond the basics of rules &
>> regs on all.....
>
>Not the same ...

It's exactly the same. Note that I wrote:

"written testing beyond the basics of rules & regs on all....."

>not knowing how to copy Morse by ear (all that's
>tested for) harms nobody ...

Perhaps. See below:

>not knowing some of the technical
>aspects can:
>
>result in interference to other services

How? The rules and regs cover things like allowed frequencies and modes. How
can ignorance of things like how a DDS synthesizer works result in interference
with other services?
>
>get you killed when you do stupid things with
>your fingers inside a radio
>
So? There is no license or test required to work on your own house wiring or
home appliances, any of which can easily get you killed. Nor is there any
license required to work on your own vehicle, even though improperly doing such
work can endanger yourself and others.

>expose your family/neighbors/passersby to RF
>radiation above the established limits

Said limits are part of the rules & regs, and covered as above.
>
>etc., etc.

>
What "etc., etc."? Why is a Morse test "hoop jumping", but not the writtens
beyond the Tech?

>> >I recognize that those who want to keep Morse testing have a right to
>> >hold that opinion ... but they don't have the right to force it on
>> >everyone
>> >else.
>> >NCI doesn't try to force its view on anyone ... nobody twists
>> >anyone's
>> >arm to join NCI, and members are not held captive, as the previous
>exchange
>> >demonstrates.
>>
>> If NCI's opinion holds sway with the FCC, then that opinion is forced on
>> everyone. Simple logic.
>
>The FCC makes the decisions on what best serves the public interest,
>convenience, and necessity ... as the expert agency charged with managing
>the non-federal-govt. use of the radio spectrum that belongs to all of us,
>if they agree with NCI's logical, factual, well-reasoned arguments, we are
>gratified :-)

And they force that opinion on everyone.

And consider this:

The FCC is the expert agency charged with managing the non-federal-govt. use of
the radio spectrum that belongs to all of us. They say that the 35 question
Tech test is adequate indication of qualification to design, build, test,
align, repair and operate amateur transmitters up to 1500 watt output on all
authorized amateur frequencies and modes above 30 MHz. As part of the
restructuring that reduced all code testing to a single 5 wpm test, FCC also
reduced the written testing for the Tech from two separate tests totalling 65
questions to the current single 35 question test.

Therefore, by your own logic, the current 35 question Tech test is adequate to
insure that those who pass it have adequate technical knowledge to:

- avoid interference to other services
- avoid getting killed when they do stupid things with their fingers inside a
radio
- avoid exposing their your family/neighbors/passersby to RF radiation above
the established limits
- etc., etc.

The FCC *is* the expert agency, right? And despite lots of comments about how
to "improve" the written tests, FCC decided that the current written testing
for Tech is adequate for the privileges.

So if the Tech test is adequate for all of VHF/UHF, why is there so much more
written testing for HF/MF? Surely there needs to be a little more testing for
the additional rules and regs (band edges, modes, etc.), but why all that

additional theory stuff on the General and Extra written? Is a QRP transmitter for 21.020 MHz that much different than a 1500 W transmitter for 432.020 MHz that two more written tests are required to use the QRP rig?

Or is it that FCC wants hams to "jump through the hoop" of taking more written tests in order to get more HF privileges?

>> >So, don't try to assert that we are somehow violating the rights of those
>> >who
>> >believe Morse testing should remain, because we are not ... we
>acknowledge
>> >that there is a minority that feels that way AND that they have the right
>to
>> >those
>> >views. On the other hand, we (NCI and its members) have an equal right
>to
>> >our views.
>>
>>
>> WHOA - I lost ya there.
>>
>> "we acknowledge that there is a minority that feels that way"
>>
>> Feels what way? That code testing should go, or should stay? It's really
>not
>> clear what's being said. Who is the minority being discussed?
>
>Sorry ... I was talking about the minority that still favors forcing Morse
>tests on everyone for access to HF ...

Sorry - the minority is those who would remove all code testing.
>
>> Note that when the comments to 98-143 were categorized and tabulated (by
>an NCI
>> staffer, btw), the majority of those who commented not only wanted code
>testing
>> to continue, but wanted at least two code test speeds. But FCC agreed with
>the
>> minority opinion.
>
>I believe a reasonable analysis would show that the demographics of ham
>radio
>in terms of the issue have changed dramatically over the past couple of
>years.

Have you done such a study?

The reduction of code testing in 2000 has not resulted in large numbers of new hams. The number of US hams has grown by only about 10,000 in all that time. And we have not seen significant technical changes brought about by the new regs.

The biggest change brought about by the 2000 restructuring has been large numbers of upgrades by already-licensed hams. That's a good thing, btw.
>
>If I had a buck for every e-mail I've received thanking me for NCI's
>work, I could HIRE someone to install the towers I plan to put up
>in the spring, rather than doing the work myself ...

How many? There are about 685,000 US hams - how many of them are NCI members? How many have emailed you?

I hope the towers help with your SSB DXCC. I think we both agree that good antennas are preferable to raw power. Check out K8MN's webpage - he has some nice ones.

73 de Jim, N2EY

940. Re: Walter Cronkite's Lawyer sends Glenn Baxter a Letter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 04:06:28 UTC
From: Woger <Anon@anon.com>
Message-ID: <b0t2e8$d2u$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 59973
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Chris" <rfburns2003@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:634e00e4.0301241922.4860eb6c@posting.google.com...
> If you've ever wondered why Walter Cronkite would ever allow Glenn
> Baxter to use his name or likeness, or have anything to do with Glenn
> Baxter, read on.
>
> A good question for Glenn Baxter might be this: If Walter Cronkite
> has requested that you NOT use his likeness and his voice and he
> CLEARLY is saying he wants NOTHING to do with you, why are you STILL
> doing it?
>
> Those requiring verification of authenticity should call Walter
> Cronkite's office and ask his secretary Julie to verify that this
> letter has been sent. This letter is now in the public domain and you
> may freely distribute it to anyone anywhere.
>
> Walter Cronkite's Attorney, Ronald S. Konecky, Attorney at Law, 488
> Madison Avenue, NY, NY, writes to Baxter:
>
> "Dear Mr. Baxter, we are the Attorneys for Mr. Walter Cronkite. Mr.
> Cronkite, as an accomodation, previously furnished an audio recording,
> to be used by you merely as a station ID.
>
> Since your use of the recording extended beyond the agreed upon and
> intended limited station I.D., Mr. Cronkite previously requested that
> you refrain from any further use of the audiotape or from any
> suggestion that he endorses your station, operation, or other
> Associations. You have improperly refused to comply with such request
> and have continued to use the tape for purposes beyond its intended
> use.
>
> We have now been advised that without Mr. Cronkite's permission or
> authorization, you have produced and are now distributing an
> approximately six minute CD video using Mr. Cronkite and the station
> identification which he previously furnished.
>
> Such Video constitutes a violation of Mr. Cronkite's rights, is
> totally improper, and is in addition to your use of the audio
> identification, a cause of serious damage to his name and reputation.
>
> We accordingly demand that you immediately cease and desist from any
> use of the audio station I.D.; from the production, publication and
> distribution of the CD video, and from the use of Mr. Cronkite's name

> and likeness; in any medium, and on any basis whatsoever."
>
> (signed) Attorney for Walter Cronkite

Note first and foremost that the poster deleted the alleged attorney's name. Clue number one. Next, re-read the alleged letter and take note of the misuse of capital letters, i.e., in all the wrong places. Take note also of the odd and misplaced useage of punctuation.
In light of the numerous gaffes one would be on good ground to hold this alleged "notification" highly suspect as originating from an attorney. I wonder if the poster himself wrote this letter in hopes of passing it off as as a factual notification. It is also possible that the poster of this alleged "notification" saw it elsewhere on one of the newsgroups, believed it to be factual, and is ignorantly passing it on.
One would be wise to take this and other such statements with a grain of salt.

941. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 04:10:28 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030124231028.29720.00000247@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 59974

> I know other
>extras
>who don't have a clue

Like yourself

> it's simply
>to make sure that people have a reasonable minimum level of qualification
>to operate safely and with a minimum potential for interference to other
>radio services

Which the present written does not do

942. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 04:11:33 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030124231133.29720.00000248@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 59975

>Why are the writtens a sacred cow but the code a scapegoat?
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Because no real knowledge is needed to pass them

943. Re: Walter Cronkite's Lawyer sends Glenn Baxter a Letter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 04:13:25 UTC
From: Jim Menning <jmenning@new.rr.com>
Message-ID: <t8oY9.25472$wE.652155@twister.kc.rr.com>
Source record: 59976
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Chris" <rfburns2003@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:634e00e4.0301241922.4860eb6c@posting.google.com...

>
> We have now been advised that without Mr. Cronkite's permission or
> authorization, you have produced and are now distributing an
> approximately six minute CD video using Mr. Cronkite and the station
> identification which he previously furnished.

Is this the 6 minute clip on the ARRL disc?

http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2003/01/17/3/?nc=1

jm

944. Re: Walter Cronkite's Lawyer sends Glenn Baxter a Letter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 04:16:31 UTC
From: N8KDV <n8kdv@iserv.net>
Message-ID: <3E320F9F.8491041E@iserv.net>
Source record: 59977
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Woger wrote:

> "Chris" <rfburns2003@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:634e00e4.0301241922.4860eb6c@posting.google.com...
> > If you've ever wondered why Walter Cronkite would ever allow Glenn
> > Baxter to use his name or likeness, or have anything to do with Glenn
> > Baxter, read on.
> >
> > A good question for Glenn Baxter might be this: If Walter Cronkite
> > has requested that you NOT use his likeness and his voice and he
> > CLEARLY is saying he wants NOTHING to do with you, why are you STILL
> > doing it?
> >
> > Those requiring verification of authenticity should call Walter
> > Cronkite's office and ask his secretary Julie to verify that this
> > letter has been sent. This letter is now in the public domain and you
> > may freely distribute it to anyone anywhere.
> >
> > Walter Cronkite's Attorney, Ronald S. Konecky, Attorney at Law, 488
> > Madison Avenue, NY, NY, writes to Baxter:
> >
> > "Dear Mr. Baxter, we are the Attorneys for Mr. Walter Cronkite. Mr.
> > Cronkite, as an accomodation, previously furnished an audio recording,
> > to be used by you merely as a station ID.
> >
> > Since your use of the recording extended beyond the agreed upon and
> > intended limited station I.D., Mr. Cronkite previously requested that
> > you refrain from any further use of the audiotape or from any
> > suggestion that he endorses your station, operation, or other
> > Associations. You have improperly refused to comply with such request
> > and have continued to use the tape for purposes beyond its intended
> > use.
> >
> > We have now been advised that without Mr. Cronkite's permission or
> > authorization, you have produced and are now distributing an
> > approximately six minute CD video using Mr. Cronkite and the station
> > identification which he previously furnished.
> >
> > Such Video constitutes a violation of Mr. Cronkite's rights, is
> > totally improper, and is in addition to your use of the audio
> > identification, a cause of serious damage to his name and reputation.
> >
> > We accordingly demand that you immediately cease and desist from any

> > use of the audio station I.D.; from the production, publication and
> > distribution of the CD video, and from the use of Mr. Cronkite's name
> > and likeness; in any medium, and on any basis whatsoever."
> >
> > (signed) Attorney for Walter Cronkite
>
> Note first and foremost that the poster deleted the alleged attorney's name.

Better learn to read Bozo, it's at the top of the letter! ;-)

>
> Clue number one. Next, re-read the alleged letter and take note of the
> misuse of capital letters, i.e., in all the wrong places. Take note also of
> the odd and misplaced useage of punctuation.
> In light of the numerous gaffes one would be on good ground to hold this
> alleged "notification" highly suspect as originating from an attorney. I
> wonder if the poster himself wrote this letter in hopes of passing it off as
> as a factual notification. It is also possible that the poster of this
> alleged "notification" saw it elsewhere on one of the newsgroups, believed
> it to be factual, and is ignorantly passing it on.
> One would be wise to take this and other such statements with a grain of
> salt.

945. Re: Walter Cronkite's Lawyer sends Glenn Baxter a Letter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 04:30:37 UTC
From: Ed Norton <EdNorton@Whoisednortoncom.net>
Message-ID: <b0t3t6$g97$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 59978
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

The Whole Thing Sounds Pretty Fishy to me!!!!!!

Ed Norton
DOD Sewer Expert

"N8KDV" <n8kdv@iserv.net> wrote in message
news:3E320F9F.8491041E@iserv.net...
>
>
> Woger wrote:
>
> > "Chris" <rfburns2003@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:634e00e4.0301241922.4860eb6c@posting.google.com...
> > > If you've ever wondered why Walter Cronkite would ever allow Glenn
> > > Baxter to use his name or likeness, or have anything to do with Glenn
> > > Baxter, read on.
> > >
> > > A good question for Glenn Baxter might be this: If Walter Cronkite
> > > has requested that you NOT use his likeness and his voice and he
> > > CLEARLY is saying he wants NOTHING to do with you, why are you STILL
> > > doing it?
> > >
> > > Those requiring verification of authenticity should call Walter
> > > Cronkite's office and ask his secretary Julie to verify that this
> > > letter has been sent. This letter is now in the public domain and you
> > > may freely distribute it to anyone anywhere.
> > >
> > > Walter Cronkite's Attorney, Ronald S. Konecky, Attorney at Law, 488
> > > Madison Avenue, NY, NY, writes to Baxter:
> > >
> > > "Dear Mr. Baxter, we are the Attorneys for Mr. Walter Cronkite. Mr.
> > > Cronkite, as an accomodation, previously furnished an audio recording,
> > > to be used by you merely as a station ID.
> > >
> > > Since your use of the recording extended beyond the agreed upon and
> > > intended limited station I.D., Mr. Cronkite previously requested that
> > > you refrain from any further use of the audiotape or from any
> > > suggestion that he endorses your station, operation, or other
> > > Associations. You have improperly refused to comply with such request
> > > and have continued to use the tape for purposes beyond its intended
> > > use.
> > >
> > > We have now been advised that without Mr. Cronkite's permission or
> > > authorization, you have produced and are now distributing an

> > > approximately six minute CD video using Mr. Cronkite and the station
> > > identification which he previously furnished.
> > >
> > > Such Video constitutes a violation of Mr. Cronkite's rights, is
> > > totally improper, and is in addition to your use of the audio
> > > identification, a cause of serious damage to his name and reputation.
> > >
> > > We accordingly demand that you immediately cease and desist from any
> > > use of the audio station I.D.; from the production, publication and
> > > distribution of the CD video, and from the use of Mr. Cronkite's name
> > > and likeness; in any medium, and on any basis whatsoever."
> > >
> > > (signed) Attorney for Walter Cronkite
> >
> > Note first and foremost that the poster deleted the alleged attorney's
name.
>
> Better learn to read Bozo, it's at the top of the letter! ;-)
>
> >
> > Clue number one. Next, re-read the alleged letter and take note of the
> > misuse of capital letters, i.e., in all the wrong places. Take note also
of
> > the odd and misplaced useage of punctuation.
> > In light of the numerous gaffes one would be on good ground to hold this
> > alleged "notification" highly suspect as originating from an attorney. I
> > wonder if the poster himself wrote this letter in hopes of passing it
off as
> > as a factual notification. It is also possible that the poster of this
> > alleged "notification" saw it elsewhere on one of the newsgroups,
believed
> > it to be factual, and is ignorantly passing it on.
> > One would be wise to take this and other such statements with a grain of
> > salt.
>

946. Re: Walter Cronkite's Lawyer sends Glenn Baxter a Letter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 04:31:17 UTC
From: Gray Shockley <gray@compcomm.com>
Message-ID: <0001HW.BA576F350002615F1204F860@news-central.giganews.com>
Source record: 59979
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Fri, 24 Jan 2003 22:06:28 -0600, Woger wrote
(in message <b0t2e8$d2u$0@pita.alt.net>):

>
> "Chris" <rfburns2003@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:634e00e4.0301241922.4860eb6c@posting.google.com...
>> If you've ever wondered why Walter Cronkite would ever allow Glenn
>> Baxter to use his name or likeness, or have anything to do with Glenn
>> Baxter, read on.
>>
>> A good question for Glenn Baxter might be this: If Walter Cronkite
>> has requested that you NOT use his likeness and his voice and he
>> CLEARLY is saying he wants NOTHING to do with you, why are you STILL
>> doing it?
>>
>> Those requiring verification of authenticity should call Walter
>> Cronkite's office and ask his secretary Julie to verify that this
>> letter has been sent. This letter is now in the public domain and you
>> may freely distribute it to anyone anywhere.
>>
>> Walter Cronkite's Attorney, Ronald S. Konecky, Attorney at Law, 488
>> Madison Avenue, NY, NY, writes to Baxter:
>>
>> "Dear Mr. Baxter, we are the Attorneys for Mr. Walter Cronkite. Mr.
>> Cronkite, as an accomodation, previously furnished an audio recording,
>> to be used by you merely as a station ID.
>>
>> Since your use of the recording extended beyond the agreed upon and
>> intended limited station I.D., Mr. Cronkite previously requested that
>> you refrain from any further use of the audiotape or from any
>> suggestion that he endorses your station, operation, or other
>> Associations. You have improperly refused to comply with such request
>> and have continued to use the tape for purposes beyond its intended
>> use.
>>
>> We have now been advised that without Mr. Cronkite's permission or
>> authorization, you have produced and are now distributing an
>> approximately six minute CD video using Mr. Cronkite and the station
>> identification which he previously furnished.
>>
>> Such Video constitutes a violation of Mr. Cronkite's rights, is
>> totally improper, and is in addition to your use of the audio
>> identification, a cause of serious damage to his name and reputation.

>>
>> We accordingly demand that you immediately cease and desist from any
>> use of the audio station I.D.; from the production, publication and
>> distribution of the CD video, and from the use of Mr. Cronkite's name
>> and likeness; in any medium, and on any basis whatsoever."
>>
>> (signed) Attorney for Walter Cronkite
>
> Note first and foremost that the poster deleted the alleged attorney's name.
> Clue number one.

Uh - you quoted it in your reply. Strike Number One

> Next, re-read the alleged letter and take note of the
> misuse of capital letters, i.e., in all the wrong places. Take note also of
> the odd and misplaced useage of punctuation.

Welcome to the fascinating area of "technical writing", i.e., "specialized
writing. Strike Number Two.

> In light of the numerous gaffes one would be on good ground to hold this
> alleged "notification" highly suspect as originating from an attorney. I
> wonder if the poster himself wrote this letter in hopes of passing it off as
> as a factual notification. It is also possible that the poster of this
> alleged "notification" saw it elsewhere on one of the newsgroups, believed
> it to be factual, and is ignorantly passing it on.
> One would be wise to take this and other such statements with a grain of
> salt.

Erroneous conclusion based on self-induced erroneous premises. Strike Number
Three.

Three strikes, no balls, you're out.

Gray Shockley

"Swinehood hath no remedy." - Sidney Lanier

947. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 05:56:31 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030125005631.06736.00000193@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 59980

>Subject: Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 1/24/03 2:24 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030124152434.27873.00000168@mb-mj.aol.com>

>To them the morse test MUST STAY! It is a divine thing, never
> to be removed (heresy)!

As opposed to unlicensed aggitators who say the test must go, ergo it is
as equally divine?

>All must do as the mighty morsemen did. Period

Seems to me it's more like "all must do as the unlicensed aggitator says
wwe must do. Period"...

948. Re: Walter Cronkite's Lawyer sends Glenn Baxter a Letter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 06:17:51 UTC
From: Woger <Anon@anon.com>
Message-ID: <b0ta4h$5au$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 59981
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Gray Shockley" <gray@compcomm.com> wrote in message
news:0001HW.BA576F350002615F1204F860@news-central.giganews.com...
> On Fri, 24 Jan 2003 22:06:28 -0600, Woger wrote
> (in message <b0t2e8$d2u$0@pita.alt.net>):
>
> >
> > "Chris" <rfburns2003@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:634e00e4.0301241922.4860eb6c@posting.google.com...
> >> If you've ever wondered why Walter Cronkite would ever allow Glenn
> >> Baxter to use his name or likeness, or have anything to do with Glenn
> >> Baxter, read on.
> >>
> >> A good question for Glenn Baxter might be this: If Walter Cronkite
> >> has requested that you NOT use his likeness and his voice and he
> >> CLEARLY is saying he wants NOTHING to do with you, why are you STILL
> >> doing it?
> >>
> >> Those requiring verification of authenticity should call Walter
> >> Cronkite's office and ask his secretary Julie to verify that this
> >> letter has been sent. This letter is now in the public domain and you
> >> may freely distribute it to anyone anywhere.
> >>
> >> Walter Cronkite's Attorney, Ronald S. Konecky, Attorney at Law, 488
> >> Madison Avenue, NY, NY, writes to Baxter:
> >>
> >> "Dear Mr. Baxter, we are the Attorneys for Mr. Walter Cronkite. Mr.
> >> Cronkite, as an accomodation, previously furnished an audio recording,
> >> to be used by you merely as a station ID.
> >>
> >> Since your use of the recording extended beyond the agreed upon and
> >> intended limited station I.D., Mr. Cronkite previously requested that
> >> you refrain from any further use of the audiotape or from any
> >> suggestion that he endorses your station, operation, or other
> >> Associations. You have improperly refused to comply with such request
> >> and have continued to use the tape for purposes beyond its intended
> >> use.
> >>
> >> We have now been advised that without Mr. Cronkite's permission or
> >> authorization, you have produced and are now distributing an
> >> approximately six minute CD video using Mr. Cronkite and the station
> >> identification which he previously furnished.
> >>
> >> Such Video constitutes a violation of Mr. Cronkite's rights, is

> >> totally improper, and is in addition to your use of the audio
> >> identification, a cause of serious damage to his name and reputation.
> >>
> >> We accordingly demand that you immediately cease and desist from any
> >> use of the audio station I.D.; from the production, publication and
> >> distribution of the CD video, and from the use of Mr. Cronkite's name
> >> and likeness; in any medium, and on any basis whatsoever."
> >>
> >> (signed) Attorney for Walter Cronkite
> >
> > Note first and foremost that the poster deleted the alleged attorney's
name.
> > Clue number one.
>
> Uh - you quoted it in your reply. Strike Number One
>
>
> > Next, re-read the alleged letter and take note of the
> > misuse of capital letters, i.e., in all the wrong places. Take note also
of
> > the odd and misplaced useage of punctuation.
>
> Welcome to the fascinating area of "technical writing", i.e., "specialized
> writing. Strike Number Two.
>
> > In light of the numerous gaffes one would be on good ground to hold this
> > alleged "notification" highly suspect as originating from an attorney. I
> > wonder if the poster himself wrote this letter in hopes of passing it
off as
> > as a factual notification. It is also possible that the poster of this
> > alleged "notification" saw it elsewhere on one of the newsgroups,
believed
> > it to be factual, and is ignorantly passing it on.
> > One would be wise to take this and other such statements with a grain of
> > salt.
>
> Erroneous conclusion based on self-induced erroneous premises. Strike
Number
> Three.
>
> Three strikes, no balls, you're out.
>
>
>
> Gray Shockley
> -------------------------
> "Swinehood hath no remedy." - Sidney Lanier

So noted. Consider also that the secretary in this case is a dolt. In this
case it would be wise for the alleged attorney to replace her or him. You

just cannot get good help these days.
And how is your pocket protector doing? No more ink-stained shirts?

949. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 06:29:32 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030125012932.06736.00000194@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 59982

>Subject: Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 1/24/03 2:24 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030124152431.27873.00000165@mb-mj.aol.com>

>If chastisement about ignorance of the rest of the radio
> world is an "insult," then I am guilty of "insulting the ignorant."

The problem is that your own "view" ends at the end of a set of VTVM probe tips. You have repeatedly demonstrated a thoroughly underdeveloped understanding of the PRACTICE of radio.

>If refusal to bow down to claims of "superiority" by those
> favoring morse code modes, then I am guilty of "ridiculing the
> self-proclaimed "superiors.

The only person here making any sort of claims of superiority is by YOU, Lennie. You are the ONLY person here saying any "procode" person made any claims of "superiority". None of the "procode" pesons in this forum have made ANY such claim.

To assert otherwise is a lie.

>Of course, the "extra double-standard" is at work
> there such as another constantly using "Putz" and "creep."

I don't make such claims unless I am ready to back them up. Luckily YOU provide me with lot's of justification, Putz.

>"Factual errors?" Surely the mighty morseman jests.
> Individual OPINIONS are not "fact."

Good. Then we have established that nothing you have to offer is factual.

>Disagreement with
> certain traditions (particularly of the standards and practices
> of the 1930s) is NOT "factual error."

Who here has insisted on the maintenence of "standards and practices of the 1930's"...?!?!

>I enjoy such equal opportunity. Follows democratic principles

No...You ABUSE it. Just like you abused the Honor of U.S.Army KIA's in order to embellish your own reputation.

That's where the "creep" part comes in.....

>It's the American Way. Does the mighty morseman Miccolis
> disagree with the American Way?

Now Lennie the Liar wraps HIMself in "patriotic bunting"...a practice he himself accuses others of doing. Of course only rear area radio clerks may do that without criticsm or correction.

>How can mighty morseman Miccolis claim that is somehow
> akin to "anonymity?"

Because we have neither evidence that the person alleging to be Leonard H Anderson in this forum is THAT Leonard H Anderson, not do we have any evidence that anything you have ever done in the field of radiocommunications was original work.

>>Not that he will ever admit being mistaken on anything.
>
> That is, obviously and by evidence of Google archives,
> WRONG.
> WRONG, Jimmie.
> W-R-O-N-G !

Abusive use of bandwidth noted.

Google archives produce REAMS of errors promulgated by the various screen names of Leonard H. Anderson.

>Lack of ass-kissing of self-proclaimed masters of the
> radio universe (ham radio division) guaranteed!

Makes it kinda hard to look yourself in the mirror to shave, doesn't it, Oh Lying One?

>Go thee to Google, grasshopper, you have much to learn
> and atone for thy attempts at character assassination.

You mean like your assertions of "dishonesty" of the ARRL and failure to produce any evidence thereof?

You mean like your assertion of radio services created for "solely recreational" applications?

You mean like your assertion of intent to get "an extra lite outh of the box"...?

You mean like your embellishment of your Army "career" based upon your service in a unit that suffered KIA's 3 years before you joined it?

There's more...do I need ot go on...?!?!

>Leonard H. Anderson
> - alleged anonymous person using screen names
> "LenOf21," "AveryFineman," and a couple others
> on AOL, an alleged heinous "crime."

Nope...no heinous crime. Just very humbling to see a person of your years and alleged professional accomplishments stooping to hide his misdeeds behind multiple personalities.

"Loser" is an understatement.

>"Payroll signature" is a common term for first name, middle
> initial, last name as required in the US military to sign for a
> monthly pay. Those who've never served in the US military
> will be unfamiliar with the term.

It's not been "monthly" in decades, Lennie. And I know a great many non-prior service persons who refer to their legal signature as "payroll signature". Many nurses have their "chart signature" which they use to clearly denote who made the entry. This is as opposed to their "payroll signature" which is used for other purposes.

Sorry to bust yet another LennieRant.

Steve

950. Re: Lets face it ... we're just communicators.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 06:36:34 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030125013634.06736.00000195@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 59983

>Subject: Re: Lets face it ... we're just communicators.....
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 1/24/03 8:55 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0301241855.4580892@posting.google.com>

>> 73 and hope none of you ever need CPR...
>
>...And all you have around is a guy who knows the code.

In my case you have the benefit of having a guy around who DOES "know the code", but can also manage your Code Blue. care for a demonstration, Brian? I'd be glad to give you a first hand demonstration of a defibrillator. You'll find the experience shocking.

Steve

951. Re: Walter Cronkite's Lawyer sends Glenn Baxter a Letter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 06:45:03 UTC
From: Gray Shockley <gray@compcomm.com>
Message-ID: <0001HW.BA578E8F0009BEF51204F860@news-central.giganews.com>
Source record: 59984
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Sat, 25 Jan 2003 0:17:51 -0600, Woger wrote
(in message <b0ta4h$5au$0@pita.alt.net>):

> So noted. Consider also that the secretary in this case is a dolt. In this
> case it would be wise for the alleged attorney to replace her or him. You
> just cannot get good help these days.
> And how is your pocket protector doing? No more ink-stained shirts?

[chuckle]

United States Army
Sergeant First Class (33T4M/26L), Retired
Vietnam 12/1968-7/1970 (31M/N)
First Sergeant, 5th Infantry Div (M) 1986

(And I had a Zenith Trans-Oceanic in Pleiku, so there!)

952. Re: Walter Cronkite's Lawyer sends Glenn Baxter a Letter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 07:53:13 UTC
From: Woger <Anon@anon.com>
Message-ID: <b0tfnb$mu6$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 59985
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Gray Shockley" <gray@compcomm.com> wrote in message
news:0001HW.BA578E8F0009BEF51204F860@news-central.giganews.com...
> On Sat, 25 Jan 2003 0:17:51 -0600, Woger wrote
> (in message <b0ta4h$5au$0@pita.alt.net>):
>
> > So noted. Consider also that the secretary in this case is a dolt. In
this
> > case it would be wise for the alleged attorney to replace her or him.
You
> > just cannot get good help these days.
> > And how is your pocket protector doing? No more ink-stained shirts?
>
> [chuckle]
>
> United States Army
> Sergeant First Class (33T4M/26L), Retired
> Vietnam 12/1968-7/1970 (31M/N)
> First Sergeant, 5th Infantry Div (M) 1986
>
> (And I had a Zenith Trans-Oceanic in Pleiku, so there!)
>
Yeah, yeah. Big deal.
I, too, humped the boonies as an E-5 squad leader.
Camp Evans, Firebase Eagle. 101st Airborne, Master Blaster.
1st Brigade, 5th Div.
CIB, Purple Heart (shrapnel)
My days in the military are NOT one of my high points. I do not wear my
service on my sleeve.
Except for an occasional bout of jungle rot between my toes I have put this
behind me.
You should do the same, bro.

953. Re: Walter Cronkite's Lawyer sends Glenn Baxter a Letter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 08:30:16 UTC
From: Gray Shockley <gray@compcomm.com>
Message-ID: <0001HW.BA57A738000F8A4D1204F860@news-central.giganews.com>
Source record: 59986
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Sat, 25 Jan 2003 1:53:13 -0600, Woger wrote
(in message <b0tfnb$mu6$0@pita.alt.net>):

>
> "Gray Shockley" <gray@compcomm.com> wrote in message
> news:0001HW.BA578E8F0009BEF51204F860@news-central.giganews.com...
>> On Sat, 25 Jan 2003 0:17:51 -0600, Woger wrote
>> (in message <b0ta4h$5au$0@pita.alt.net>):
>>
>>> So noted. Consider also that the secretary in this case is a dolt. In
> this
>>> case it would be wise for the alleged attorney to replace her or him.
> You
>>> just cannot get good help these days.
>>> And how is your pocket protector doing? No more ink-stained shirts?
>>
>> [chuckle]
>>
>> United States Army
>> Sergeant First Class (33T4M/26L), Retired
>> Vietnam 12/1968-7/1970 (31M/N)
>> First Sergeant, 5th Infantry Div (M) 1986
>>
>> (And I had a Zenith Trans-Oceanic in Pleiku, so there!)
>>
> Yeah, yeah. Big deal.
> I, too, humped the boonies as an E-5 squad leader.
> Camp Evans, Firebase Eagle. 101st Airborne, Master Blaster.
> 1st Brigade, 5th Div.
> CIB, Purple Heart (shrapnel)
> My days in the military are NOT one of my high points. I do not wear my
> service on my sleeve.
> Except for an occasional bout of jungle rot between my toes I have put this
> behind me.
> You should do the same, bro.

>>> And how is your pocket protector doing? No more ink-stained shirts?

You asked.

You got your answer.

Be happy, be joyful.

>>> And how is your pocket protector doing? No more ink-stained shirts?

You asked.

Responsibity for yourself: learn it, live it, love it.

Gray Shockley

"Swinehood hath no remedy." - Sidney Lanier

954. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 08:42:55 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0301250042.a5597ff@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59987

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:<GQeY9.689$hP2.55@nwrddc04.gnilink.net>...
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> news:c2356669.0301240927.110b95f5@posting.google.com...
> > Not a major issue anymore.
>
> True.

Not true. All the battalions of nocodes out there who are smugly
sitting on their dead butts counting the days until S25.5 goes away so
that they can get free passes to 75 & 20 ssb are gonna be HUGELY
pissed off if that doesn't happen(Jim: e.g. our beloved ATO). You bet
S25.5 is still a major issue. It's no longer a major issue in this
isolated funny farm full of odd units but only because we've
collectively worn it out and beaten it into the ground.

> > I'll be surprised if it takes any more
> > agenda time than the minimum required to propose elimination of S25.5
> > and do the vote.
>
> I'm not so sure about that, Jim. Perhaps we may see some European "ringers"
> in there. ;-)

There are some former Soviet entities in eastern Europe which now have
the same clout at WRCs as Foggy Bottom has and the little bit of
traffic on the subject I've seen so far indicates that they very well
could be yer "ringers".

>
> > Of course I hope I am mistaken about this and that
> > S25.5 survives WRC-2003
>
> Me too!

> > , but I doubt very much that will happen. And
> > once the treaty (yes, it's a genuine treaty) changes and is ratified,
> > FCC will most probably dump Element 1 ASAP.
>
> Last hope?
>
> > 40 meters is actually a much more important issue for HF amateur
> > radio, for a bunch of reasons. The real question is: can a better deal
> > be struck with the SWBC folks?
>
> True true, I hope that deal can come to fruition.

We all do. It's developing into an interesting joust to say the least.
I noticed that none of the options offered for discussion at the WRC
so far include any mention of opening up 6.900 - 7.000 Mhz for ham
ops. I thought that was an excellent idea when I first heard about it.

Like Doris Day sang, "Que sara, sara".

We'll deal with it. We always have dealt with it. No matter what.

>
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

955. Re: Lets face it ... we're just communicators.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 13:07:59 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301250507.449359f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59988

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030125013634.06736.00000195@mb-cv.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Lets face it ... we're just communicators.....
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 1/24/03 8:55 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0301241855.4580892@posting.google.com>
>
> >> 73 and hope none of you ever need CPR...
> >
> >...And all you have around is a guy who knows the code.
>
> In my case you have the benefit of having a guy around who DOES "know the
> code", but can also manage your Code Blue. care for a demonstration, Brian?
> I'd be glad to give you a first hand demonstration of a defibrillator. You'll
> find the experience shocking.
>
> Steve

Steve, you probably know how to change a flat tire, too. I'll let you
know next time I have car trouble.

956. Hot Fun In The Summertime With Brian

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 14:15:08 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030125091508.05609.00000198@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 59989

>Subject: Re: This Is How KB1HMW "Supports" Amateur Radio
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 1/24/03 5:52 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0301241552.4441642a@posting.google.com>

>Where did you get that idea?

From your own quotes, Brian. You should try reading them some times. Very funny stuff!

Follow this...

First you say:

>Who says it wasn't voluntary??? I didn't say that? And I didn't say
>I declined further service.

Then only three sentences later:

>It was offered, I declined.

You are as confused and idiotic as can be, Brain. And it get's more hillarious as you try to deny it. Kinda like insisting how "legal" your T5 operations were, and NOT having any evidence of it.

>You can have a second try if you wish. Really. I'm up to it.

It doesn't take more than one pass to undermine your rants, Brian. It's very simple, really.

>Got a picture of it
>somewhere, but I'm just a has-been now and don't live in the past.

Yes, you are, but you DO still try to live in the past, Brian.

>Someday when you go SK, someone is likely to see those wings
>in your collection and try to bury you in Arlington.

Nope...Anyone who is anyone knows it's what's in your SRB that counts. Anyone except you, that is.

957. Re: Lets face it ... we're just communicators.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 14:22:32 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030125092232.05609.00000199@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 59990

>Subject: Re: Lets face it ... we're just communicators.....
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 1/25/03 7:07 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0301250507.449359f@posting.google.com>

>Steve, you probably know how to change a flat tire, too. I'll let you
>know next time I have car trouble.

Which, considering your incompetentcy with simple adminisitrative matters,
will probably be soon. I'll get the truck warmed up.

Steve

958. Re: Lets face it ... we're just communicators.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 15:31:28 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030125103128.21418.00000500@mb-mu.aol.com>
Source record: 59991

>I'd be glad to give you a first hand demonstration of a defibrillator.
>You'll
>find the experience shocking.
>
>Steve

Can I help, lets start it at 450, and instead of using gel lets use water

959. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 15:36:42 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030125103642.05141.00000120@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 59992

In article <d22b54c3.0301250042.a5597ff@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
>news:<GQeY9.689$hP2.55@nwrddc04.gnilink.net>...
>> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>> news:c2356669.0301240927.110b95f5@posting.google.com...
>> > Not a major issue anymore.
>>
>> True.
>
>Not true.

I sincerely hope you are correct and that Bert and I are mistaken on this issue.

>All the battalions of nocodes out there who are smugly
>sitting on their dead butts counting the days until S25.5 goes away so
>that they can get free passes to 75 & 20 ssb are gonna be HUGELY
>pissed off if that doesn't happen(Jim: e.g. our beloved ATO). You bet
>S25.5 is still a major issue. It's no longer a major issue in this
>isolated funny farm full of odd units but only because we've
>collectively worn it out and beaten it into the ground.
>
And because of the actions of FCC and other Western-bloc countries' administrations wrt code testing.

>> > I'll be surprised if it takes any more
>> > agenda time than the minimum required to propose elimination of S25.5
>> > and do the vote.
>>
>> I'm not so sure about that, Jim. Perhaps we may see some European "ringers"
>> in there. ;-)
>
>There are some former Soviet entities in eastern Europe which now have
>the same clout at WRCs as Foggy Bottom has and the little bit of
>traffic on the subject I've seen so far indicates that they very well
>could be yer "ringers".

I have to wonder what their motivations could be. It cannot be the preservation of Morse skills in their own countries, because they could always retain Morse testing on their own, without S25.5.
>
>> > Of course I hope I am mistaken about this and that
>> > S25.5 survives WRC-2003
>>

>> Me too!
>
>> > , but I doubt very much that will happen. And
>> > once the treaty (yes, it's a genuine treaty) changes and is ratified,
>> > FCC will most probably dump Element 1 ASAP.

We shall hope for the best and prepare for the worst.
>>
>> Last hope?
>>
>> > 40 meters is actually a much more important issue for HF amateur
>> > radio, for a bunch of reasons. The real question is: can a better deal
>> > be struck with the SWBC folks?
>>
>> True true, I hope that deal can come to fruition.
>
>We all do. It's developing into an interesting joust to say the least.
>I noticed that none of the options offered for discussion at the WRC
>so far include any mention of opening up 6.900 - 7.000 Mhz for ham
>ops. I thought that was an excellent idea when I first heard about it.

Apparently moving the folks there was seen as much more of a no-go than moving SWBC out of 7100 and above.

Perhaps the deal will go like this: The Eastern bloc folks trade 40 SWBC for the code test. Or some permutation. Won't know for sure until the fat lady sings.
>
>Like Doris Day sang, "Que sara, sara".
>
>We'll deal with it. We always have dealt with it. No matter what.
>
Yup. Lookit 160 meters - major ham band before WW2, all but lost to LORAN afterwards, then slowly regained. Now LORAN is no longer there, but hams are. Many of them are using CW. BWAAHAAAHAAAA!!!!!

73 de Jim, N2EY

960. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 15:51:58 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E32B26D.9090401@adelphia.net>
Source record: 60051

Dave Heil wrote:
HAR! Boy, I say pay attention to me boy - I ain't no chicken!

> Oh, what the heck. For a visual aid, try
> http://www.home.earthlink.net/~k8mn/foghorn.jpg

961. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 16:13:05 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0301250813.66af407e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 59993

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0301241515.5018da17@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030124100213.01401.00000141@mb-mk.aol.com>...
> > >Subject: Re: NR-1 Book
> > >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> > >Date: 1/24/03 7:18 AM Central Standard Time
> > >Message-id: <f45722ac.0301240518.184ce709@posting.google.com>
>
> > >RRAA is full of character assassination
> >
> > It's not "character assassination" if it's true, Brain.
> >
> > Steve
>
> Have you followed the Fractenna assassination for the last 4 years or so, Steav?

Right: One little piece of completely ignorable ongoing nonsense in
RRAA and you just had to land on it. No surprise at all, the other 98%
of RRAA is so far over yer empty head you can't even start to deal
with it.

Go back to yer rubber ducky.

w3rv

962. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 16:15:47 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b0udsq$6ol$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 59996

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030125005631.06736.00000193@mb-cv.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >Date: 1/24/03 2:24 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20030124152434.27873.00000168@mb-mj.aol.com>
>
> >To them the morse test MUST STAY! It is a divine thing, never
> > to be removed (heresy)!
>
> As opposed to unlicensed aggitators who say the test must go, ergo it
is
> as equally divine?
>
> >All must do as the mighty morsemen did. Period
>
> Seems to me it's more like "all must do as the unlicensed aggitator
says
> wwe must do. Period"...

The facts are that all regulations and requirements MUST
be justified. The court of public opinion and technical
need as determined by the FCC has negated any reasons
to retain code testing. That's all that needs be said.

To RETAIN morse testing, the burden of proof falls on
those that WANT a test. It's that simple.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

963. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 16:18:24 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <kNyY9.652$N5.478853@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 59994

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030124224741.16889.00000183@mb-cc.aol.com...
> In article <x1mY9.611$N5.393593@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20030124190326.27873.00000174@mb-mj.aol.com...
> >> In article <pPdY9.520$N5.346260@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> >> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
> >> >The logic fails, Dave ... supporting the view that Morse testing
should
> >> >be forced on all, like it or not, is NOT supporting freedom of choice.
> >>
> >> Apply that logic to forcing written testing beyond the basics of rules
&
> >> regs on all.....
> >
> >Not the same ...
>
> It's exactly the same. Note that I wrote:
>
> "written testing beyond the basics of rules & regs on all....."

Anything "beyond the basics of rules & regs" sounds like
the technical parts of the written test to me ... isn't that what
you were referring to???

> >not knowing how to copy Morse by ear (all that's
> >tested for) harms nobody ...
>
> Perhaps. See below:
>
> >not knowing some of the technical
> >aspects can:
> >
> >result in interference to other services
>
> How? The rules and regs cover things like allowed frequencies and modes.
How
> can ignorance of things like how a DDS synthesizer works result in
interference
> with other services?

Not knowing how a DDS works could result in programming it incorrectly,
causing out of band emissions.

Not knowing (fill in some technical thing here) could also result in the ham
having no clue that his radio was malfunctioning and creating interference
(let alone how to fix it ...)

> >get you killed when you do stupid things with
> >your fingers inside a radio
> >
> So? There is no license or test required to work on your own house wiring
or
> home appliances, any of which can easily get you killed. Nor is there any
> license required to work on your own vehicle, even though improperly doing
such
> work can endanger yourself and others.

In some states mechanics are licensed ... which shows the recognition of
the danger ... electricians are pretty universally licensed, as are
plumbers,
and other craftsmen whose work could, if poorly done, endanger the public.

> >expose your family/neighbors/passersby to RF
> >radiation above the established limits
>
> Said limits are part of the rules & regs, and covered as above.

Yes, but if you are so technically ignorant (as you seem to be
advocating, at least as devil's advocate in an effort to prop up
the "equal legitimacy" of Morse testing) that you can't understand
those rules and apply them, having memorized them is useless.

> >etc., etc.
> >
> What "etc., etc."? Why is a Morse test "hoop jumping", but not the
writtens
> beyond the Tech?

Because of what we're allowed to do in terms of repairing, modifying,
adjusting, tinkering with, and even building our own equipment. We
are the only radio service (other than the Experimental Radio Service
under Part 5, which is limited to very specific uses) that allows such
flexibility ... in return, we owe an obligation to demonstrate at least a
minimum level of technical understanding and competence.

> >> >I recognize that those who want to keep Morse testing have a right to
> >> >hold that opinion ... but they don't have the right to force it on
> >> >everyone
> >> >else.
> >> >NCI doesn't try to force its view on anyone ... nobody twists
> >> >anyone's
> >> >arm to join NCI, and members are not held captive, as the previous
> >exchange
> >> >demonstrates.
> >>
> >> If NCI's opinion holds sway with the FCC, then that opinion is forced

on
> >> everyone. Simple logic.
> >
> >The FCC makes the decisions on what best serves the public interest,
> >convenience, and necessity ... as the expert agency charged with managing
> >the non-federal-govt. use of the radio spectrum that belongs to all of
us,
> >if they agree with NCI's logical, factual, well-reasoned arguments, we
are
> >gratified :-)
>
> And they force that opinion on everyone.

Clearly the FCC's rules apply to everyone ... what WE were talking about
is whether NCI would force its views on everyone, as would many PCTAs.

> And consider this:
>
> The FCC is the expert agency charged with managing the non-federal-govt.
use of
> the radio spectrum that belongs to all of us.

I said previous sentence ... you said the following:

> They say that the 35 question
> Tech test is adequate indication of qualification to design, build, test,
> align, repair and operate amateur transmitters up to 1500 watt output on
all
> authorized amateur frequencies and modes above 30 MHz.

I disagree with that part ... and have stated so on many occasions.
As an RF engineer by profession, I do not personally believe that the
current Tech written tests are adequate to justify authorizing the use of
1500W output transmitters, with unlimited antenna gain, at frequencies
that are commonly used to cook food and frequencies with similar
potential dangers at adequate field strengths.

>As part of the
> restructuring that reduced all code testing to a single 5 wpm test, FCC
also
> reduced the written testing for the Tech from two separate tests totalling
65
> questions to the current single 35 question test.

When I got my Tech license, the written was the same as the General.
The current test has fewer questions than the parts before it, in
recognition
that the Tech was intended to be an entry level license.

Nobody ever bitched that the old Novice test was "too easy" ... everyone
knew that its purpose was to get folks on the air so they could learn more
and get socialized a bit ...

Again, I don't think the current Tech test is adequate to convey full power privs, but I do think it's OK for an entry level license. The fix would be to try to get the FCC to reduce the power limit for techs to something more reasonable (I would suspect that the VAST majority of techs don't run legal limit, but rather 25-50W or less, with a few having "bricks" cable of around 100W ...)

> Therefore, by your own logic, the current 35 question Tech test is adequate to
> insure that those who pass it have adequate technical knowledge to:
>
> - avoid interference to other services
> - avoid getting killed when they do stupid things with their fingers inside a
> radio
> - avoid exposing their your family/neighbors/passersby to RF radiation above
> the established limits
> - etc., etc.
>
> The FCC *is* the expert agency, right? And despite lots of comments about how
> to "improve" the written tests, FCC decided that the current written testing
> for Tech is adequate for the privileges.

I have elaborated my view that the tech test is inadequate for 1500W, but that otherwise it's OK.

> So if the Tech test is adequate for all of VHF/UHF, why is there so much more
> written testing for HF/MF? Surely there needs to be a little more testing for
> the additional rules and regs (band edges, modes, etc.), but why all that
> additional theory stuff on the General and Extra written? Is a QRP transmitter
> for 21.020 MHz that much different than a 1500 W transmitter for 432.020 MHz
> that two more written tests are required to use the QRP rig?

Setting aside the question of actual danger (electrical and RF) that can be involved
in high power transmitters (and particularly at frequencies that cook meat), there
is still a difference ... HF normally propagates internationally far more readily and
commonly than VHF/UHF ... and a higher percentage of HF folks run "legal limit"
(and then some) than do VHF/UHF folks. Thus the potential for interference is
more limited at VHF/UHF, and tends to be more under control of one administration.

This makes it easier for regulatory agencies to be a bit more lenient and
generous
with VHF/UHF privs than with HF privs.

> Or is it that FCC wants hams to "jump through the hoop" of taking more
written
> tests in order to get more HF privileges?

At least those "hoops" are based on a demonstration of RELEVANT and
important qualifications, rather than one's ability to practice an arcane
method of communications that is more "art form" and "cult religion" than
"necessary" in any reasonable way.
>> >> WHOA - I lost ya there.
> >>
> >> "we acknowledge that there is a minority that feels that way"
> >>
> >> Feels what way? That code testing should go, or should stay?
> >Sorry ... I was talking about the minority that still favors forcing
Morse
> >tests on everyone for access to HF ...
>
> Sorry - the minority is those who would remove all code testing.
> >
> >I believe a reasonable analysis would show that the demographics of ham
> >radio
> >in terms of the issue have changed dramatically over the past couple of
> >years.
>
> Have you done such a study?
>
> The reduction of code testing in 2000 has not resulted in large numbers of
new
> hams. The number of US hams has grown by only about 10,000 in all that
time.
> And we have not seen significant technical changes brought about by the
new
> regs.

Prior to the changes, we were slowly losing ground and few were upgrading.

The FCC has not enacted changes in the technical rules that would promote
more advancement ... what we can do is still rather constrained to favor the
use of "legacy" technology at the expense of innovation.

> The biggest change brought about by the 2000 restructuring has been large
> numbers of upgrades by already-licensed hams. That's a good thing, btw.

What it demonstrates that reducing the code requirement allowed 10s of
thousands of otherwise qualified individuals to upgrade ... the in itself
clearly
proves that 13 and 20 wpm Morse tests were an unnecessary and artificial
barrier to entry into the higher classes of license and the additional privs

that
they convey.

> >If I had a buck for every e-mail I've received thanking me for NCI's
> >work, I could HIRE someone to install the towers I plan to put up
> >in the spring, rather than doing the work myself ...
>
> How many? There are about 685,000 US hams - how many of them are NCI
members?

LOTS :-)

> How many have emailed you?

LOTS :-)

> I hope the towers help with your SSB DXCC.

I log on the computer, but chasing DXCC (on any mode, or all) is certainly
not a burning interest ... I wish you would accept me at my word on that and
stop harping on it as if my operating on HF is somehow "wrong."

> I think we both agree that good antennas are preferable to raw power.

Clearly ... and don't get the ideas that all of the antennas will be for HF
...
there will be plenty for VHF/UHF/SHF as well ... I plan to be fully equipped
for all of the satellites and for high speed terrestrial digital networking
when
I am "done" with the antenna farm (I guess if you have enough room, an
antenna
farm is never really done :-)

>Check out K8MN's webpage - he has some nice ones.

Are these commercial kits to buy, or plans to build your own?
The latter is preferable ... do you have the URL handy?

73,
Carl - wk3c

964. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 16:21:18 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030125112118.16054.00000379@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 59995

>Yup. Lookit 160 meters - major ham band before WW2, all but lost to LORAN
>afterwards, then slowly regained. Now LORAN is no longer there, but hams are.
>Many of them are using CW. BWAAHAAAHAAAA!!!!!
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Its really the only real Ham Band left, most No-Coders and CBplussers, will never operate there, why, because most are to Dump to make a Antenna work. Was on 160 last night. Somebody needs to tell all those CW operators that there using a mode thats outdated, and someone forgot to tell them no one uses CW anymore. The band was full of CW

965. Re: Why Dave has such a p*ss poor attitude

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 16:33:56 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <U%yY9.653$N5.480292@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 59997

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3E31EFB4.5B96876@earthlink.net...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3E31A3A6.B874E842@earthlink.net...
> > > Don't you ever tire of sticking your foot in your mouth? You can
start
> > > with:
> >
> > URLs deleted ...
> >
> > Dave, you really got stuck with some s**t assignments, didn't you?
> >
> > Maybe that's why your attitude is so lousy ... you seem to have
> > spent your entire career in backwater places of little importance
> > and with none of the "glamor and excitement" of more "significant"
> > postings ...
>
> Perhaps you, like Len, consider Finland a third world posting.

Not at all ... Helsinki is a LOVELY city ... and I've enjoyed my
visits there very much.

>Helsinki was my first posting. I didn't bid on the assignment, I was
sent
> there.

OK, so you got lucky and got a good first assignment. Fair enough.

> I liked it well enough to bid on it again and was reassigned
> there in the nineties for three years. Except for that third
> assignment, I bid on all of the others.

OK, so your standards went down significantly with time ... what
happened?

Did you PO somebody powerful and limit your career options? Or
do you just LIKE backwater places because it's easier to be lazy
and inept in such places?

> Mark it down as just another thing you don't understand. Have you
> figured out what explains your behavior?

Yes ... assuming that you're refering to my behavior towards you,
it's simple ... "Pompus, narrow-minded jerks irritate me>"

> How's the "experimentation" with chasing DX on SSB coming along?

Another fiction of your warped mind, Dave ... I will work DX if I come across it, but I am not "chasing DX" in the sense of having a compulsion to collect wallpaper ... or, worse yet, participate in contests.

And, I have been so busy with important work work and 3 weeks of vacation with my wife's family in Mexico that I haven't even been on HF since Dec. 14th ...

As far as my "experimentation" goes, I'm in the design and simulation phase, but work obligations have limited the amount of time I've been able to devote ... but don't worry yourself... I seriously doubt that you are
technically competent to actually understand it anyway ...

Carl - wk3c

966. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 17:11:03 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030125121103.13482.00000330@mb-fe.aol.com>
Source record: 59998

>Not knowing (fill in some technical thing here) could also result in the ham
>having no clue that his radio was malfunctioning and creating interference
>(let alone how to fix it ...)

Which is the present state of new HAMS

>Yes, but if you are so technically ignorant (as you seem to be
>advocating, at least as devil's advocate in an effort to prop up
>the "equal legitimacy" of Morse testing) that you can't understand
>those rules and apply them, having memorized them is useless.
>

Which is the present STATUS with the writtens now

> in return, we owe an obligation to demonstrate at least a
>minimum level of technical understanding and competence.
>

Which the present written does not do

>what WE were talking about
>is whether NCI would force its views on everyone,

And thats exactly what you are doing

>I have elaborated my view that the tech test is inadequate for 1500W, but
>that otherwise it's OK.
>

The Written is a give away just like the CW test

>what we can do is still rather constrained to favor the
>use of "legacy" technology at the expense of innovation.

Oh thats right, and you were the one that was going to bring all this great new
Techno stuff to HF once the FCC gave you a free hand out, wheres the Stuff?

>What it demonstrates that reducing the code requirement allowed 10s of
>thousands of otherwise qualified individuals to upgrade ... the in itself
>clearly
>proves that 13 and 20 wpm Morse tests were an unnecessary and artificial
>barrier to entry into the higher classes of license and the additional privs
>that
>they convey.

NO, what it proves is a Bunch of Free loaders, who were either to Dumb or to
Lazy to upgrade, were given there FREE HANDOUTS

>Clearly ... and don't get the ideas that all of the antennas will be for HF

Im sure of that, at least 1 will be for CB and the other for 2 Meter CB.

967. Re: Why Dave has such a p*ss poor attitude

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 17:43:10 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E32CCE6.D8842848@earthlink.net>
Source record: 59999

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3E31EFB4.5B96876@earthlink.net...
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3E31A3A6.B874E842@earthlink.net...
> > > > Don't you ever tire of sticking your foot in your mouth? You can
> start
> > > > with:
> > >
> > > URLs deleted ...
> > >
> > > Dave, you really got stuck with some s**t assignments, didn't you?
> > >
> > > Maybe that's why your attitude is so lousy ... you seem to have
> > > spent your entire career in backwater places of little importance
> > > and with none of the "glamor and excitement" of more "significant"
> > > postings ...
> >
> > Perhaps you, like Len, consider Finland a third world posting.
>
> Not at all ... Helsinki is a LOVELY city ... and I've enjoyed my
> visits there very much.
>
> >Helsinki was my first posting. I didn't bid on the assignment, I was
> sent
> > there.
>
> OK, so you got lucky and got a good first assignment. Fair enough.
>
> > I liked it well enough to bid on it again and was reassigned
> > there in the nineties for three years. Except for that third
> > assignment, I bid on all of the others.
>
> OK, so your standards went down significantly with time ... what
> happened?
>
> Did you PO somebody powerful and limit your career options? Or
> do you just LIKE backwater places because it's easier to be lazy
> and inept in such places?

Your questions were answered in the parts you snipped. Reading may not
be your strong suit. You still don't understand the assignments process
for the Foreign Service, huh?

> > Mark it down as just another thing you don't understand. Have you
> > figured out what explains your behavior?
>
> Yes ... assuming that you're refering to my behavior towards you,
> it's simple ... "Pompus, narrow-minded jerks irritate me>"

I love it. Someone who can't spell "pompous" quotes himself. I assume
that your view assumes that anyone who doesn't buy into your grand
scheme is pompous and narrow-minded. You've not just used that method
with me.

> > How's the "experimentation" with chasing DX on SSB coming along?
>
> Another fiction of your warped mind, Dave ... I will work DX if I come
> across it, but I am not "chasing DX" in the sense of having a compulsion
> to collect wallpaper ... or, worse yet, participate in contests.

Oh, excuse me. In one of your past incarnations here you were regaling
us with tales of your DXploits on SSB.

> And, I have been so busy with important work work and 3 weeks
> of vacation with my wife's family in Mexico that I haven't even been
> on HF since Dec. 14th ...

I'm sure you are doing very important work. How could they spare you
from the important work for three weeks in Mexico?

> As far as my "experimentation" goes, I'm in the design and simulation
> phase, but work obligations have limited the amount of time I've been
> able to devote ... but don't worry yourself... I seriously doubt that you
> are
> technically competent to actually understand it anyway ...

Pompous, narrow-minded jerks irritate me. Did I mention your arrogance?

Dave K8MN

968. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 17:50:22 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E32CE94.1407BB76@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60000

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> At least those "hoops" are based on a demonstration of RELEVANT and
> important qualifications, rather than one's ability to practice an arcane
> method of communications that is more "art form" and "cult religion" than
> "necessary" in any reasonable way.

Ahhh, the arrogant old Carl is back.

> What it demonstrates that reducing the code requirement allowed 10s of
> thousands of otherwise qualified individuals to upgrade ... the in itself
> clearly
> proves that 13 and 20 wpm Morse tests were an unnecessary and artificial
> barrier to entry into the higher classes of license and the additional privs
> that
> they convey.

I love that "otherwise qualifed" phrase, Carl. Except for the part
about med school, I'm otherwise qualified to do heart surgery. The only
thing holding me back is that I'm not going to jump through their hoops.

Dave K8MN

969. Re: ONLY 8 HOURS UNTIL THE LIBERTY NET!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 19:14:35 UTC
From: tinkle balls <waawatersd@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <3e32e218@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 60052
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

"Nobody You Know" <ycthulhu@aol.complex> wrote in message
news:20030125140134.07415.00000240@mb-mg.aol.com...
> Get that radio ready. The Net can usually be found somewhere between 3947
and
> 3980 khz (LSB). Just look for the malicious jamming, you can't miss it.

Should be even more fun as NX0T is back on the air
again and showed up last week to crash k5blb's
"frequency panty raid" on 3.947 Haven't laughed
that much since the old days of 14.313 and MUJ's
drunken rantings. I hope that KJI shows
up as him and NX used to go at it like alley
cats in heat on the air which was so darn funny
my sides would ache from laughter

970. Re: ONLY 8 HOURS UNTIL THE LIBERTY NET! (part II)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 19:26:18 UTC
From: tinkle balls <waawatersd@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <3e32e4d4@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 60053
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

Links to radio programs where the Liberty Net
participants get all of their "information". This is a
list of kook USA domestic shortwave programs with
a political or religious flavor which have been the
traditional sources of "pay-triot" gossip. While your
waiting for the Liberty Net, if your looking for premium
unleaded 93 octane paranoia, check out
the info to the SW programs shown on these links:

http://www.cybercoffee.org/radio/sw_mon_weekday.html

http://www.cybercoffee.org/radio/radio.html

http://www.assaultweb.net/cgi-bin/ultimatebb.cgi?ubb=forum;f=42

http://www-2.cs.cmu.edu/afs/cs.cmu.edu/user/jeffrey/www/loons/

971. Re: This Is How KB1HMW "Supports" Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 19:33:01 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030125143301.29207.00000228@mb-cf.aol.com>
Source record: 60055

In article <f45722ac.0301241552.4441642a@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

<on a reply to someone else...>

>Of course, I never wore an Air Medal again, don't even have one in my
>"collection." The only things in my "collection" are the awards I
>earned. Someday when you go SK, someone is likely to see those wings
>in your collection and try to bury you in Arlington. Wonder if you've
>got a Medal of Honor in there. If you're not already making up tales
>of bravery now.

He is. Rather constantly. It's the "corps mystique" at work! :-)

Remember the wandering-out-loud about a "HALO Insertion?"
[High Altitude jump Low Opening]

Must be the testosterone supplements or something... :-)

972. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 19:33:02 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030125143302.29207.00000229@mb-cf.aol.com>
Source record: 60059

In article <ucjY9.1321$U27.120985@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
<kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG> writes:

>"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
>news:cuvyxnansvbet.h98exek.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
>: On 24 Jan 2003 20:24:29 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:
>:
>: > For an audio-visual aid, see Otto Preminger's performance
>: > in the motion picture "Stalag 17."
>:
>: Otto Preminger was a movie producer. Were you thinking of Werner
>: Klemperer, who was also a symphonic orchestral conductor as was his
>: father, Otto...??
>
>Lennie is correct. In "Stalag 17", starring Bill Holden and produced by
>Billy Wilder, Otto Preminger played the part of Oberst Von Scherbach.

Thank you, Hans. Preminger was a pretty good actor though
somewhat typecast. Maybe it was the accent? :-)

>You have it mixed up with Stalag 13, the home of Oberst Klink, Sgt Schultz,
>Colonel Hogan, et. al.

Don't forget the "secret radio" concealed in something in "Hogan's
Heroes." It worked every time. Must have been CW mode... :-)

Phil is getting touchy in here. Bad billings? He may start up the
"mistake" in "Magnificent Seven" about the "telephone wires" in
a couple scenes...at the railhead in the 1880s, widely-spaced
and NOT telephone but rather telegraph (then 40 years in service).

None of this is about "internet linking," is it? Heh heh heh.

973. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 19:33:03 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030125143303.29207.00000230@mb-cf.aol.com>
Source record: 60056

In article <20030124190325.27873.00000173@mb-mj.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>What I'm talking about is why SOME (not all) folks dislike the code test so
>much. Particularly folks for whom the written test presents no challenge at
>all.

Then take that up with the VEC QPC. The FCC doesn't require
any specific-topic written question subjects anymore.

>Some (not all!) just don't like the idea of having to learn a skill
>specifically for the ham license - particularly since that skill usually
>cannot
>be learned in bits and pieces by reading a book or watching a video.

Neither can Hula-Hoop twirling...but all Must Jump in HF hamming.

>Why is it "jumping through hoops" to learn Morse at 5 wpm (even if someone
>never intends to use the mode), but not "jumping through hoops" to learn all
>the theory and regs necessary to pass the written exams (even though someone
>never intends to use 99% of the privileges allowed by the license)? Seems
>like a double standard.

Okay, mighty morseman Miccolis, present your "plan" on the
"proper testing" to the FCC and VEC QPC. Get going. Time's
a wasting for the future...

While you are at it, think about all the Modes not yet devised
that may be used in that future of US ham radio. You are a
Big Shot in amateur radio, let's hear what they are going to be.

>Since the FCC has determined that the 35 question Tech test is adequate to
>allow Techs to use all authorized amateur bands and modes above 30 MHz, and
>to design/build/adjust/repair/align and operate equipment for those bands and
>modes without further certification, aren't the higher class theory questions
>really a form of "hoop jumping"?

Ah, mighty morseman Miccolis wants a NO-THEORY test!

Not a problem. Just propose that to the FCC along with
Type Acceptance of all transmitting equipments and
enforce it.

>Why is a new Tech allowed to design/build/adjust/repair/align and operate a
>1500 W transmitter on 50.020 CW, (or any other authorized band/mode above 50
>MHz), but if said Tech wants to use a 1.5 watt transmitter on 3.520 MHz CW,
>he/she must take two more written tests totalling 85 questions?

Ooooo! Becoming annoyed? You ask all these questions and don't propose any answers. Is this some kind of "quiz?" :-)

Try THINKING about it instead of visceral-emotional reaction to the Old Rules. The FCC doesn't really care about "knowing any morse" for interference mitigation. This isn't 1934 and hardly any other civil radio service USES morse for any purpose... except the automatic ID transmissions in some radio services.

Lead to any preliminary conclusions? It should. Morse skills just aren't important to licensing in US amateur radio...except to satisfy some ossified minds demanding adherence to old rules of yester-year.

974. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 19:33:03 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030125143303.29207.00000231@mb-cf.aol.com>
Source record: 60058

In article <20030124190326.27873.00000174@mb-mj.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>Feels what way? That code testing should go, or should stay? It's really not
>clear what's being said. Who is the minority being discussed?
>
>Note that when the comments to 98-143 were categorized and tabulated (by an
>NCI
>staffer, btw), the majority of those who commented not only wanted code
>testing
>to continue, but wanted at least two code test speeds. But FCC agreed with
>the
>minority opinion.

Ooooo! "Minority opinion!" Ooooo!

ARRL membership is LESS than a quarter of all licensed US radio amateurs. A far-smaller Minority than the commenters on NPRM 98-143...yet the FCC has agreed, in the past, with ARRL dictates.

Quod Erat Demonstrandum.

975. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 19:33:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030125143304.29207.00000233@mb-cf.aol.com>
Source record: 60054

In article <b0sfddaga1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>> Bill, doesn't it really boil down to the PCTA's whining of
>> "everyone has to do it like I did it?" They all come across
>> that way.
>>
>> Call the PCTA statements like they are: Rationalization City.
>
>Makes no difference to me or NCI what they are called. The only
>thing that counts is that not one of the arguments, statements
>and/or rationalizations has convinced the FCC of any need to
>retain code testing...other than to stay compliant for now with the
>current ITU treaty.

Quite so, Bill. I agree with you. Problem lies with the PCTAs'
inability to progress with the times and accept reality.

976. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 19:33:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030125143304.29207.00000232@mb-cf.aol.com>
Source record: 60057

In article <b0sg4euis1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>While some in the PCTA group might wish that is so, the
>reality is that we have that right and we have excersized
>that right without being silenced by anyone.
>
>The war of ideas and opinions on morse testing is over
>and the only thing standing in the way of a total demise of
>morse testing is the treaty. That's why I don't bother
>engaging in the arguments anymore.

The last PCTA will have his code key removed from his
cold, dead fingers a long time from now...and probable
be frowning mightily that "youngsters never had to take
any test HE had to take." :-)

>> Mighty morsemen are superior in all respects and they expect
>> respect in all things.
>
>They can believe whatever they want...its a free country.

Every place in this country except in amateur radio newsgroups!

Every time an NCTA opinion pops up, that NCTA commenter
is immediately castigated in an ugly little set of personal
attacks. So much for "free country."

>> To them the morse test MUST STAY! It is a divine thing, never
>> to be removed (heresy)!
>
>Opinions of such have failed the test of time and analysis by
>the FCC.

I know that. You know that. The mighty morsemen do not.

>> All must do as the mighty morsemen did. Period.
>
>The end of that era is not far off.

Roughly four decades away as I estimate it. Eric June may
be one of the last of the PCTAs to go. :-)

977. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 19:33:05 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030125143305.29207.00000235@mb-cf.aol.com>
Source record: 60060

In article <3E31A3A6.B874E842@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Oh, and if you are worrying about my being an ugly American towards you,
>kindly furnish information as to your nationality. If you are other
>than a United States citizen, I'll provide a personal apologize
>promptly.

Ah, a new twist on the "Ugly American!" Ugly Americans only
insult and demean other Americans? :-)

As to "proof" of my citizenship, feel free to contact the County
Clerk of Winnebago County, Illinois. Or the FBI. Or the IRS.
Or the California Franchise Tax Board. Or the National
Records Administration database. Or the FCC ECFS. Use
whatever "contacts" you have, "old buddies from the 'foreign
service'" or whatever. PROVE I'm not a USA citizen.

Go for it, Herr Robust. Snarl your wurst. :-)

978. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 19:33:05 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030125143305.29207.00000234@mb-cf.aol.com>
Source record: 60061

In article <FxhY9.618$cJ6.312@nwrddc02.gnilink.net>, "Bert Craig"
<wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> writes:

>Seems to me that the "hard"est part was actually deciding to get one's butt
>in gear and then sit down and just do it. Fifteen minutes to a half-an-hour
>daily for as long as it takes hardly constitutes "working hard (jumping
>through hoops)" to me.

Gosh, Bert. Don't let me disturb your "whelming" here. :-)

Does the collective US ARS "judge" on all that "work?"

Isn't "work" something that is done for pecuniary reasons?
Federal law defines US amateur radio as WITHOUT
pecuniary reasons. True!

>> US amateur radio is an AVOCATION, not an occupation.
>
>I'm thoroughly underwhelmed.

...but, everyone has to WORK to please the already-licensed,
right? Work, work, work. A four-letter word. :-)

Please accept my apologies on disturbance of your whelms.

979. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 19:41:28 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030125144128.15849.00000494@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 60062

>Ah, mighty morseman Miccolis wants a NO-THEORY test!

Thats what we have now.

980. Re: ONLY 8 HOURS UNTIL THE LIBERTY NET! (part II.a)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 19:44:27 UTC
From: tinkle balls <waawatersd@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <3e32e910@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 60063
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

One more link we forgot: http://w4.lns.cornell.edu/~riehle/crank.html

(Links to: The Institute for Neo-Creationism, Philadelphia Experiment, Eternal Life
Devices, Dipole Anti-Gravity, Bob Larson Ministries.....it's all there folks!)

More links to kooks than you'll ever need in a lifetime - a veritable circuis side-show cornocopia exhaustive concordance of all things black helocopter-ish

"The tenets of skepticism do not require an advanced degree, as most successful used-car buyers demonstrate. The whole idea of a democratic application of skepticism is that everyone should have the essential tools to effectively and constructively evaluate claims to knowledge. All science asks is to employ the same levels of skepticism we use in buying a used car or in judging the quality of analgesics or beer from their TV commercials."

- Carl Sagan

981. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 20:40:45 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030125154045.08273.00000137@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 60064

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>>WHY? Just to serve your interests? If you want a new specialty club,
>>then start one yourself.

There is some interest in the technical aspects. I did attempt to start one.
Two people showed up. However, other obligations piled up and I had to put the
club on hold for now.

>>> >Are you willing to do the work necessary to effect changes?
>>>
>>> Yes.
>>
>>Not based on anything I've seen from you here.

I attempted to start the club. This shows I am willing to put the effort in.

>>> I have put in suggestions, but no interest in the club. I would volunteer
>>> if there were interest.
>>
>>Translation: IF someone else does all the formative work, then
>>maybe I'll join and help.

No, I would lead any such projects if there were any interest. Problem is, I
making my pitches to Hams at clubs, so I'm making my pitch to those that are
probably not interested.

982. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 20:43:10 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030125154310.05578.00000231@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 60065

>Subject: Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 1/25/03 1:33 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030125143304.29207.00000233@mb-cf.aol.com>

>Quite so, Bill. I agree with you. Problem lies with the PCTAs'
> inability to progress with the times and accept reality.

Let's see....Larry is active with many digital modes as attested to here by third parties. Hans has been very much "pro code" without being "pro test". I am busy with datalink programs for aerial repeaters and am tinkering with EchoLink. Jim Miccolis and others have expressed similar participation in other-than-CW modes and practices.

Hmmmmmm....Then we have an UN-licensed, antagonistic ex radio technician who ACCUSES others, especially those who support code use, with not progressing or accepting reality. Of course this is the SAME unlicensed antagonist whose only claim to ANY radio operation was in a rear area Army relay station in the 1950s, who's membership in he uses to embellish his own military service based on the combat deaths suffered by that unit three years prior to his joining same...

What a creep.

Yes, Lennie...that would be YOU.

Putz..

983. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 20:46:25 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030125154625.05578.00000232@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 60066

>Subject: Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 1/25/03 1:33 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030125143302.29207.00000229@mb-cf.aol.com>

>Thank you, Hans. Preminger was a pretty good actor though
> somewhat typecast. Maybe it was the accent?

Good actor? He was more "ham" than anyone in this NG with an Amateur
Radio license. He was a great director, but his acting skills were strcitly
junior high school drama class.

>None of this is about "internet linking," is it? Heh heh heh.

Since when was "on topic" one of your known attributes?

984. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 20:47:46 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030125154746.05578.00000233@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 60067

>Subject: Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 1/25/03 1:33 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030125143304.29207.00000232@mb-cf.aol.com>

>The last PCTA will have his code key removed from his
> cold, dead fingers a long time from now...and probable
> be frowning mightily that "youngsters never had to take
> any test HE had to take."

At least we will have taken "A" test. No "SK" listing for Lennie the Liar.

985. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 20:53:44 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030125155344.04873.00000124@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 60068

In article <b0udsq$6ol$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>The facts are that all regulations and requirements MUST
>be justified. The court of public opinion and technical
>need as determined by the FCC has negated any reasons
>to retain code testing. That's all that needs be said.
>
>To RETAIN morse testing, the burden of proof falls on
>those that WANT a test. It's that simple.

Well said, Bill!
>
IOW, unless a compelling reason can be shown why a law must exist, that law must be repealed. FCC says that, in their opinion, the only compelling reason for code testing is S25.5.

And it's FCC's opinion what makes da rules!

You don't need to know how to drive stick to get an automobile driver's license here in PA. Nor in any other state I know of. Those who want to drive stick shifts are free to do so. And there are plenty of manual-shift cars on the road today, decades after automatic transmissions were perfected.

73 de Jim, N2EY

986. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 20:53:47 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030125155347.04873.00000125@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 60069

In article <kNyY9.652$N5.478853@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>> >> >The logic fails, Dave ... supporting the view that Morse testing
>should
>> >> >be forced on all, like it or not, is NOT supporting freedom of choice.
>> >>
>> >> Apply that logic to forcing written testing beyond the basics of rules
>&
>> >> regs on all.....
>> >
>> >Not the same ...
>>
>> It's exactly the same. Note that I wrote:
>>
>> "written testing beyond the basics of rules & regs on all....."
>
>Anything "beyond the basics of rules & regs" sounds like
>the technical parts of the written test to me ... isn't that what
>you were referring to???

Not all of it. For example, in order to understand the regs that define the 40
meter band as being from 7.000 to 7.300 MHz, you have to understand what a MHz
is, so technical questions on MHz are needed to insure that the regs are
understood.

But the written exams go far beyond that level.
>
>> >not knowing how to copy Morse by ear (all that's
>> >tested for) harms nobody ...
>>
>> Perhaps. See below:
>>
>> >not knowing some of the technical
>> >aspects can:
>> >
>> >result in interference to other services
>>
>> How? The rules and regs cover things like allowed frequencies and modes.
>> How
>> can ignorance of things like how a DDS synthesizer works result in
>> interference
>> with other services?
>
>Not knowing how a DDS works could result in programming it incorrectly,

>causing out of band emissions.

But there is no requirement that hams use DDS, let alone program them. The test does not guarantee that any ham knows how to program a DDS, either.

So the test questions on DDS do nothing to prevent interference to other services. They are in the "hoop" category.
>
>Not knowing (fill in some technical thing here) could also result in the ham
>having no clue that his radio was malfunctioning and creating interference
>(let alone how to fix it ...)

Possibly. But there is no requirement that any ham use a particular technology, let alone a particular rig. The tests provide no assurance whatsoever that any particular ham knows how his/her rig actually works, or when it is not working right.

Even at your level of technical knowledge, can you guarantee that there is no possible malfunction of your ham gear that would go undetected by you?
>
End result is that many if not most of the technical questions fall into the "hoop" category.

>> >get you killed when you do stupid things with
>> >your fingers inside a radio
>> >
>> So? There is no license or test required to work on your own house wiring
>or
>> home appliances, any of which can easily get you killed. Nor is there any
>> license required to work on your own vehicle, even though improperly doing
>such
>> work can endanger yourself and others.
>
>In some states mechanics are licensed ... which shows the recognition of
>the danger ... electricians are pretty universally licensed, as are
>plumbers,
>and other craftsmen whose work could, if poorly done, endanger the public.

But ONLY if those people do work on others' properties. And such licensing is far from universal.

The fact remains that in the vast majority of cases a person does not need a license of any kind to work on his/her own house or car, even though the work may cause a possible hazard to oneself.

In short, licenses do not exist to protect people from their own stupidity.
>
>> >expose your family/neighbors/passersby to RF
>> >radiation above the established limits
>>
>> Said limits are part of the rules & regs, and covered as above.
>
>Yes, but if you are so technically ignorant (as you seem to be

>advocating, at least as devil's advocate in an effort to prop up
>the "equal legitimacy" of Morse testing) that you can't understand
>those rules and apply them, having memorized them is useless.

See above.
>
>> >etc., etc.
>> >
>> What "etc., etc."? Why is a Morse test "hoop jumping", but not the
>> writtens beyond the Tech?
>
>Because of what we're allowed to do in terms of repairing, modifying,
>adjusting, tinkering with, and even building our own equipment.

FCC disagrees. They say the Tech written is adequate for doing all of those
things to VHF/UHF/microwave ham gear. Is HF/MF ham gear somehow more dangerous
or complex than VHF/UHF ham gear?

>We
>are the only radio service (other than the Experimental Radio Service
>under Part 5, which is limited to very specific uses) that allows such
>flexibility ... in return, we owe an obligation to demonstrate at least a
>minimum level of technical understanding and competence.

Which the Technician test does - according to the FCC. Except for the
HF/MF-specific parts, the rest of the General and Extra writtens falls into the
"hoop" category - by your definition.
>
>> >> >I recognize that those who want to keep Morse testing have a right to
>> >> >hold that opinion ... but they don't have the right to force it on
>> >> >everyone
>> >> >else.
>> >> >NCI doesn't try to force its view on anyone ... nobody twists
>> >> >anyone's
>> >> >arm to join NCI, and members are not held captive, as the previous
>> >exchange
>> >> >demonstrates.
>> >>
>> >> If NCI's opinion holds sway with the FCC, then that opinion is forced
>on
>> >> everyone. Simple logic.
>> >
>> >The FCC makes the decisions on what best serves the public interest,
>> >convenience, and necessity ... as the expert agency charged with managing
>> >the non-federal-govt. use of the radio spectrum that belongs to all of
>us,
>> >if they agree with NCI's logical, factual, well-reasoned arguments, we
>are
>> >gratified :-)
>>
>> And they force that opinion on everyone.

>
>Clearly the FCC's rules apply to everyone ... what WE were talking about
>is whether NCI would force its views on everyone, as would many PCTAs.

How could anyone "force" their views on anyone else, other than to have those
views enacted into the rules? FCC does the forcing.
>
>> And consider this:
>>
>> The FCC is the expert agency charged with managing the non-federal-govt.
>>use of
>> the radio spectrum that belongs to all of us.
>
>I said previous sentence ... you said the following:
>
>> They say that the 35 question
>> Tech test is adequate indication of qualification to design, build, test,
>> align, repair and operate amateur transmitters up to 1500 watt output on
>> all
>> authorized amateur frequencies and modes above 30 MHz.
>
>I disagree with that part ... and have stated so on many occasions.

So the FCC is WRONG? But they are "the expert agency charged with managing the
non-federal-govt. use of the radio spectrum that belongs to all of us."!!!

>As an RF engineer by profession, I do not personally believe that the
>current Tech written tests are adequate to justify authorizing the use of
>1500W output transmitters, with unlimited antenna gain, at frequencies
>that are commonly used to cook food and frequencies with similar
>potential dangers at adequate field strengths.

FCC disagrees with you.

And that still leaves many other sunjects in the "hoop" category. Thevenin
equivalents, complex impedance calculations - how does knowing them at the
level required by the tests increase RF safety?
>
>>As part of the
>> restructuring that reduced all code testing to a single 5 wpm test, FCC
>> also
>> reduced the written testing for the Tech from two separate tests totalling
>>65
>> questions to the current single 35 question test.
>
>When I got my Tech license, the written was the same as the General.

Yeah, me too, 1968, Philly FCC office. I was 14.

>The current test has fewer questions than the parts before it, in
>recognition
>that the Tech was intended to be an entry level license.

Doesn't answer the question.
>
>Nobody ever bitched that the old Novice test was "too easy" ...

YES, they DID. They were wrong, btw.

> everyone
>knew that its purpose was to get folks on the air so they could learn more
>and get socialized a bit ...
>
And to that end, it offered extremely limited privileges (75 w input, xtal
control, tiny bits of a few bands, only a few modes). It was also originally
limited to a one-year one-shot term.

>Again, I don't think the current Tech test is adequate to convey full power
>privs, but I do think it's OK for an entry level license. The fix would be
>to try to get the FCC to reduce the power limit for techs to something more
>reasonable (I would suspect that the VAST majority of techs don't run
>legal limit, but rather 25-50W or less, with a few having "bricks" cable
>of around 100W ...)

FCC disagrees, though.
>
>> Therefore, by your own logic, the current 35 question Tech test is
>>adequate to
>> insure that those who pass it have adequate technical knowledge to:
>>
>> - avoid interference to other services
>> - avoid getting killed when they do stupid things with their fingers
>>inside a radio
>> - avoid exposing their your family/neighbors/passersby to RF radiation
>above
>> the established limits
>> - etc., etc.
>>
>> The FCC *is* the expert agency, right? And despite lots of comments about
>>how
>> to "improve" the written tests, FCC decided that the current written
>> testing
>> for Tech is adequate for the privileges.
>
>I have elaborated my view that the tech test is inadequate for 1500W, but
>that otherwise it's OK.
>
So all that is needed is to add some RF safety stuff to the Tech, and it's OK,
even by you.

That proves the rest of the writtens contain much "hoop" content.

>> So if the Tech test is adequate for all of VHF/UHF, why is there so much
>>more
>> written testing for HF/MF? Surely there needs to be a little more testing
>>for

>> the additional rules and regs (band edges, modes, etc.), but why all that
>> additional theory stuff on the General and Extra written? Is a QRP
>> transmitter
>> for 21.020 MHz that much different than a 1500 W transmitter for 432.020
>> MHz
>> that two more written tests are required to use the QRP rig?
>
>Setting aside the question of actual danger (electrical and RF) that can be
>involved
>in high power transmitters (and particularly at frequencies that cook meat),
>there
>is still a difference ... HF normally propagates internationally far more
>readily and
>commonly than VHF/UHF ... and a higher percentage of HF folks run "legal
>limit"
>(and then some) than do VHF/UHF folks. Thus the potential for interference
>is
>more limited at VHF/UHF, and tends to be more under control of one
>administration.
>This makes it easier for regulatory agencies to be a bit more lenient and
>generous
>with VHF/UHF privs than with HF privs.

I disagree! Most of the services that involve safety-of-life comms (police, fire, air traffic control, marine VHF, to name just a few) are at VHF/UHF, not HF. The danger of causing serious loss-of-life or property damage today is far greater at VHF-UHF than HF-MF.

>> Or is it that FCC wants hams to "jump through the hoop" of taking more
>> written
>> tests in order to get more HF privileges?
>
>At least those "hoops" are based on a demonstration of RELEVANT and
>important qualifications,

So you agree that they ARE "hoops" and not necessary requirements!

What it really comes down to is that you use phrases like "force", "hazing ritual" and "jumping through hoops" selectively.

You think it's OK to force new hams to take lots of written tests on technical material that is in no way necessary for the safe and legal operation of a modern amateur radio station, yet you find even a 5 wpm code test to be unacceptable.

>rather than one's ability to practice an arcane
>method of communications that is more "art form" and "cult religion" than
>"necessary" in any reasonable way.

More put-downs and loaded phraseology. Why not just say "there's no reason for Morse to have it's own stand-alone pass-fail test anymore?"

If you need a comparison, just use the stick-shift driving analogy.

Try listening to the non-phone parts of the HF ham bands with an adequate receiver, and see how much Morse is actually in use by hams today. Hardly "arcane" or "cult". Hams use that mode by choice, not requirement.

>>> >> WHOA - I lost ya there.
>> >>
>> >> "we acknowledge that there is a minority that feels that way"
>> >>
>> >> Feels what way? That code testing should go, or should stay?
>> >Sorry ... I was talking about the minority that still favors forcing
>Morse
>> >tests on everyone for access to HF ...
>>
>> Sorry - the minority is those who would remove all code testing.
>> >
>> >I believe a reasonable analysis would show that the demographics of ham
>> >radio
>> >in terms of the issue have changed dramatically over the past couple of
>> >years.
>>
>> Have you done such a study?

Well?

I didn't think so.
>>
>> The reduction of code testing in 2000 has not resulted in large numbers of
>>new
>> hams. The number of US hams has grown by only about 10,000 in all that
>>time.
>> And we have not seen significant technical changes brought about by the
>>new regs.
>
>Prior to the changes, we were slowly losing ground and few were upgrading.

Losing ground? Check out AH0A's numbers for the two years prior to restructuring.

Since restructuring, we have only gained about 10,000. That's 1.4% in three years.

Is it really all about the numbers, then?
>
>The FCC has not enacted changes in the technical rules that would promote
>more advancement ...

They dumped many of the SS restrictions. Some of us petitioned for the Novice bands to be reused as developmental subbands instead of just more analog phone space. FCC hasn't ruled on that one yet.

What changes to the rules would YOU have the FCC do? How would such changes "promote more advancement", particularly considering that most US hams today use manufactured gear?

>what we can do is still rather constrained to favor the
>use of "legacy" technology at the expense of innovation.
>
Like what? SSB? It's a legacy from the 80 years ago.

>> The biggest change brought about by the 2000 restructuring has been large
>> numbers of upgrades by already-licensed hams. That's a good thing, btw.

73 de Jim, N2EY

987. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 20:55:42 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030125155542.05578.00000234@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 60070

>Subject: Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 1/25/03 1:33 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030125143303.29207.00000230@mb-cf.aol.com>

>Okay, mighty morseman Miccolis, present your "plan" on the
> "proper testing" to the FCC and VEC QPC. Get going. Time's
> a wasting for the future...

Speaking of which...where was your submission to the FCC to accomodate
GROL/EE holders without further testing?

Had you acted on this five years ago, you might be licensed today
(unlikely, but mopre probable than the way it's going.)

A simple NPRM might have added one more element to FCC testing...A test on
Amateur practices and regulations only...no theory...for anyone presenting a
valid GROL.

It cudda been yours, Lennie...Ya cudda been a hero...Instead, you're still
just a zero.

>While you are at it, think about all the Modes not yet devised
> that may be used in that future of US ham radio. You are a
> Big Shot in amateur radio, let's hear what they are going to be.

Wonder if Marconi could envision all the modes we have today? Who today
can envision them for another 50 years from now?

>>Since the FCC has determined that the 35 question Tech test is adequate to
>>allow Techs to use all authorized amateur bands and modes above 30 MHz, and
>>to design/build/adjust/repair/align and operate equipment for those bands
>and
>>modes without further certification, aren't the higher class theory
>questions
>>really a form of "hoop jumping"?
>
> Ah, mighty morseman Miccolis wants a NO-THEORY test!

How in the Blue Blazes did you come up with a THIS from what Jim
said...?!?!

Sheesh! No one can accuse Lennie the Lame of not having an imagination!

>Lead to any preliminary conclusions? It should. Morse skills
> just aren't important to licensing in US amateur radio...except
> to satisfy some ossified minds demanding adherence to old
> rules of yester-year.

Lennie once again manages to pull Harvey-the-Rabbit out of his hat and somehow get apples from an orange tree.

Simply amazing.

988. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 21:04:23 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030125160423.05578.00000236@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 60071

>Subject: Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 1/25/03 2:40 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030125154045.08273.00000137@mb-cq.aol.com>

>I attempted to start the club. This shows I am willing to put the effort in.

The clubs are not now in existence. Obviously not ENOUGH effort was put
into it, otherwise the "clubs" would be operating now.

>>>Translation: IF someone else does all the formative work, then
>>>maybe I'll join and help.
>
>No, I would lead any such projects if there were any interest. Problem is, I
>making my pitches to Hams at clubs, so I'm making my pitch to those that are
>probably not interested.

Then you need to take your pitch to forums where they would most likely be
favorably received. When I try to recruit for Civil Air Patrol, I don't put
ad's in "Cat Fancy" , nor do I ask to speak to the Ladies Bridge Club. I go
where I know I am most likely to find folks interested in Aviation, SAR or
Disaster Relief.

You are not thinking this through. You struck a match a couple times, and
when the flame blew out, you just quit.

Your bust...Not ours.

Steve, K4YZ

989. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 21:27:12 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030125162712.08273.00000138@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 60072

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>Nope. In fact, I think the written tests are not well-matched to the
privileges
>granted.

The incentive system is backwards, but its too late to change it now.

>Why is a new Tech allowed to design/build/adjust/repair/align and operate a
>1500 W transmitter on 50.020 CW, (or any other authorized band/mode above 50
>MHz), but if said Tech wants to use a 1.5 watt transmitter on 3.520 MHz CW,
>he/she must take two more written tests totalling 85 questions?

The only fair solution now is to eliminate the code test. The important thing
is to have RELAVANCE. Tying the code to the General class forces non-relavance
to the licence class. You seem to agree with this.

>Why did I have to
>learn about UHF/VHF, transistors, SSB, FM, and a variety of other
>things just so I could work Morse on 7010?

Sounds like an only-coder!

I used a computer program that you can type in questions and it will respond
"appropriately". WA8ULX has a limited number of phrases, and his responses are
so predictable. Also, he offers no evidence, just uses one of these phrases.
One must wonder if WA8ULX is just a computer program.

---

990. Re: ONLY 8 HOURS UNTIL THE LIBERTY NET! (part II.a)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 22:23:10 UTC
From: starman <starman@tech.net>
Message-ID: <3E330E4E.20FBD24B@tech.net>
Source record: 60073
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

1/25/03

One of our forefathers (who?) said it's the responsibility of a
democracy to educate it's citizens.
*****

tinkle balls wrote:
>
> One more link we forgot: http://w4.lns.cornell.edu/~riehle/crank.html
>
> (Links to: The Institute for Neo-Creationism, Philadelphia Experiment,
> Eternal Life
> Devices, Dipole Anti-Gravity, Bob Larson Ministries.....it's all there
> folks!)
>
> More links to kooks than you'll ever need in a lifetime - a veritable
> circuis side-show cornocopia exhaustive concordance of all things
> black helocopter-ish
>
> "The tenets of skepticism do not require an advanced degree, as most
> successful used-car buyers demonstrate. The whole idea of a
> democratic application of skepticism is that everyone should have
> the essential tools to effectively and constructively evaluate claims
> to knowledge. All science asks is to employ the same levels of
> skepticism we use in buying a used car or in judging the quality
> of analgesics or beer from their TV commercials."
>
> - Carl Sagan

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

991. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 23:15:12 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301251515.70796e1c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60074

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030125143302.29207.00000229@mb-cf.aol.com>...
> In article <ucjY9.1321$U27.120985@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
> <kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG> writes:
>
> >"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> >news:cuvyxnansvbet.h98exek.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> >: On 24 Jan 2003 20:24:29 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:
> >:
> >: > For an audio-visual aid, see Otto Preminger's performance
> >: > in the motion picture "Stalag 17."
> >:
> >: Otto Preminger was a movie producer. Were you thinking of Werner
> >: Klemperer, who was also a symphonic orchestral conductor as was his
> >: father, Otto...??
> >
> >Lennie is correct. In "Stalag 17", starring Bill Holden and produced by
> >Billy Wilder, Otto Preminger played the part of Oberst Von Scherbach.
>
> Thank you, Hans. Preminger was a pretty good actor though
> somewhat typecast. Maybe it was the accent? :-)
>
> >You have it mixed up with Stalag 13, the home of Oberst Klink, Sgt Schultz,
> >Colonel Hogan, et. al.
>
> Don't forget the "secret radio" concealed in something in "Hogan's
> Heroes." It worked every time. Must have been CW mode... :-)

Percolator

> Phil is getting touchy in here. Bad billings? He may start up the
> "mistake" in "Magnificent Seven" about the "telephone wires" in
> a couple scenes...at the railhead in the 1880s, widely-spaced
> and NOT telephone but rather telegraph (then 40 years in service).
>
> None of this is about "internet linking," is it? Heh heh heh.

992. Re: This Is How KB1HMW "Supports" Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 23:17:38 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301251517.6ef25c74@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60075

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030125143301.29207.00000228@mb-cf.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0301241552.4441642a@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> <on a reply to someone else...>
>
> >Of course, I never wore an Air Medal again, don't even have one in my
> >"collection." The only things in my "collection" are the awards I
> >earned. Someday when you go SK, someone is likely to see those wings
> >in your collection and try to bury you in Arlington. Wonder if you've
> >got a Medal of Honor in there. If you're not already making up tales
> >of bravery now.
>
> He is. Rather constantly. It's the "corps mystique" at work! :-)
>
> Remember the wandering-out-loud about a "HALO Insertion?"
> [High Altitude jump Low Opening]
>
> Must be the testosterone supplements or something... :-)

I see a trend. Wings and Halo's. He must be an angel.

993. Re: Hot Fun In The Summertime With Brian

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-25 23:46:33 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301251546.47ee33fa@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60076

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030125091508.05609.00000198@mb-df.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: This Is How KB1HMW "Supports" Amateur Radio
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 1/24/03 5:52 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0301241552.4441642a@posting.google.com>
>
> >Where did you get that idea?
>
> From your own quotes, Brian. You should try reading them some times. Very
> funny stuff!

Read them? I wrote them.

> Follow this...
>
> First you say:
>
> >Who says it wasn't voluntary??? I didn't say that? And I didn't say
> >I declined further service.
>
> Then only three sentences later:
>
> >It was offered, I declined.

Yes, I declined to go to jump school, yet my service continued. How
can that be if I declined further service? How could I decline if it
were involuntary?

Oh, the possiblities!

Perhaps I served under protest? Yeh, that's it. I got a concentious
ojector status to jump school.

Only your imagination knows.

So, your second pass at it failed. No suprise. At this point I would
say you are a moron.

Would you like to try for moron squared? I think you're capable. Go
for it.

> You are as confused and idiotic as can be, Brain. And it get's more
> hillarious as you try to deny it. Kinda like insisting how "legal" your T5
> operations were, and NOT having any evidence of it.

I don't live in the past.

> >You can have a second try if you wish. Really. I'm up to it.
>
> It doesn't take more than one pass to undermine your rants, Brian. It's
> very simple, really.

No rant here. But you do get awfully wrapped around the axle on
things you have little understanding of - such as words.

> >Got a picture of it
> >somewhere, but I'm just a has-been now and don't live in the past.
>
> Yes, you are, but you DO still try to live in the past, Brian.
>
> >Someday when you go SK, someone is likely to see those wings
> >in your collection and try to bury you in Arlington.
>
> Nope...Anyone who is anyone knows it's what's in your SRB that counts.

So you really are out of luck.

994. Re: ONLY 8 HOURS UNTIL THE LIBERTY NET! (part II)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 00:27:50 UTC
From: RedOctober90@space.com
Message-ID: <9553ed5f.0301251627.2c45cb8a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60077
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

"tinkle balls" <waawatersd@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:<3e32e4d4@snipnews.snip.net>...
> Links to radio programs where the Liberty Net
> participants get all of their "information". This is a
> list of kook USA domestic shortwave programs with
> a political or religious flavor which have been the
> traditional sources of "pay-triot" gossip. While your
> waiting for the Liberty Net, if your looking for premium
> unleaded 93 octane paranoia, check out
> the info to the SW programs shown on these links:
>
> http://www.cybercoffee.org/radio/sw_mon_weekday.html
>
> http://www.cybercoffee.org/radio/radio.html
>
> http://www.assaultweb.net/cgi-bin/ultimatebb.cgi?ubb=forum;f=42
>
> http://www-2.cs.cmu.edu/afs/cs.cmu.edu/user/jeffrey/www/loons/

0 2 4 6 8 10
/
/
/
/
/
/
/
/
TROLL-O-METER

995. Re: Why Dave has such a p*ss poor attitude

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 00:29:17 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030125192917.03463.00000207@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 60079

In article <3E32CCE6.D8842848@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>>
>> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>> news:3E31EFB4.5B96876@earthlink.net...
>> > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>> > >
>> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>> > > news:3E31A3A6.B874E842@earthlink.net...
>> > > > Don't you ever tire of sticking your foot in your mouth? You can
start
>> > > > with:
>> > >
>> > > URLs deleted ...
>> > >
>> > > Dave, you really got stuck with some s**t assignments, didn't you?
>> > >
>> > > Maybe that's why your attitude is so lousy ... you seem to have
>> > > spent your entire career in backwater places of little importance
>> > > and with none of the "glamor and excitement" of more "significant"
>> > > postings ...
>> >
>> > Perhaps you, like Len, consider Finland a third world posting.
>>
>> Not at all ... Helsinki is a LOVELY city ... and I've enjoyed my
>> visits there very much.
>>
>> >Helsinki was my first posting. I didn't bid on the assignment, I was
sent
>> > there.
>>
>> OK, so you got lucky and got a good first assignment. Fair enough.
>>
>> > I liked it well enough to bid on it again and was reassigned
>> > there in the nineties for three years. Except for that third
>> > assignment, I bid on all of the others.
>>
>> OK, so your standards went down significantly with time ... what
>> happened?
>>
>> Did you PO somebody powerful and limit your career options? Or
>> do you just LIKE backwater places because it's easier to be lazy

>> and inept in such places?
>
>Your questions were answered in the parts you snipped. Reading may not
>be your strong suit. You still don't understand the assignments process
>for the Foreign Service, huh?

Tell us more about the Great and Vast communications networks
you managed. I especially liked the elevation of Guinea-Bisseau
to an "important, strategic" location, vital to US interests. Oh, my!

The "using CW (manual keying) as an order-wire to synchronize
schedules of a single-channel RTTY circuit" as an original idea
was masterful in the 1980s. Nobody else had bothered to do that.
Of course, you changed the tune later when pressed on it, saying
it "was State Department protocol/procedures" and thus disavowing
the originality. Didn't make sense some years ago in here and
still doesn't.

If one "can't get through" with modern RTTY equipment and has to
resort to OOK CW to "set schedules," how in the world can any
traffic be passed via TTY when it is required? If "conditions were so
bad," then it should not have been a TTY circuit at all, instead being
an OOK CW circuit.

If there is an RTTY radio circuit, then one uses TTY to send
scheduling information changed from printed information sent to
both ends. That's common sense. That's the way things have
been done since before WW2 on RTTY circuits worldwide by
the rest of the radio world.

>> > Mark it down as just another thing you don't understand. Have you
>> > figured out what explains your behavior?
>>
>> Yes ... assuming that you're refering to my behavior towards you,
>> it's simple ... "Pompus, narrow-minded jerks irritate me>"
>
>I love it. Someone who can't spell "pompous" quotes himself. I assume
>that your view assumes that anyone who doesn't buy into your grand
>scheme is pompous and narrow-minded. You've not just used that method
>with me.

Awwww. Don't like your own kind of commentary coming right back
to you? Tsk, tsk, tsk.

Oh...I forgot. You were in the Foreign Service! Something extra-
super-special...a small group of communicators in a much larger
(much, much larger) radio world...and you were attempting a grande
Snow Job on everyone else and expecting them to buy it.

>> > How's the "experimentation" with chasing DX on SSB coming along?
>>
>> Another fiction of your warped mind, Dave ... I will work DX if I come
>> across it, but I am not "chasing DX" in the sense of having a compulsion

>> to collect wallpaper ... or, worse yet, participate in contests.
>
>Oh, excuse me. In one of your past incarnations here you were regaling
>us with tales of your DXploits on SSB.

Try living in the PRESENT, Mr. FSO. Demands to go back to Google
archives to "prove" some sort of point is very dangerous. All others
can see examples there of hypocrisy, snow jobbing, and other
assorted perfidy you wrote in here. You DON'T want to go there.

Carl lived in Mexico for a time, had a Mexican amateur radio license
and operated with that? That's not "arrogance" or anything else
but a statement of facts. Certainly not "regaling" anyone...such as
the "CW as an order-wire on an RTTY circuit" from Guinea-Bisseau.
Harf! :-)

>> And, I have been so busy with important work work and 3 weeks
>> of vacation with my wife's family in Mexico that I haven't even been
>> on HF since Dec. 14th ...
>
>I'm sure you are doing very important work. How could they spare you
>from the important work for three weeks in Mexico?

So, Mr. FSO of the exhaulted Foreign Service now has a grudge
against those who still work for non-government corporations?!?

You aren't "B.A. Barracus" of any "A Team," Mr. FSO. Quit
trying to imitate that character.

>> As far as my "experimentation" goes, I'm in the design and simulation
>> phase, but work obligations have limited the amount of time I've been
>> able to devote ... but don't worry yourself... I seriously doubt that you
>> are technically competent to actually understand it anyway ...
>
>Pompous, narrow-minded jerks irritate me. Did I mention your arrogance?

Poor baby.

I think that past examples of "radio expertise" have demonstrated the
"competence." I really like the "CW used as an order-wire on RTTY"
claimed from the US embassy at a country whose chief export is
cashew nuts. Says a lot right there. :-)

996. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 00:29:18 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030125192918.03463.00000208@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 60080

In article <d22b54c3.0301250042.a5597ff@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
>news:<GQeY9.689$hP2.55@nwrddc04.gnilink.net>...
>> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>> news:c2356669.0301240927.110b95f5@posting.google.com...
>> > Not a major issue anymore.
>>
>> True.
>
>Not true. All the battalions of nocodes out there who are smugly
>sitting on their dead butts counting the days until S25.5 goes away so
>that they can get free passes to 75 & 20 ssb are gonna be HUGELY
>pissed off if that doesn't happen(Jim: e.g. our beloved ATO). You bet
>S25.5 is still a major issue.

Not quite, senior. ALL of S25 is up for rewrite. You may see exactly how in Items 1.7.1, 1.7.2, 1.7.3 at the WRC page, International Bureau, FCC website. Informal Working Group 6 (IWG-6) has the nitty-gritty of regular meeting minutes...finally...much late in write-up but completed.

Actually, amateur radio matters are a very small item in the totality of what will be discussed at WRC-03. It will be surprising if the WRC manages to get anything discussed on such things.

>It's no longer a major issue in this
>isolated funny farm full of odd units but only because we've
>collectively worn it out and beaten it into the ground.

No again. The PCTAs have been worn out and beaten to the ground. They don't have any valid arguments whatsoever to keep the code test...all they have are many and varied personal insults leveled at NCTAs. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

>> > I'll be surprised if it takes any more
>> > agenda time than the minimum required to propose elimination of S25.5
>> > and do the vote.
>>
>> I'm not so sure about that, Jim. Perhaps we may see some European "ringers"
>> in there. ;-)
>
>There are some former Soviet entities in eastern Europe which now have
>the same clout at WRCs as Foggy Bottom has and the little bit of

>traffic on the subject I've seen so far indicates that they very well
>could be yer "ringers".

Ah! The "insider" at WRCs and WARCs who "knows" what
happens there and "who has clout." :-)

Kellie's "estimation-opinion" has as much validity as his
expertise with numbers...like swelling a single patent (as co-
inventor) in twenty-six! :-)

If Kellie's opinion were true, then such "ringers" can equally
apply to every other Recommendation about amateur radio.

>> > 40 meters is actually a much more important issue for HF amateur
>> > radio, for a bunch of reasons. The real question is: can a better deal
>> > be struck with the SWBC folks?
>>
>> True true, I hope that deal can come to fruition.
>
>We all do. It's developing into an interesting joust to say the least.
>I noticed that none of the options offered for discussion at the WRC
>so far include any mention of opening up 6.900 - 7.000 Mhz for ham
>ops. I thought that was an excellent idea when I first heard about it.

Kellie just found out about that?!?!? Good grief, it's been
a topic of discussion for years, before WRC-99!

Kellie had better get up to speed and with the program.

>Like Doris Day sang, "Que sara, sara".

Senior, there are few fans of 30+ year old movies starring
Doris Day. She doesn't have a ham license. Neither did
Jimmy Stewart (as far as I know) and he was talking on
radio from airplanes well before Kellie knew what a beep was.
:-)

>We'll deal with it. We always have dealt with it. No matter what.

Ey, youse wan' anudder hoagie ta munch, tuff guy?

997. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 00:29:19 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030125192919.03463.00000209@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 60078

In article <20030124212905.27873.00000176@mb-mj.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <0IkY9.1440$U27.126502@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
><kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG> writes:
>
>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>>
>>: Why is a new Tech allowed to design/build/adjust/repair/align and operate a
>>: 1500 W transmitter on 50.020 CW, (or any other authorized band/mode above
50
>>: MHz), but if said Tech wants to use a 1.5 watt transmitter on 3.520 MHz CW,
>>: he/she must take two more written tests totalling 85 questions?
>>
>>Are you laying the groundwork for NTI ("No Theory International")?
>
>Nope. In fact, I think the written tests are not well-matched to the
>privileges granted.

...spoken like a true company man! :-)

>My point is simply that when terms like "jumping through hoops" are used wrt
>license tests, the same criteria should apply to all license tests.
>
>Why are the writtens a sacred cow but the code a scapegoat?

The FCC requires ALL US radio amateurs to be responsible for the
technical and legal requirements of amateurs' operation. All.
No exceptions.

The FCC does NOT require any US amateur to operate OOK CW
over and above any other mode. All modes are optional within
allocated bands.

Ergo, there is NO justification for any morse code test other than
a politically-biased (in favor of morsemen) recommendation.

A morse code test is thus little more than a hazing ritual demanded
by some long-time amateur morsemen to make all newcomers
jump through the same hoops they had to long ago.

998. Re: ONLY 8 HOURS UNTIL THE LIBERTY NET! (part II.a)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 01:39:12 UTC
From: cheesecutter@webhideout.com
Message-ID: <fef386d5.0301251739.7ea21fe2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60081
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

"tinkle balls" <waawatersd@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:<3e32e910@snipnews.snip.net>...
> One more link we forgot: http://w4.lns.cornell.edu/~riehle/crank.html
>
> (Links to: The Institute for Neo-Creationism, Philadelphia Experiment,
> Eternal Life
> Devices, Dipole Anti-Gravity, Bob Larson Ministries.....it's all there
> folks!)
>
> More links to kooks than you'll ever need in a lifetime - a veritable
> circuis side-show cornocopia exhaustive concordance of all things
> black helocopter-ish
>
>
> "The tenets of skepticism do not require an advanced degree, as most
> successful used-car buyers demonstrate. The whole idea of a
> democratic application of skepticism is that everyone should have
> the essential tools to effectively and constructively evaluate claims
> to knowledge. All science asks is to employ the same levels of
> skepticism we use in buying a used car or in judging the quality
> of analgesics or beer from their TV commercials."
>
> - Carl Sagan

hey i have seen the black helocopters.....the army does this thing
around here where they practice insertions in urban areas, like they
are fighting in a urban setting.....makes me
nervous.....sometimes they try and take over a town, exploding
ordinance , etc.....you watch my words,....one day they will use
that stuff on you and me.....people need to keep
alert.....freedom isn't just a word.....

999. Re: ONLY 8 HOURS UNTIL THE LIBERTY NET! (part II.a)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 01:40:57 UTC
From: cheesecutter@webhideout.com
Message-ID: <fef386d5.0301251740.7141bcc4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60082
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

"tinkle balls" <waawatersd@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:<3e32e910@snipnews.snip.net>...
> One more link we forgot: http://w4.lns.cornell.edu/~riehle/crank.html
>
> (Links to: The Institute for Neo-Creationism, Philadelphia Experiment,
> Eternal Life
> Devices, Dipole Anti-Gravity, Bob Larson Ministries.....it's all there
> folks!)
>
> More links to kooks than you'll ever need in a lifetime - a veritable
> circuis side-show cornocopia exhaustive concordance of all things
> black helocopter-ish
>
>
> "The tenets of skepticism do not require an advanced degree, as most
> successful used-car buyers demonstrate. The whole idea of a
> democratic application of skepticism is that everyone should have
> the essential tools to effectively and constructively evaluate claims
> to knowledge. All science asks is to employ the same levels of
> skepticism we use in buying a used car or in judging the quality
> of analgesics or beer from their TV commercials."
>
> - Carl Sagan
by the way.......tinkle...didn't the liberty net get run out of canada
a few years ago??? they got sued for talking rather badly about our
hebrew brothers.....rogo????

1000. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 01:44:24 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3E333D78.C34CCB56@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 60083

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> In article <c2356669.0301220553.2e305963@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> (N2EY) writes:
>
> >Say, Larry, you can play the "years" game, too. Add up your age, years
> >as a licensed ham, years of military service, years with a bachelor's
> >degree, years with a driver's license, years with a CDL, years as an
> >ARRL member, plus any other years you find usable and see what the
> >total is.
> >
> >73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Jim:
>
> OK, here goes:
>
> Age: 50
> Years as a ham: 21 (Just received Old Timer's Club certificate)
> Years as an Extra: 20
> Years as an ARRL member: 22
> Years of military service: 19 (took early retirement in the mid-90's
> downsizing)
> Years with a CDL: 2.5
> Years on rrap: 12
> Let's see, that makes me 146.5 years old. Shouldn't I be in a nursing home
> by now?
>

Another 200KHz and you'd be on 2 meter simplex (146.52). :-)

19 years in the military. Did you get a pension? Or just miss out?

1001. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 01:46:09 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3E333DE1.85E0A54B@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 60084

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>
> Years on rrap: 12

Has rrap been around that long?

1002. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 01:48:43 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3E333E7B.E0BF5EAB@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 60085

N2EY wrote:

>
> 2) Do you think the "commercial content" rules in Part 97 should be
> relaxed or eliminated?

No. The purpose of that rule is to keep businesses from invading and
taking over our bands.

1003. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 02:00:13 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.h9akhpq.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 60086

On 25 Jan 2003 19:33:02 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:

> Phil is getting touchy in here.

I get "feely" too.... <ggg>

>Bad billings?

Yeah - my pro bono clients want discounts... <ggg>

> He may start up the
> "mistake" in "Magnificent Seven" about the "telephone wires" in
> a couple scenes...at the railhead in the 1880s, widely-spaced
> and NOT telephone but rather telegraph (then 40 years in service).

IIRC they were power lines with a "Danger High Voltage" strip on the
crossarm....but it's been a long time since I've seen that film.

And the "location" was 'sposed to be a small rural village in
Mexico, where LADWP-type facilities were not very common...

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1004. Re: Why Dave has such a p*ss poor attitude

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 02:09:43 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.h9alkvr.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 60087

On 26 Jan 2003 00:29:17 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:

> claimed from the US embassy at a country whose chief export is
> cashew nuts.

Gotta get my cashews from SOMEWHERE. There are all sorts of nuts in
this group, too.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1005. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 03:08:12 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030125220812.19271.00000462@mb-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 60088

In article <RHdY9.502$N5.345696@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>Please refrain from spreading deliberate misinformation.

Carl:

I usually do!

>A very large percentage of NCI's membership have passed Morse
>tests ... many are Extras, or other countries' equivalents thereof.

QSL. Oooops, in your case, I guess I should say, "10-4, good buddy!"

>Most of NCI's Board of Directors have passed Morse tests and
>hold higher classes of license ...

ZZZZZZZZZzzzzzz....mxgvqrzzzzxxxttt!!! Hunh? Did you say sumpthin?

>And, once again, we do NOT oppose the (voluntary) learning
>and use of Morse, nor do we have any intention to ban or restrict
>the use of Morse in any way ... we simply oppose the Morse TEST
>as an unnecessary requirement for licensure in today's world.

And those of us with a more mature, enlightened, and rational attitude
toward the Morse/CW mode realize that the USE of this mode will not
continue at it's former levels unless there *is* a requirement for Morse
code testing at useful proficiency levels! Which, BTW, is why we're
NOT members of No-Clue International!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1006. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 03:13:38 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0301251913.266b2694@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60089

Continued from earlier post...

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<kNyY9.652$N5.478853@nnrp1.ptd.net>...

(N2EY wrote:)

> > The biggest change brought about by the 2000 restructuring has been large
> > numbers of upgrades by already-licensed hams. That's a good thing, btw.
>
> What it demonstrates that reducing the code requirement allowed 10s of
> thousands of otherwise qualified individuals to upgrade ...

Otherwise qualified? Perhaps

What really happened is that many hams found themselves able to
upgrade with only a little more testing, or none at all. For example,
a pre-1987 Tech Plus could get a General with no more testing at all.
That same person could jump all the way to Extra with just a single 50
question written, rather than the two writtens and 20 wpm code test
formerly required.

> in itself
> clearly
> proves that 13 and 20 wpm Morse tests were an unnecessary and artificial
> barrier to entry into the higher classes of license and the additional privs
> that
> they convey.

How does the fact of existing hams taking advantage of easier upgrades
prove anyhting of the sort? By that logic, the old Advanced test was
an unnecessary and artificial barrier.

Lower the price of anything, and you will see a surge in purchases.
Supply and demand.

There are folks out there petitioning FCC to grant Extras to anyone
who can show they held a General or Advanced prior to November 22,
1968. Their argument is that since they once had full privs, they
should have 'em again, with no additional testing. Or some such. I
don't buy that argument at all, but if enacted, we'd see a surge of
new Extras.
>
> > >If I had a buck for every e-mail I've received thanking me for NCI's
> > >work, I could HIRE someone to install the towers I plan to put up
> > >in the spring, rather than doing the work myself ...
> >

> > How many? There are about 685,000 US hams - how many of them are NCI
> members?
>
> LOTS :-)

In other words, not that many, because you'd tell us the number if it
were significant. I've never seen an NCI membership number over 4000,
and since you folks started at 1000, the total membership mus not be
more than 3000 - worldwide. Hardly a majority!
>
> > How many have emailed you?
>
> LOTS :-)
>
Same as above.

> > I hope the towers help with your SSB DXCC.
>
> I log on the computer, but chasing DXCC (on any mode, or all) is certainly
> not a burning interest ...

Must not have 100 yet, then... ;-)

> I wish you would accept me at my word on that and
> stop harping on it as if my operating on HF is somehow "wrong."

I do accept that it's not a burning interest of yours. And there is
nothing morally or legally "wrong" with any licensed amateur
participating in DX, award hunting, or any other amateur activity as
long as it is done legally and in accord with good amateur operating
practices.

However, it *is* somewhat surreal (as dear departed N0BK would say) to
read your description of working 70+ countries on HF. Particularly
when it developed that they were worked on SSB using a manufactured
transceiver.

After reading many, many posts about "better methods and modulations"
for amateurs, the need to experiment and become technological leaders
instead of appliance operators, and more posts decrying "electronic
paintball wars" and the "elitism" of short vanity calls, one would
naturally expect that the writer of those diatribes to be engaged in
something other than busting pileups on the way to the magic 100.
>
> > I think we both agree that good antennas are preferable to raw power.
>
> Clearly ... and don't get the ideas that all of the antennas will be for HF
> ...
> there will be plenty for VHF/UHF/SHF as well ... I plan to be fully equipped
> for all of the satellites and for high speed terrestrial digital networking
> when
> I am "done" with the antenna farm (I guess if you have enough room, an

> antenna
> farm is never really done :-)

Even without enough room!
>
> >Check out K8MN's webpage - he has some nice ones.
>
> Are these commercial kits to buy, or plans to build your own?

?? What are you talking about?? I was talking about antennas.

> The latter is preferable ... do you have the URL handy?

Take a look at

http://www.elecraft.com

73 de Jim, N2EY

1007. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 03:16:12 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E3352BF.3060307@adelphia.net>
Source record: 60090

At the risk of bringing this back on topic, I downloaded the Echolink software, and installed and got it running yesterday. After all, I souldn't condemm it if I hadn't used it, yaknow?

Installation was pretty straightforward. Setup was accomplished by opening up some ports on my router, and the next morning I was signed in.

Then it all goes down because of the internet attack. In fact the ARES net for this evening was canceled.

Not an auspicious start, I must say.

1008. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 03:17:06 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b0vk36$4rp$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 60091

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in
message news:20030125220812.19271.00000462@mb-fp.aol.com...
> In article <RHdY9.502$N5.345696@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
....
> >And, once again, we (NCI) do NOT oppose the (voluntary) learning
> >and use of Morse, nor do we have any intention to ban or restrict
> >the use of Morse in any way ... we simply oppose the Morse TEST
> >as an unnecessary requirement for licensure in today's world.
>
> And those of us with a more mature, enlightened, and rational attitude
> toward the Morse/CW mode realize that the USE of this mode will not
> continue at it's former levels unless there *is* a requirement for Morse
> code testing at useful proficiency levels! Which, BTW, is why we're
> NOT members of No-Clue International!
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Now there's a new twist...so now it isn't enough that morse use simply
survive to make Larry happy, but rather it must survive at "it's
former level (whatever that means) for Larry to be satisfied.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1009. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 03:18:45 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <psIY9.971$N5.542689@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 60092

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3E32CE94.1407BB76@earthlink.net...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> > At least those "hoops" are based on a demonstration of RELEVANT and
> > important qualifications, rather than one's ability to practice an
arcane
> > method of communications that is more "art form" and "cult religion"
than
> > "necessary" in any reasonable way.
>
> Ahhh, the arrogant old Carl is back.

What's arrogant about mu coment above? I consider it to be a purely
accurate factual statement ... where's the arrogance?

> > What it demonstrates that reducing the code requirement allowed 10s of
> > thousands of otherwise qualified individuals to upgrade ... the in
itself
> > clearly
> > proves that 13 and 20 wpm Morse tests were an unnecessary and artificial
> > barrier to entry into the higher classes of license and the additional
privs
> > that they convey.
>
> I love that "otherwise qualifed" phrase, Carl. Except for the part
> about med school, I'm otherwise qualified to do heart surgery.

Right ... and so is my Rotweiller ... your point is?

As long as people can pass the prescribed written tests, they are,
by definition "otherwise qualified," with the exception of the remaining
5 wpm Morse test, to operate on HF.

> The only
> thing holding me back is that I'm not going to jump through their hoops.

I think it would be more accurate to say that the only thing holding you
back is a lack of the requisite intelligence and skill ... and that little
thing
called passing the tests and getting the license.

I have NEVER advocated that anyone should operate a radio without
the prescribed license .. I would CERTAINLY recommend that you
refrain from doing heart surgery ... I don't care if you get tossed into
the can for practicing medicing without a license ... it's the potential

victims that I'm thinking of.

Carl - wk3c

>
> Dave K8MN

1010. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 03:35:14 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030125223514.04712.00000390@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 60093

>Right ... and so is my Rotweiller ... your point is?
>

Well Carl it appears you have just answered the Question, what is your dogs NCI Number?

>I think it would be more accurate to say that the only thing holding you
>back is a lack of the requisite intelligence and skill ... and that little
>thing
>called passing the tests and getting the license.

Carl that pretty much describes you and your NCI bunch. Just think Carl if they hadnt LOWERED the standards you wouldnt be an EXTRA.

1011. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 03:51:21 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <ZWIY9.973$N5.547433@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 60094

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030125155347.04873.00000125@mb-cb.aol.com...
> In article <kNyY9.652$N5.478853@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
> >> >> >The logic fails, Dave ... supporting the view that Morse testing
> >should
> >> >> >be forced on all, like it or not, is NOT supporting freedom of
choice.
> >> >>
> >> >> Apply that logic to forcing written testing beyond the basics of
rules
> >&
> >> >> regs on all.....
> >> >
> >> >Not the same ...
> >>
> >> It's exactly the same. Note that I wrote:
> >>
> >> "written testing beyond the basics of rules & regs on all....."
> >
> >Anything "beyond the basics of rules & regs" sounds like
> >the technical parts of the written test to me ... isn't that what
> >you were referring to???
>
> Not all of it. For example, in order to understand the regs that define
the 40
> meter band as being from 7.000 to 7.300 MHz, you have to understand what a
MHz
> is, so technical questions on MHz are needed to insure that the regs are
> understood.

OK ... I'll go along with that ...

> But the written exams go far beyond that level.

Sure ... because to prevent interference to other services, one needs to
know
more than "1 MHz = 1,000,000 cycles/sec and and the band edges are X to Y"

> >> >not knowing some of the technical
> >> >aspects can:
> >> >
> >> >result in interference to other services
> >>

> >> How? The rules and regs cover things like allowed frequencies and
modes.

They also cover things like signal purity, modulation, out of band
emissions, and many more things that require a certain level of
technical knowledge to understand and comply with to a reasonable
level of surety.

> >> How
> >> can ignorance of things like how a DDS synthesizer works result in
> >> interference with other services?
> >
> >Not knowing how a DDS works could result in programming it incorrectly,
> >causing out of band emissions.
>
> But there is no requirement that hams use DDS, let alone program them. The
test
> does not guarantee that any ham knows how to program a DDS, either.

But we are ALLOWED to use them (and they are becoming more popular
because of the significant advantages they can provide over old-fashioned
VFOs) ... it is clearly necessary to understand the basics of how a DDS
works
to understand the principles necessary to correctly program it to operate on
a certain frequency (and/or to figure out why it's not working right) ...

> So the test questions on DDS do nothing to prevent interference to other
> services. They are in the "hoop" category.

No ... as I've explained above, they are not in the "hoop" category ...
they are legitimate questions on technical qualifications ...

> >Not knowing (fill in some technical thing here) could also result in the
ham
> >having no clue that his radio was malfunctioning and creating
interference
> >(let alone how to fix it ...)
>
> Possibly. But there is no requirement that any ham use a particular
technology,
> let alone a particular rig. The tests provide no assurance whatsoever that
any
> particular ham knows how his/her rig actually works, or when it is not
working
> right.

All of the rigs available today work on rather well-established principles
that should be (at least reasonably) understood by those who use them.
Heck ... when I took my novice test, there were questions about how
oscillators worked ...

> Even at your level of technical knowledge, can you guarantee that there is
no

> possible malfunction of your ham gear that would go undetected by you?

Nothing in live is 100% ... except death (some cheat on their taxes, but
the grim reaper eventually will get us all :-)

However, the probability that I would recognize a malfunction (or understand
the implications of a bad signal report, etc.) are higher because I was
required
to demonstrate at least a reasonable level of technical knowledge through
the
written tests.

Besides, I have test equipment that many hams don't have and check my
gear on a pretty regular basis as preventative maintenance ...

> End result is that many if not most of the technical questions fall into
the
> "hoop" category.

I'm beginning to think that Hans' question as to whether you were
laying the ground work for NTI (No Test International) may have
been on the mark :-) WHY are you so intent on eliminating all of
the technical content?

And why are not all the "dumbing downers" not coming out of the
woodwork to flame the hell out of you? (I guess it's ok to dumb
down the technical part, but Morse is sacred, right???)

> >> Why is a Morse test "hoop jumping", but not the
> >> writtens beyond the Tech?
> >
> >Because of what we're allowed to do in terms of repairing, modifying,
> >adjusting, tinkering with, and even building our own equipment.
>
> FCC disagrees. They say the Tech written is adequate for doing all of
those
> things to VHF/UHF/microwave ham gear. Is HF/MF ham gear somehow more
dangerous
> or complex than VHF/UHF ham gear?
>
> >We
> >are the only radio service (other than the Experimental Radio Service
> >under Part 5, which is limited to very specific uses) that allows such
> >flexibility ... in return, we owe an obligation to demonstrate at least a
> >minimum level of technical understanding and competence.
>
> Which the Technician test does - according to the FCC. Except for the
> HF/MF-specific parts, the rest of the General and Extra writtens falls
into the
> "hoop" category - by your definition.

As I stated in another message, my *personal view* (based on my
professional experience) is that the Tech test does not justify 1500W

privs ... and that the VAST majority of Techs would probably not
care if they were limited to the sorts of powers that most commercial
2m and 440 rigs put out ... say 50ish watts ...

I think the General test should be good for, say 250w ... and that
1500W should be limited to Extras (not that I have any plans of
running that power, in fact, I wouldn't care if Extras were limited
to 500w ... or even 250W) ... as I've said, there's much more
"bang for the buck" in better antennas and better modulation/coding
than in brute force power
(if more hams were more technically knowledgable,
they'd know that and there'd be a lot less cross-town rag chewing
with full legal limit in violation of the minimum power rule ...)

Now, I realize that there are old time Generals who will give up
their linears when they are pried from their cold, dead hands ...
there is an implemenation problem here, in the sense of "taking
away" something from some ... so, while I don't think the FCC
would implement these power limits, I think they *should* ...

> So the FCC is WRONG? But they are "the expert agency charged
> with managing the non-federal-govt. use of the radio spectrum that
> belongs to all of us."!!!

As above, nothing is 100% ... I disagree with the FCC on the power
limits vs. technical knowledge required ... but that is a vestige of
the past that they are sort of politically stuck with ... you know the
history of how some old timers lost privs (and some are still bitching
about it 50 years later ...)

> >> Or is it that FCC wants hams to "jump through the hoop" of taking more
> >> written
> >> tests in order to get more HF privileges?
> >
> >At least those "hoops" are based on a demonstration of RELEVANT and
> >important qualifications,
>
> So you agree that they ARE "hoops" and not necessary requirements!

NO ... I made the mistake of trying to stay consistent with your
terminology ... I do NOT believe that the technical content in
the written tests are irrelevant "hoops to be jumped through ... that's
why I use the phrase "based on a demonstration of RELEVANT and
important qualifications" ... you're smart enough to know what I
meant, so please stop playing word games ...

> Is it really all about the numbers, then?

No ... it's about REASONABLE, RELEVANT QUALIFICATIONS.

73,

--
Carl R. Stevenson - wk3c
Grid Square FN20fm
<mailto:wk3c@fast.net> (general personal e-mail and NCI e-mail)
<mailto:wk3c-shack@fast.net> (QSO, QSL, skeds, only, please)
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wk3c>

NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, QCWA (31424)
Member, ARRL
Member, TAPR
Member, The SETI League

Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

1012. Re: Why Dave has such a p*ss poor attitude

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 04:06:29 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <99JY9.977$N5.548098@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 60095

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3E32CCE6.D8842848@earthlink.net...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>> > Yes ... assuming that you're refering to my behavior towards you,
> > it's simple ... "Pompus, narrow-minded jerks irritate me>"
>
> I love it. Someone who can't spell "pompous" quotes himself. I assume
> that your view assumes that anyone who doesn't buy into your grand
> scheme is pompous and narrow-minded. You've not just used that method
> with me.

You have ADD, right Dave? I've mentioned several times that I have
a bit of loss of feeling/coordination in my fingers due to a spinal injury.

> > > How's the "experimentation" with chasing DX on SSB coming along?
> >
> > Another fiction of your warped mind, Dave ... I will work DX if I come
> > across it, but I am not "chasing DX" in the sense of having a compulsion
> > to collect wallpaper ... or, worse yet, participate in contests.
>
> Oh, excuse me. In one of your past incarnations here you were regaling
> us with tales of your DXploits on SSB.

Baloney ... I haven't bragged about "DXploits" ... I do believe I mentioned
having a good time during a short stint at 4U1ITU while I was in Geneva
for meetings at the ITU ... if I recall correctly, I said something like
"What
a change being at the center of a pileup ... worked 200 stations in 3
hours."
or something like that ... BFD ...

> > And, I have been so busy with important work work and 3 weeks
> > of vacation with my wife's family in Mexico that I haven't even been
> > on HF since Dec. 14th ...
>
> I'm sure you are doing very important work. How could they spare you
> from the important work for three weeks in Mexico?

1) Even *I* get to take a vacation once in a while ... though this was the
first in 2 years ...
2) It was the first time in the 10 years we've been together that my wife
and I have been able to spend Christmas with her family ... I owed it to
her ... we'd planned to do it a couple of other years, but something always
came up.
3) Since most of my work these days is dealing with regulatory agencies,
and most governments sort of shut down over the holiday season, it was

easier to get away then than at other times

(not that I have to justify my vacations to you ...)

> > As far as my "experimentation" goes, I'm in the design and simulation
> > phase, but work obligations have limited the amount of time I've been
> > able to devote ... but don't worry yourself... I seriously doubt that
you
> > are
> > technically competent to actually understand it anyway ...
>
> Pompous, narrow-minded jerks irritate me. Did I mention your arrogance?

In other words, you *wouldn't* understand it so you have to find some
way to divert attention from that fact :-)

Carl - wk3c

1013. Re: Why Dave has such a p*ss poor attitude

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 04:10:16 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <IcJY9.978$N5.548944@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 60096

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.h9alkvr.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On 26 Jan 2003 00:29:17 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> > claimed from the US embassy at a country whose chief export is
> > cashew nuts.
>
> Gotta get my cashews from SOMEWHERE.

Phil,

I like cashews, too ... but do we really need Dave's
"CW order wire for a RTTY circuit" to coordinate
the delivery? I think not ... :-)

73,
Carl - wk3c

1014. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 05:12:33 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030126001233.20005.00000499@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 60097

>I was
>required
>to demonstrate at least a reasonable level of technical knowledge through
>the
>written tests.

Which present testing does not do, ask many of the new hams they will tell you.

>And why are not all the "dumbing downers" not coming out of the
>woodwork to flame the hell out of you?

Because most allready know that the present written is a JOKE

>(if more hams were more technically knowledgable,

I thought thats what the written was for, to prove there technical expertise.

1015. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 06:07:28 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <AWKY9.3471$d66.350878@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 60098

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote

:
: In other words, not that many, because you'd tell us the number if it
: were significant. I've never seen an NCI membership number over 4000,

73, OM, de Hans, K0HB
--
FISTS 7419
NCI 4304

1016. Re: Hot Fun In The Summertime With Brian

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 06:23:56 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030126012356.18366.00000266@mb-ma.aol.com>
Source record: 60151

In article <f45722ac.0301251546.47ee33fa@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>Perhaps I served under protest? Yeh, that's it. I got a concentious
>ojector status to jump school.
>
>Only your imagination knows.
>
>So, your second pass at it failed. No suprise. At this point I would
>say you are a moron.
>
>Would you like to try for moron squared? I think you're capable. Go
>for it.

I doubt he could pass it. He has to study for his blood test.

>> You are as confused and idiotic as can be, Brain. And it get's more
>> hillarious as you try to deny it. Kinda like insisting how "legal" your T5
>> operations were, and NOT having any evidence of it.
>
>I don't live in the past.

All the PCTAs in here seem to do that.

Want some imported cashew nuts? :-)

[I have this contact who once worked in Guinea-Bisseau...]

>> >You can have a second try if you wish. Really. I'm up to it.
>>
>> It doesn't take more than one pass to undermine your rants, Brian.
>It's
>> very simple, really.
>
>No rant here. But you do get awfully wrapped around the axle on
>things you have little understanding of - such as words.

He tries.

Problem is, he winds up being very trying. :-)

>> >Someday when you go SK, someone is likely to see those wings
>> >in your collection and try to bury you in Arlington.
>>
>> Nope...Anyone who is anyone knows it's what's in your SRB that counts.
>
>So you really are out of luck.

A long time ago...like back when he was "in hostile action seven times" in the USMC. Unverified, of course, not a single reference. :-)

Now watch Sgt Putz come roaring in on that one! :-) :-) :-)

1017. Re: This Is How KB1HMW "Supports" Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 06:23:57 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030126012357.18366.00000267@mb-ma.aol.com>
Source record: 60100

In article <f45722ac.0301251517.6ef25c74@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20030125143301.29207.00000228@mb-cf.aol.com>...
>> In article <f45722ac.0301241552.4441642a@posting.google.com>,
>> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>>
>> <on a reply to someone else...>
>>
>> >Of course, I never wore an Air Medal again, don't even have one in my
>> >"collection." The only things in my "collection" are the awards I
>> >earned. Someday when you go SK, someone is likely to see those wings
>> >in your collection and try to bury you in Arlington. Wonder if you've
>> >got a Medal of Honor in there. If you're not already making up tales
>> >of bravery now.
>>
>> He is. Rather constantly. It's the "corps mystique" at work! :-)
>>
>> Remember the wandering-out-loud about a "HALO Insertion?"
>> [High Altitude jump Low Opening]
>>
>> Must be the testosterone supplements or something... :-)
>
>I see a trend. Wings and Halo's. He must be an angel.

He has death on the mind a lot, poor guy...all mixed up with
some imaginary Glory and Honor and Credentialism complex.

1018. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 06:23:59 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030126012359.18366.00000268@mb-ma.aol.com>
Source record: 60099

In article <20030125155347.04873.00000125@mb-cb.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes another volume in his on-going "Andy Rooney" wannabe
column in here:

>In article <kNyY9.652$N5.478853@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
><wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

<massive snipping to ease casual readers' eyes...>

>>Not knowing how a DDS works could result in programming it incorrectly,
>>causing out of band emissions.
>
>But there is no requirement that hams use DDS, let alone program them. The
>test does not guarantee that any ham knows how to program a DDS, either.
>
>So the test questions on DDS do nothing to prevent interference to other
>services. They are in the "hoop" category.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. You haven't "won" any argument. It isn't "about
DDS" per se but any question on FREQUENCY CONTROL.

A single-crystal oscillator can make trouble just as easily as
a PLL or DDS or Fractional-N synthesizer and produce RF
outside of ham bands. US amateurs are not allowed to RF
outside their alloted bands.

>Possibly. But there is no requirement that any ham use a particular
technology,
>let alone a particular rig. The tests provide no assurance whatsoever that any
>particular ham knows how his/her rig actually works, or when it is not working
>right.

Every single US amateur radio licensee is DIRECTLY RESPONSIBLE
for their equipment. It doesn't matter what it is, they are still
DIRECTLY RESPONSIBLE.

Try going with that for a change instead of resorting to reducto ad
absurdum "examples."

>The fact remains that in the vast majority of cases a person does not need a
>license of any kind to work on his/her own house or car, even though the work
>may cause a possible hazard to oneself.
>
>In short, licenses do not exist to protect people from their own stupidity.

Not quite correct. Licenses seem to exist as Mighty Monuments to
the Fantastic Achievements of The Licensee from THE TEST!!!

There are many with that overt attitude in here. Stupid. None of the
FCC operator license tests have any academic validity. The FCC is
not chartered as an academic organization. Never was.

>>> What "etc., etc."? Why is a Morse test "hoop jumping", but not the
>>> writtens beyond the Tech?
>>
>>Because of what we're allowed to do in terms of repairing, modifying,
>>adjusting, tinkering with, and even building our own equipment.
>
>FCC disagrees. They say the Tech written is adequate for doing all of those
>things to VHF/UHF/microwave ham gear. Is HF/MF ham gear somehow more
>dangerous or complex than VHF/UHF ham gear?

Ahem. Morsemanship has NOTHING to do with ANY kind of
technical smarts. None. Zip. Nada.

You SHOULD know that the morse test for amateur licenses
below 30 MHz is a POLITICAL thing. POLITICAL. Has nothing
to do with technical anything.

Bad form, OM. You are scrabbling on more minutae in a classic
reducto ad absurdum counter which is totally invalid.

>Which the Technician test does - according to the FCC. Except for the
>HF/MF-specific parts, the rest of the General and Extra writtens falls into
>the "hoop" category - by your definition.

No, no, no. You cannot RE-define things already defined...you are
NOT the Final Arbiter of that.

Try staying with the program and the very distinct difference between
technical and legal subjects and a purely ear-mind cognition skill
that involves absolutely NO theory whatsoever.

>How could anyone "force" their views on anyone else, other than to have those
>views enacted into the rules? FCC does the forcing.

:-) Sure looks like Andy...oops, I mean Jimmie spends much time
in here trying to FORCE his old ideas into everyone. :-)

>So the FCC is WRONG? But they are "the expert agency charged with managing
>the non-federal-govt. use of the radio spectrum that belongs to all of us."!!!

Stuff it, Jimmie. Quit trying to put words on someone else's messages
that weren't written by others.

>And that still leaves many other sunjects in the "hoop" category. Thevenin
>equivalents, complex impedance calculations - how does knowing them at the
>level required by the tests increase RF safety?

Jimmie, you sure building up to modern amateur radio NO-THEORY
TESTING! ! !

Now tell us...did you REALLY communicate with the VEC QPC or have
you been funnin' us?

>Yeah, me too, 1968, Philly FCC office. I was 14.

You were LATE. Other kids did it at 6! You could have done it
in 1960 and had 8 more years to brag about! Tsk, tsk, tsk.

>That proves the rest of the writtens contain much "hoop" content.

Proves NOTHING of the kind, goombah.

As has been said, quit trying to be the legal-technical moderator
of what others have written which are readily understood by
others. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

>So you agree that they ARE "hoops" and not necessary requirements!

No, he does NOT!!!

>What it really comes down to is that you use phrases like "force", "hazing
>ritual" and "jumping through hoops" selectively.

...there you go again, putting words in others' writings. BAD form, OM.

>You think it's OK to force new hams to take lots of written tests on
>technical
>material that is in no way necessary for the safe and legal operation of a
>modern amateur radio station, yet you find even a 5 wpm code test to be
>unacceptable.

You think it is OK to force morse code down everyone whether
it is not justifiable. No problem, Jimmie. We all know what you
are trying to do here...

>More put-downs and loaded phraseology. Why not just say "there's no reason for
>Morse to have it's own stand-alone pass-fail test anymore?"

...damn! There you go AGAIN trying to act the editor! You are NOT
one of those, don't have the authority.

>If you need a comparison, just use the stick-shift driving analogy.

If you need a used car with a stick shift I can put you in touch
with some salesmen. Otherwise, may we suggest you take
that stick and "shift" it someplace? :-)

>Try listening to the non-phone parts of the HF ham bands with an adequate
>receiver, and see how much Morse is actually in use by hams today. Hardly
>"arcane" or "cult". Hams use that mode by choice, not requirement.

Try opening your mind to "listen" to others that don't believe in
your little morse-ist cult following.

You think you have a hammer. If that's all you have then
everything looks like a nail to you. Others don't have that
viewpoint.

>Like what? SSB? It's a legacy from the 80 years ago.

BWAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAH!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

At best, Jimmie, FIFTY years ago. The 1950s. For amateur radio, that is...

It was the commercial and military people who pioneered SSB beginning in the 1930s, based on landline frequency-division multiplex "carrier" systems of 15 years earlier.

If less than ten amateurs "used SSB" in the 1930s, it is an exaggeration of the highest order to suddenly elevate those copiers-of-commercial techniques as "legacy operators."

Bwahahahaha...hehehehehehe...snicker, snicker...

1019. Re: Why Dave has such a p*ss poor attitude

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 06:43:50 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030126014350.20835.00000253@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 60152

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.h9alkvr.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 26 Jan 2003 00:29:17 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>> claimed from the US embassy at a country whose chief export is
>> cashew nuts.
>
> Gotta get my cashews from SOMEWHERE. There are all sorts of nuts in
> this group, too.

Eschew cashew.

1020. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 06:43:51 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030126014351.20835.00000254@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 60153

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.h9akhpq.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 25 Jan 2003 19:33:02 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>> Phil is getting touchy in here.
>
> I get "feely" too.... <ggg>

Poor baby.

>>Bad billings?
>
> Yeah - my pro bono clients want discounts... <ggg>

I would think the anti-Bono clients want much more.

Or do you favor modern music?

>> He may start up the
>> "mistake" in "Magnificent Seven" about the "telephone wires" in
>> a couple scenes...at the railhead in the 1880s, widely-spaced
>> and NOT telephone but rather telegraph (then 40 years in service).
>
> IIRC they were power lines with a "Danger High Voltage" strip on the
> crossarm....but it's been a long time since I've seen that film.

Bad form, OM. It's been a VERY long time since NEVER.

I saw it on first run, then on TV, now we have a DVD of
it. It isn't there, Phil. There's NO evidence of it.

Overruled on acount of trying to use hearsay as evidence.

Tsk, tsk, tsk.

> And the "location" was 'sposed to be a small rural village in
> Mexico, where LADWP-type facilities were not very common...

DWP doesn't service inland Mexico, senior. The details of
shooting that film were in American Cinematographer
magazine long ago. Nothing was mentioned about any
"HV signs" then, there isn't anything to see in the DVD to
prove your point.

Case dismissed.

1021. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 09:23:22 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0301260123.1918e0a8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60154

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message news:<20030124224739.16889.00000182@mb-cc.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0301241516.3ad79e35@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
> >news:<20030123211353.21366.00000467@mb-mu.aol.com>...
> >> In article <c2356669.0301220553.2e305963@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> >> (N2EY) writes:
> >>
> >> >Say, Larry, you can play the "years" game, too. Add up your age, years
> >> >as a licensed ham, years of military service, years with a bachelor's
> >> >degree, years with a driver's license, years with a CDL, years as an
> >> >ARRL member, plus any other years you find usable and see what the
> >> >total is.
> >> >
> >> >73 de Jim, N2EY
> >>
> >> Jim:
> >>
> >> OK, here goes:
> >>
> >> Age: 50
> >> Years as a ham: 21 (Just received Old Timer's Club certificate)
> >> Years as an Extra: 20
> >> Years as an ARRL member: 22
> >> Years of military service: 19 (took early retirement in the mid-90's
> >> downsizing)
> >> Years with a CDL: 2.5
> >> Years on rrap: 12
> >
> >I'll play this sillyass game.
> >
> >Age: 65
> >Years as a Ham: 50
> >Years as an Extra: 35
> >Years as an ARRL member: Spotty, maybe 25 out of my 50
> >Years of Military Service: Zip for purposes of this discussion
> >Years driving long-haul 18-wheelers long before there were CDLs: Had
> >to do with flatbed 40 foot stake bodies fulla Joisy tomatoes and the
> >nonsense ya get into to pay yer way thru injuneering collitch. Gimmee
> >3.
> >Years on RRAP: 5??
> >
> >183 "RRAP Age Points" for Romeo Victor.

> >
> You're not palying it right.
>
> You left out:

This is ridiculous and getting worse.

> - Years as a degreed engineer (count each degree seperately)
Zero around here because I ain't an EE.

> - Years with DXCC
43

> - Years with 5BDXCC
31

> - Years present callsign
26

> - Years with previous callsign
WN3 1
W3 23

> - Years with other radio service licenses (expired or not)
CB 30
RRtO 49

> - Years your favorite Scotch is aged
0.04 (two weeks works fine).

>
> Etc.
>
> 73 de jim, N2EY

1022. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 09:32:38 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0301260132.25ece4c1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60155

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<uFlY9.609$N5.388816@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> news:udeY9.5268$IN1.3658@nwrddc02.gnilink.net...
>
> Bert,
>
> It's in reference to any unnecessary requirement. Some folks think that
> the tests are "way easier" today than they were "in the good old days."

That's not too hard to "decipher". I had to bust my weenie adolesecent
butt to teach myself enough "theory" to get thru my Novice & General
exams "back in the good old days". So an engineeering degree and a
half century in ham radio later I can't imagine why the tests today
look so easy to me. WTF . . what a big surprise.

There can be no question that becoming a ham really did require
jumping thru more hoops back then than it does today - written test
content and code tests aside. FCC offices only, no such thing as
CSCEs, screw any of it up and come back in a month and do it *all* of
it over again, the usual.

I can hear the whiners today if the pore things had to do 100 miles
one way to an FCC site just to take a Tech test.

> I don't want to put words in his mouth, but IIRC, my good friend Ed
> Hare, W1RFI, of the ARRL, has stated the ease with which he got
> his general "back when" (as have others).

That completely falls apart given the huge variations in what people
know and their backgrounds going into tests. Any tests which are not
directly related to instruction in the subject. The technically
inclined and more precisely electronics hobbyists will obviously have
a much easier time of it than most others. You bet Minnie the typist
who never had Algebra 1 or physics 1 and could care less will have a
lot more work to do to get past the writtens than those of us who had
the natural aptitudes and were into technical matters well before we
went for our ham licenses. I don't know how far along Ed was on the
academic path to his EE but I'll bet bucks on the fact that he was no
stranger to electronics when he "breezed" thru his General. Minnie
would have a much different view yes? Certainly.

> The written tests aren't an EE final ... never were, never were meant
> to be, never should be.

Could not agree more.

> The issue is that some folks are PO'd that people who already know
> all the radio stuff don't have to work as hard as they did (because they
> didn't know the radio stuff ...

That's stupid on their part.

> hell, many still don't ... I know other
> extras
> who don't have a clue on the technical side.

Hell yeah! But is that necessarily bad? And if yes why?

The last president of the club to which I belong is the recently
retired head of the department of opthalmology at one of the big-name
med schools. Another former prez is an EE who was a VP at General
Electric before he took a buyout. Neither of 'em could design a piece
of solid state ham equipment if their lives depended on it. Neither
can I. For instance.

But then grease yer paddles and join those two in the ARRL CW dx bash
a few weeks from now out where the rubber actually hits road on the
airwaves. Normally they'll have logged another "DXCC" between 00 GMT
Friday evening and noon EST Sunday if not sooner. I understand you're
still working on your first, keep slugging and best of luck with it
Carl.

Then of course comes the current Prez who is a Postal Service truck
mechanic and the band-cleaning shop vac from hell . . . I'm sure you
get my drift eh?

What yardstick do you use to quantify cluelessness? And why?

> The point is that that the reason for licensing (and the tests) is NOT to
> "control the population" or to "keep out the 'unworthy' " ... it's simply
> to make sure that people have a reasonable minimum level of qualification
> to operate safely and with a minimum potential for interference to other
> radio services ... nothing more, nothing less. It is NOT to "make someone
> prove they are 'dedicated enough' by making them 'work hard' for their
> license."
>
> Too damned many people value their license for what they perceive as
> some sort of epic, heroic effort that they made to get it, rather than for
> what it allows them to do (and the latter is where the value of the license
> lies).

That's SOP human behavior, it's all about pecking orders. On the
job,in the hobbies, it's everywhere and it started when our
predecessors decided that living on the ground was a better idea than
living in trees. Fuggem all, I ignore it.

>
> 73,
> Carl - wk3c

w3rv

1023. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 09:45:38 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E33AE54.3010704D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60156

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E31A3A6.B874E842@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Oh, and if you are worrying about my being an ugly American towards you,
> >kindly furnish information as to your nationality. If you are other
> >than a United States citizen, I'll provide a personal apologize
> >promptly.
>
> Ah, a new twist on the "Ugly American!" Ugly Americans only
> insult and demean other Americans? :-)

Pardon me, Leonard. Since you used the term, I'd assumed that you knew
what it meant. It was a bad assumption. I can now understand your
misuse of the term.

> As to "proof" of my citizenship, feel free to contact the County
> Clerk of Winnebago County, Illinois. Or the FBI. Or the IRS.
> Or the California Franchise Tax Board. Or the National
> Records Administration database. Or the FCC ECFS. Use
> whatever "contacts" you have, "old buddies from the 'foreign
> service'" or whatever. PROVE I'm not a USA citizen.
>
> Go for it, Herr Robust. Snarl your wurst. :-)

Your apology will come only after you submit proof that you are not an
American. I'm not going to do your leg work for you.

It is amazing just how quickly you snipped all the stuff referencing Key
Officer listings and got the hell off that subject before revealing any
more of your ignorance. You're quite the tap dancer.

Dave K8MN

1024. Re: Why Dave has such a p*ss poor attitude

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 10:18:18 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E33B5AA.FE4A238E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60157

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E32CCE6.D8842848@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> >>
> >> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >> news:3E31EFB4.5B96876@earthlink.net...
> >> > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> >> > >
> >> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >> > > news:3E31A3A6.B874E842@earthlink.net...
> >> > > > Don't you ever tire of sticking your foot in your mouth? You can
> start
> >> > > > with:
> >> > > >

> Tell us more about the Great and Vast communications networks
> you managed. I especially liked the elevation of Guinea-Bisseau
> to an "important, strategic" location, vital to US interests. Oh, my!

I'll bet you liked it. After all, you made it up. Wanna tell me more
about those Key Officer listings?

> The "using CW (manual keying) as an order-wire to synchronize
> schedules of a single-channel RTTY circuit" as an original idea
> was masterful in the 1980s. Nobody else had bothered to do that.
> Of course, you changed the tune later when pressed on it, saying
> it "was State Department protocol/procedures" and thus disavowing
> the originality. Didn't make sense some years ago in here and
> still doesn't.

You've been asked several times to back up your erroneous statements
regarding the matter. You've never done so. The fact that you are
still making them lends strength to K4YZ's view of you--that you are a
liar.

> If one "can't get through" with modern RTTY equipment and has to
> resort to OOK CW to "set schedules," how in the world can any
> traffic be passed via TTY when it is required? If "conditions were so
> bad," then it should not have been a TTY circuit at all, instead being
> an OOK CW circuit.

This has been explained enough times for you to be able to understand
it; the last explanation was given just a few months back.

> If there is an RTTY radio circuit, then one uses TTY to send
> scheduling information changed from printed information sent to
> both ends. That's common sense. That's the way things have
> been done since before WW2 on RTTY circuits worldwide by
> the rest of the radio world.

See above.

> >> > Mark it down as just another thing you don't understand. Have you
> >> > figured out what explains your behavior?
> >>
> >> Yes ... assuming that you're refering to my behavior towards you,
> >> it's simple ... "Pompus, narrow-minded jerks irritate me>"
> >
> >I love it. Someone who can't spell "pompous" quotes himself. I assume
> >that your view assumes that anyone who doesn't buy into your grand
> >scheme is pompous and narrow-minded. You've not just used that method
> >with me.
>
> Awwww. Don't like your own kind of commentary coming right back
> to you? Tsk, tsk, tsk.

I didn't quote myself and botch it.

> Oh...I forgot. You were in the Foreign Service! Something extra-
> super-special...a small group of communicators in a much larger
> (much, much larger) radio world...and you were attempting a grande
> Snow Job on everyone else and expecting them to buy it.

Here's the part where you prove N2EY's point. You give hell to others
over being radio amateurs and not understanding what is going on the the
rest of the radio world. When one of those radio amateurs has
experience in military, government and the broadcast industry, you
attempt to belittle those experiences.

> >> > How's the "experimentation" with chasing DX on SSB coming along?
> >>
> >> Another fiction of your warped mind, Dave ... I will work DX if I come
> >> across it, but I am not "chasing DX" in the sense of having a compulsion
> >> to collect wallpaper ... or, worse yet, participate in contests.
> >
> >Oh, excuse me. In one of your past incarnations here you were regaling
> >us with tales of your DXploits on SSB.
>
> Try living in the PRESENT, Mr. FSO. Demands to go back to Google
> archives to "prove" some sort of point is very dangerous. All others
> can see examples there of hypocrisy, snow jobbing, and other
> assorted perfidy you wrote in here. You DON'T want to go there.

Len, I could never equal your output and am not in dread of what a
Google search of my statements would reveal. That Extra ticket right
out of the box however...

> Carl lived in Mexico for a time, had a Mexican amateur radio license
> and operated with that? That's not "arrogance" or anything else
> but a statement of facts. Certainly not "regaling" anyone...such as
> the "CW as an order-wire on an RTTY circuit" from Guinea-Bisseau.
> Harf! :-)

Harf a lough is better than none. I guess you wanted to respond to the
material below.

> >> And, I have been so busy with important work work and 3 weeks
> >> of vacation with my wife's family in Mexico that I haven't even been
> >> on HF since Dec. 14th ...
> >
> >I'm sure you are doing very important work. How could they spare you
> >from the important work for three weeks in Mexico?
>
> So, Mr. FSO of the exhaulted Foreign Service now has a grudge
> against those who still work for non-government corporations?!?

The what Foreign Service? Exhausted? Oh--maybe you meant "exalted"
How'd you manage to think I have grudge against "those who still work
for non-government corporations". Does that indicate that I give
retirees a pass
or that I believe only in government corporations? It is probably that
I don't care for a guy who describes how important his work is.

> You aren't "B.A. Barracus" of any "A Team," Mr. FSO. Quit
> trying to imitate that character.

I'd have to know the character in order to imitate. I don't know the
character.

> >> As far as my "experimentation" goes, I'm in the design and simulation
> >> phase, but work obligations have limited the amount of time I've been
> >> able to devote ... but don't worry yourself... I seriously doubt that you
> >> are technically competent to actually understand it anyway ...
> >
> >Pompous, narrow-minded jerks irritate me. Did I mention your arrogance?
>
> Poor baby.

I know. It sucks to be Carl.

> I think that past examples of "radio expertise" have demonstrated the
> "competence." I really like the "CW used as an order-wire on RTTY"
> claimed from the US embassy at a country whose chief export is
> cashew nuts. Says a lot right there. :-)

Oh, you probably think I had something to do with the export of
cashews. Right there is part of your problem, Foghorn. Just a couple
of days ago you mentioned something about Key Officer lists. What
happened to that particular rant?

Dave K8MN

1025. Pisswilly Babies

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 10:39:31 UTC
From: Lois <Winer@anon.com>
Message-ID: <b10drf$6ef$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 60158

And here you see it. Pisswilly Babies sniping and disecting the posts of others. It goes on and on and on to the point of nausea. Will the real 11 meter Pisswilly please bend over???
You are making Lloyd proud.

1026. Re: Hot Fun In The Summertime With Brian

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 12:13:56 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301260413.26e9e8c7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60159

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030126012356.18366.00000266@mb-ma.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0301251546.47ee33fa@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
>
> >Perhaps I served under protest? Yeh, that's it. I got a concentious
> >ojector status to jump school.
> >
> >Only your imagination knows.
> >
> >So, your second pass at it failed. No suprise. At this point I would
> >say you are a moron.
> >
> >Would you like to try for moron squared? I think you're capable. Go
> >for it.
>
> I doubt he could pass it. He has to study for his blood test.
>
> >> You are as confused and idiotic as can be, Brain. And it get's more
> >> hillarious as you try to deny it. Kinda like insisting how "legal" your T5
> >> operations were, and NOT having any evidence of it.
> >
> >I don't live in the past.
>
> All the PCTAs in here seem to do that.
>
> Want some imported cashew nuts? :-)
>
> [I have this contact who once worked in Guinea-Bisseau...]
>
>
> >> >You can have a second try if you wish. Really. I'm up to it.
> >>
> >> It doesn't take more than one pass to undermine your rants, Brian.
> It's
> >> very simple, really.
> >
> >No rant here. But you do get awfully wrapped around the axle on
> >things you have little understanding of - such as words.
>
> He tries.
>
> Problem is, he winds up being very trying. :-)

>
>
> >> >Someday when you go SK, someone is likely to see those wings
> >> >in your collection and try to bury you in Arlington.
> >>
> >> Nope...Anyone who is anyone knows it's what's in your SRB that counts.
> >
> >So you really are out of luck.
>
> A long time ago...like back when he was "in hostile action
> seven times" in the USMC. Unverified, of course, not a
> single reference. :-)
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
> Now watch Sgt Putz come roaring in on that one! :-) :-) :-)

He's welcome to post his expeditionary awards if he likes. One thing
though, he's got real "military background."

1027. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 13:59:26 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <2RRY9.1014$N5.598924@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 60160

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030125220812.19271.00000462@mb-fp.aol.com...
> In article <RHdY9.502$N5.345696@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
> >Please refrain from spreading deliberate misinformation.
>
> Carl:
>
> I usually do!

ROTFLMAO!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

> >A very large percentage of NCI's membership have passed Morse
> >tests ... many are Extras, or other countries' equivalents thereof.
>
> QSL. Oooops, in your case, I guess I should say, "10-4, good buddy!"

Actually, "Yes, I know" is a more appropriate response in text
modes such as this, or in voice. (The common use of "Roger" being
incorrect, as "Roger" simply means "I received your transmission"
NOT "Yes," "affirmative," "I agree," etc.)

And you know into exactly which dark place you can stuff the
attempted CB perjorative :-)

> >And, once again, we do NOT oppose the (voluntary) learning
> >and use of Morse, nor do we have any intention to ban or restrict
> >the use of Morse in any way ... we simply oppose the Morse TEST
> >as an unnecessary requirement for licensure in today's world.
>
> And those of us with a more mature, enlightened, and rational attitude
> toward the Morse/CW mode realize that the USE of this mode will not
> continue at it's former levels unless there *is* a requirement for Morse
> code testing at useful proficiency levels!

SO, you publicly admit that your motivation to force all to learn Morse
in order to pass a test is based SOLELY on your desire for more "recruits"
(willing or not) to the ranks of Morsedom ... in hopes that at least a few
will
stick to using the mode.

Frankly, while I have no desire to see Morse USE dwindle, I don't give
a rat's arse if it does either. Modes should survive on the basis of a
free-
market approach ... if people use them fine, if nobody finds them useful

or attractive enough to pursue, that's fine too. In the REAL world, it's
NOT
religion ... that fantasy only exists in the minds of the rabid PCTA crowd.

Carl - wk3c

1028. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 14:25:07 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <7dSY9.1052$N5.598152@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 60161

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0301260132.25ece4c1@posting.google.com...
> I don't know how far along Ed was on the
> academic path to his EE but I'll bet bucks on the fact that he was no
> stranger to electronics when he "breezed" thru his General. Minnie
> would have a much different view yes? Certainly.

How many bucks??? IIRC, Ed was 13 or 14 when he got his
general. Being a ham is way motivated him to a career in radio
electronics.

> > The written tests aren't an EE final ... never were, never were meant
> > to be, never should be.
>
> Could not agree more.
>
> > The issue is that some folks are PO'd that people who already know
> > all the radio stuff don't have to work as hard as they did (because they
> > didn't know the radio stuff ...
>
> That's stupid on their part.

Tell THEM that ... it's "dog in the manger" and "work ethic" BS ...

> > hell, many still don't ... I know other
> > extras
> > who don't have a clue on the technical side.
>
> Hell yeah! But is that necessarily bad? And if yes why?

Any ham who doesn't meet the intended level of technial
proficiency for his/her license class is a bad thing in my view,
because we are supposed to be a technical service ... read
97.1 again ...

> The last president of the club to which I belong is the recently
> retired head of the department of opthalmology at one of the big-name
> med schools. Another former prez is an EE who was a VP at General
> Electric before he took a buyout. Neither of 'em could design a piece
> of solid state ham equipment if their lives depended on it. Neither
> can I. For instance.
>
> But then grease yer paddles and join those two in the ARRL CW dx bash
> a few weeks from now out where the rubber actually hits road on the
> airwaves. Normally they'll have logged another "DXCC" between 00 GMT
> Friday evening and noon EST Sunday if not sooner. I understand you're

> still working on your first, keep slugging and best of luck with it
> Carl.

I'm not "working on DXCC" ... I haven't haven't even been on HF
since Dec. (something) ... does that sound like I'm a wild-eyed paper
chaser to you???

> Then of course comes the current Prez who is a Postal Service truck
> mechanic and the band-cleaning shop vac from hell . . . I'm sure you
> get my drift eh?
>
> What yardstick do you use to quantify cluelessness? And why?

Cluelessness is relative to the level of proficiency that the license
class expects ... IOW, I would not consider a tech who didn't
understand extra theory completely to be clueless ... he/she is
a beginner and is supposed to be learning, not to know it all.
On the other hand, since I used the phrase "know it all," I should
clarify that I don't expect extras to "know it all" either ... because
there is so much that goes beyond the content of the extra QP that
NOBODY could be expected to know it ALL ...

> > The point is that that the reason for licensing (and the tests) is NOT
to
> > "control the population" or to "keep out the 'unworthy' " ... it's
simply
> > to make sure that people have a reasonable minimum level of
qualification
> > to operate safely and with a minimum potential for interference to other
> > radio services ... nothing more, nothing less. It is NOT to "make
someone
> > prove they are 'dedicated enough' by making them 'work hard' for their
> > license."
> >
> > Too damned many people value their license for what they perceive as
> > some sort of epic, heroic effort that they made to get it, rather than
for
> > what it allows them to do (and the latter is where the value of the
license
> > lies).
>
> That's SOP human behavior, it's all about pecking orders. On the
> job,in the hobbies, it's everywhere and it started when our
> predecessors decided that living on the ground was a better idea than
> living in trees. Fuggem all, I ignore it.

But too much of ham culture is built around this pecking order (and
attempting at all costs to maintain it) ... that hurts ham radio and I
would like to see it die away with the new generation of hams.

73,
Carl - wk3c

1029. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 14:37:42 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030126093742.01476.00000231@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 60162

>Subject: Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 1/25/03 3:27 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030125162712.08273.00000138@mb-cq.aol.com>

>>Why is a new Tech allowed to design/build/adjust/repair/align and operate a
>>1500 W transmitter on 50.020 CW, (or any other authorized band/mode above 50
>>MHz), but if said Tech wants to use a 1.5 watt transmitter on 3.520 MHz CW,
>>he/she must take two more written tests totalling 85 questions?
>
>The only fair solution now is to eliminate the code test.

The code test, Vipul, CANNOT be eliminated until the international treaty,
of which the United States is a signatory, has been itself deleted or ammended.

And please note Jim's comments were relative to the WRITTEN tests, NOT the
code test.

>The important thing
>is to have RELAVANCE. Tying the code to the General class forces
>non-relavance
>to the licence class. You seem to agree with this

Yep, and the code test, at present, is VERY relevent, since it is requied
by same said treaty if you seek privileges on frequencies below 30mHz.

BTW, Lennie the Liar Anderson will tell you it's NOT a "treaty", but I
suggest you ignore him and rely on the comments of Mr. Phil Kane in that
regard. Mr Kane is a professional communications lawyer with decades of
practice as opposed to Lennie's barracks lawyering...Not a good place for
reputable information.

>>Why did I have to
>>learn about UHF/VHF, transistors, SSB, FM, and a variety of other
>>things just so I could work Morse on 7010?
>
>Sounds like an only-coder!

Then you are incredibly ignorant and did not pay attention to what Jim
said, Vipul. Please try to exceed our expectations.

Steve, K4YZ

1030. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 14:40:40 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030126094040.01476.00000232@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 60163

>Subject: Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 1/25/03 6:29 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030125192919.03463.00000209@mb-cr.aol.com>

>Ergo, there is NO justification for any morse code test other than
> a politically-biased (in favor of morsemen) recommendation.

I suggest that you go back and review the numerous posts by Mr. Phil
Kane, a communications lawyer of some years experience on the matter, Lennie.

Your assertions do not match reality.

>A morse code test is thus little more than a hazing ritual demanded
> by some long-time amateur morsemen to make all newcomers
> jump through the same hoops they had to long ago

A tale of some magnificent proportion. Again.

Putz.

Steve, K4YZ

1031. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 14:57:08 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030126095708.01476.00000233@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 60164

>Subject: Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 1/25/03 6:29 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030125192918.03463.00000208@mb-cr.aol.com>

>No again. The PCTAs have been worn out and beaten to
> the ground. They don't have any valid arguments whatsoever
> to keep the code test...all they have are many and varied
> personal insults leveled at NCTAs

Lennie, YOU are the ONLY one in here ranting about the code test and it's continuuation beyond WRC-03. I don't know of a single one of us who favor Morse Code use OR testing that has not expressed the thought that the test is gone, and time to move on.

YOU, however, have been the only impediment to changing "policy" topics to other AMATEUR RADIO policy matters.

>Tsk, tsk, tsk.

Tsk, tsk, tsk is right. How shameful that you act the way you do when your conduct and foolheartyness is so transparent...and archived so accuarately.

>>There are some former Soviet entities in eastern Europe which now have
>>the same clout at WRCs as Foggy Bottom has and the little bit of
>>traffic on the subject I've seen so far indicates that they very well
>>could be yer "ringers".
>
> Ah! The "insider" at WRCs and WARCs who "knows" what
> happens there and "who has clout."

For anyone who has been following the progress of the issue (which Lennie Anderson obviously has NOT), one knows this to be true. The "position" of former Soviet entities and many African "nations" is dubious. However they have the exact same number of votes as the United States does in these issues...ONE. Cesspools like Yemen, Somalia and Zimbabwe can out vote the United States if they choose to.

>Kellie had better get up to speed and with the program.

Pot/kettle/black. Anderson's awareness and comprehension of Amateur Radio related issues is thin, to say the least.

>Ey, youse wan' anudder hoagie ta munch, tuff guy?

Does it have the same crow YOU are used to eating, Oh Unlicensed Putz?

1032. Re: ONLY 8 HOURS UNTIL THE LIBERTY NET! (part II)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 14:58:30 UTC
From: RedOctober90@space.com
Message-ID: <9553ed5f.0301260658.5101afd6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60165
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

RedOctober90@space.com (RedOctober90) wrote in message
news:<9553ed5f.0301251627.2c45cb8a@posting.google.com>...
> "tinkle balls" <waawatersd@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:<3e32e4d4@snipnews.snip.net>...
> > Links to radio programs where the Liberty Net
> > participants get all of their "information". This is a
> > list of kook USA domestic shortwave programs with
> > a political or religious flavor which have been the
> > traditional sources of "pay-triot" gossip. While your
> > waiting for the Liberty Net, if your looking for premium
> > unleaded 93 octane paranoia, check out
> > the info to the SW programs shown on these links:
> >
> > http://www.cybercoffee.org/radio/sw_mon_weekday.html
> >
> > http://www.cybercoffee.org/radio/radio.html
> >
> > http://www.assaultweb.net/cgi-bin/ultimatebb.cgi?ubb=forum;f=42
> >
> > http://www-2.cs.cmu.edu/afs/cs.cmu.edu/user/jeffrey/www/loons/
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
> 0 2 4 6 8 10
> /
> /
> /
> /
> /
> /
> /
> /
> TROLL-O-METER

Lol just kidding there..... I tuned into the net last night for the
first time and listened for an hour or so. Absolutely hillarious, you

had this one guy jamming the net with CW by literally pounding on the morse keyer. These other guys were saying "this isn't CB turn your microphone gain down now" And then this other guy came on and "nicely" asked for them to turn down the power.

lmao!!

1033. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 15:19:05 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0301260719.4750d2df@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60166

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0301251525.4a3c0e3e@posting.google.com>...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0301250813.66af407e@posting.google.com>...
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0301241515.5018da17@posting.google.com>...
> > > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030124100213.01401.00000141@mb-mk.aol.com>...
> > > > >Subject: Re: NR-1 Book
> > > > >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> > > > >Date: 1/24/03 7:18 AM Central Standard Time
> > > > >Message-id: <f45722ac.0301240518.184ce709@posting.google.com>
>
> > > > >RRAA is full of character assassination
> > > >
> > > > It's not "character assassination" if it's true, Brain.
> > > >
> > > > Steve
> > >
> > > Have you followed the Fractenna assassination for the last 4 years or so, Steav?
> >
> > Right: One little piece of completely ignorable ongoing nonsense in
> > RRAA and you just had to land on it. No surprise at all, the other 98%
> > of RRAA is so far over yer empty head you can't even start to deal
> > with it.
> >
> > Go back to yer rubber ducky.
> >
> > w3rv
>
> Empty Head, I've discussed the t2fd and similar antennas on rraa.
> According to your experts they do not work and they cannot work (dummy
> load).

That's right, the t2fd is an extremely inefficient antenna on most
freqs because most of the power ya put to one is wasted heating the
resistor in the thing. It's a terrible antenna for ham purposes,
anybody with half a brain and the same space a t3fd needs can put up a
far more efficient antenna for 1/10 the cost of a t2fd. That leaves
you out.

Then they'll tell you how they contacted Australia with a
> light bulb when they were kid hams.

That leaves you out again.

> You deal with it.

I have, no problem.

w3rv

1034. Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 15:19:37 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030126101937.02227.00000265@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 60167

>Subject: Re: Why Dave has such a p*ss poor attitude
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 1/25/03 6:29 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030125192917.03463.00000207@mb-cr.aol.com>

>The "using CW (manual keying) as an order-wire...(SNIP)

Whew...Lennie the Lame strikes again.

He frequently chastises othrs for "1930-s era practice", yet can only come up with ONE rant to supposedly undermine Dave Heil. And all of Lennie's "radio operating (and what HE call's "DXing") comes from a 3 year active hitch in the Army in the mid fifties)

What a loser. The SAME loser who has no license, has no vested interest in Amateur Radio, and who finds it necessary to embellish his service career by making up war stories about rear area radio stations and how HE allegedly operated 24/7, single handedly passing 1.2 million pieces of traffic.

The SAME loser who makes promises he doesn't keep, makes allegations he cannot substantiate, and who has no real reason for being in this forum save to antagonize and harrass.

Lennie...we've heard your rant before. We see through the lies, and NO ONE (except maybe Brian, who doesn't know regulations and Vipul, who doesn't know anything) believes you.

You are lying. You are untruthful. Your "facts" are "cut-and'paste" at best, and usually a day late and a dollar short as it applies to AMATEUR RADIO practice.

You are OUTTED. Get over it.

1035. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 15:24:31 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030126102431.02227.00000266@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 60168

>Subject: Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 1/26/03 12:43 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030126014351.20835.00000254@mb-fy.aol.com>

>> I get "feely" too.... <ggg>
>
> Poor baby.

"Poor baby"...?!?! How long is it since YOU touched ANYTHING that wasn't
attached to you at birth?

>> Yeah - my pro bono clients want discounts... <ggg>
>
> I would think the anti-Bono clients want much more.
>
> Or do you favor modern music?

More insensitive crap at the expense of a dead man.

Come to think of it, you DO have a track record with trying to make
yourself look good at the expense of dead men. Why was I surprised...?!?!

>Overruled on acount of trying to use hearsay as evidence.

As opposed to YOUR "evidence" of dishonesty at the ARRL...?!?!

>> And the "location" was 'sposed to be a small rural village in
>> Mexico, where LADWP-type facilities were not very common...
>
> DWP doesn't service inland Mexico, senior.

That was the point he was making, Ya Twit.

>Case dismissed.

But the facts are still there...Lennie's a Putz. That's always open!

1036. Re: This Is How KB1HMW "Supports" Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 15:25:39 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030126102539.02227.00000267@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 60169

>Subject: Re: This Is How KB1HMW "Supports" Amateur Radio
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 1/25/03 5:17 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0301251517.6ef25c74@posting.google.com>

>I see a trend. Wings and Halo's. He must be an angel.

Compared to you two...?!?!...I dare say!

Steve, K4YZ

1037. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 15:36:50 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030126103650.20835.00000258@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 60170

In article <AWKY9.3471$d66.350878@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
<kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG> writes:

>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
>:
>: In other words, not that many, because you'd tell us the number if it
>: were significant. I've never seen an NCI membership number over 4000,
>
>73, OM, de Hans, K0HB
>--
> FISTS 7419
> NCI 4304
>
OK, make that 4400. Works out to no more than 3400 NCI members. And I know of a
few who have resigned their membership. Plus memberships do not expire, even if
the members do.

Did someone say "majority"?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1038. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 15:36:54 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030126103654.20835.00000259@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 60171

In article <ZWIY9.973$N5.547433@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

(N2EY wrote):

>>For example, in order to understand the regs that define
>>the 40
>> meter band as being from 7.000 to 7.300 MHz, you have to understand what a
>>MHz
>> is, so technical questions on MHz are needed to insure that the regs are
>> understood.
>
>OK ... I'll go along with that ...
>
>> But the written exams go far beyond that level.
>
>Sure ... because to prevent interference to other services, one needs to
>know
>more than "1 MHz = 1,000,000 cycles/sec and and the band edges are X to Y"

But not that much more. For example, you need to know the bandwidths of various
signals so that the entire signal is inside the band.

But the written tests go far beyond those basics needed to understand and
comply woth the rules and regs.
>
>> >> >not knowing some of the technical
>> >> >aspects can:
>> >> >
>> >> >result in interference to other services
>> >>
>> >> How? The rules and regs cover things like allowed frequencies and
>> >>modes.
>
>They also cover things like signal purity, modulation, out of band
>emissions, and many more things that require a certain level of
>technical knowledge to understand and comply with to a reasonable
>level of surety.
>
All of which is covered by the Tech test, acording to the FCC. Techs are
allowed to use every mode authorized to the amateur service, so FCC must think
the Tech test contains adequate questions and testing on "signal purity,
modulation, out of band emissions, and many more things that require a certain
level of technical knowledge to understand and comply with" the rules "to a
reasonable level of surety."

It's just plain logical, Carl. The only disagreement you've expressed here with the current written testing for Tech is over power levels, not modes or bands. So, according to your logic, the current 35 question Tech test contains all of the testing needed to insure that hams have clean signals, and keep them from interfereing with other services. It logically follows that the only additional testing for HF/MF access that is "relevant" or "necessary" is the regs concerning the HF/MF ham bands. Right?

>> >> How
>> >> can ignorance of things like how a DDS synthesizer works result in
>> >> interference with other services?
>> >
>> >Not knowing how a DDS works could result in programming it incorrectly,
>> >causing out of band emissions.
>>
>> But there is no requirement that hams use DDS, let alone program them. The
>> test
>> does not guarantee that any ham knows how to program a DDS, either.
>
>But we are ALLOWED to use them (and they are becoming more popular
>because of the significant advantages they can provide over old-fashioned
>VFOs) ...

DDS also has significant disadvantages, too. And then there's PLL.

But all of that misses the point. No ham is REQUIRED to use a DDS, just as no ham is REQUIRED to use Morse code. So if there is no reason to test Morse code because Morse use is not required, there is no reason to test for DDS knowledge, because DDS use is not required.

If someone wants to use Morse or DDS on the ham bands, the rules make it clear that they are responsible for the proper use. What is wrong with freedom of choice of modes and technology, as long as they meet the regs?

> it is clearly necessary to understand the basics of how a DDS
>works
>to understand the principles necessary to correctly program it to operate on
>a certain frequency (and/or to figure out why it's not working right) ...

Sure - and that stuff can be learned as/when the decision is made to use DDS.

How many hams are actually using homebrew and self-programmed DDS rigs? How many manufactured ham rigs using DDS allow the user to easily reprogram the DDS? Answer: not many.

>> So the test questions on DDS do nothing to prevent interference to other
>> services. They are in the "hoop" category.
>
>No ... as I've explained above, they are not in the "hoop" category ...
>they are legitimate questions on technical qualifications ...

You have not made that point at all. Indeed, you've proven just the opposite point.

Now if you say that hams need to be tested on DDS because they may, at some point, decide to use DDS, then by the same logic they must be tested on manual Morse because they may, at some point, decide to use manual Morse.
>
>> >Not knowing (fill in some technical thing here) could also result in the
>> >ham
>> >having no clue that his radio was malfunctioning and creating
>> >interference
>> >(let alone how to fix it ...)
>>
>> Possibly. But there is no requirement that any ham use a particular
>>technology,
>> let alone a particular rig. The tests provide no assurance whatsoever that
>>any
>> particular ham knows how his/her rig actually works, or when it is not
>>working
>> right.
>
>All of the rigs available today work on rather well-established principles
>that should be (at least reasonably) understood by those who use them.

Why? There is no requirement that hams must repair their own rigs, just that those rigs meet the applicable technical specs.

>Heck ... when I took my novice test, there were questions about how
>oscillators worked ...

Not at the level needed to insure that an oscillator was working properly.
>
>> Even at your level of technical knowledge, can you guarantee that there is
>>no
>> possible malfunction of your ham gear that would go undetected by you?
>
>Nothing in live is 100% ...

In other words: NO

>However, the probability that I would recognize a malfunction (or understand
>the implications of a bad signal report, etc.) are higher because I was
>required
>to demonstrate at least a reasonable level of technical knowledge through
>the
>written tests.

How?
>
>Besides, I have test equipment that many hams don't have and check my
>gear on a pretty regular basis as preventative maintenance ...
>
And if it fails the day after a test?

Fact is, very few hams are cited by the FCC for technical problems nowadays. Just look at the enforcement letters. In fact, the big technical trouble Riley

faces wrt hams is getting commercial electric power companies (run by professionals) to clean up their line noise.

>> End result is that many if not most of the technical questions fall into
>>the
>> "hoop" category.
>
>I'm beginning to think that Hans' question as to whether you were
>laying the ground work for NTI (No Test International) may have
>been on the mark :-)

Nope. I'm just applying your logic of minimal testing on an equal basis to all ham radio testing.

>WHY are you so intent on eliminating all of
>the technical content?

WHERE do you get the idea that I'm against technical content? Nowhere do I say that. I simply point out the logical consequences of the minimal testing philosophy. And I point out that if one is going to call Morse testing "hoop jumping" because Morse use is a choice, then the same phrase can be applied to much of the writtens.

Ask Minnie the typist or Sally the lawyer or Tom the bus driver.
>
>And why are not all the "dumbing downers" not coming out of the
>woodwork to flame the hell out of you? (I guess it's ok to dumb
>down the technical part, but Morse is sacred, right???)

Nope. They see the logical validity of my argument. A hoop is still a hoop, regardless of its form.

And I do not concern myself with trolls, flamers, agitators and those more intent on personal attack than logical discussion.
>
>> >> Why is a Morse test "hoop jumping", but not the
>> >> writtens beyond the Tech?
>> >
>> >Because of what we're allowed to do in terms of repairing, modifying,
>> >adjusting, tinkering with, and even building our own equipment.
>>
>> FCC disagrees. They say the Tech written is adequate for doing all of
>>those
>> things to VHF/UHF/microwave ham gear. Is HF/MF ham gear somehow more
>>dangerous
>> or complex than VHF/UHF ham gear?

Well?

It's interesting that you duck the important questions, like that one.

>>
>> >We

>> >are the only radio service (other than the Experimental Radio Service
>> >under Part 5, which is limited to very specific uses) that allows such
>> >flexibility ... in return, we owe an obligation to demonstrate at least a
>> >minimum level of technical understanding and competence.
>>
>> Which the Technician test does - according to the FCC. Except for the
>> HF/MF-specific parts, the rest of the General and Extra writtens falls
>into the
>> "hoop" category - by your definition.
>
>As I stated in another message, my *personal view* (based on my
>professional experience) is that the Tech test does not justify 1500W
>privs ... and that the VAST majority of Techs would probably not
>care if they were limited to the sorts of powers that most commercial
>2m and 440 rigs put out ... say 50ish watts ...

OK, fine. But that only involves power level/RF safety, not signal purity and
the like.

>I think the General test should be good for, say 250w ... and that
>1500W should be limited to Extras (not that I have any plans of
>running that power, in fact, I wouldn't care if Extras were limited
>to 500w ... or even 250W) ... as I've said, there's much more
>"bang for the buck" in better antennas and better modulation/coding

Better than SSB?

>than in brute force power
>(if more hams were more technically knowledgable,
>they'd know that and there'd be a lot less cross-town rag chewing
>with full legal limit in violation of the minimum power rule ...)
>
>Now, I realize that there are old time Generals who will give up
>their linears when they are pried from their cold, dead hands ...
>there is an implemenation problem here, in the sense of "taking
>away" something from some ... so, while I don't think the FCC
>would implement these power limits, I think they *should* ...
>
>> So the FCC is WRONG? But they are "the expert agency charged
>> with managing the non-federal-govt. use of the radio spectrum that
>> belongs to all of us."!!!
>
>As above, nothing is 100% ... I disagree with the FCC on the power
>limits vs. technical knowledge required ... but that is a vestige of
>the past that they are sort of politically stuck with ... you know the
>history of how some old timers lost privs (and some are still bitching
>about it 50 years later ...)

Not me - and I was there, lost the privs, yada yada. It was 34 years ago. At
least I had the privs to lose.
>
>> >> Or is it that FCC wants hams to "jump through the hoop" of taking more

>> >> written
>> >> tests in order to get more HF privileges?
>> >
>> >At least those "hoops" are based on a demonstration of RELEVANT and
>> >important qualifications,
>>
>> So you agree that they ARE "hoops" and not necessary requirements!
>
>NO ... I made the mistake of trying to stay consistent with your
>terminology ... I do NOT believe that the technical content in
>the written tests are irrelevant "hoops to be jumped through ... that's
>why I use the phrase "based on a demonstration of RELEVANT and
>important qualifications" ... you're smart enough to know what I
>meant, so please stop playing word games ...

No games. I just pointed out logical inconsistencies in your arguments.
>
>> Is it really all about the numbers, then?
>
>No ... it's about REASONABLE, RELEVANT QUALIFICATIONS.

"Reasonable" and "relevant" are in the eye of the beholder. Seems odd that you think Morse testing is neither, even though the mode is clearly thhe second most popular on amateur HF/MF, but all sorts of technical knowledge testing is reasonable and relevant, even though few hams homebrew from scratch anymore. (Except a few like me).
>
Compare the number of hams using Morse on HF to the number programming their own DDS systems.

And tell us:

Is HF/MF ham gear somehow more dangerous or complex than VHF/UHF ham gear?

if not, why is more technical knowledge needed to use HF than VHF/UHF?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1039. Re: Hot Fun In The Summertime With Brian

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 15:38:06 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030126103806.02227.00000268@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 60172

>Subject: Re: Hot Fun In The Summertime With Brian
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 1/25/03 5:46 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0301251546.47ee33fa@posting.google.com>

>Yes, I declined to go to jump school, yet my service continued. How
>can that be if I declined further service? How could I decline if it
>were involuntary?

Do you read what you write, Brian? Do you read what was quoted?

I don't think so...

>Oh, the possiblities!

You said it. You tell only half the story, then try to retort with "the
rest of the story (with apologies to Paul Harvey) in a later post.

Funny!

>Perhaps I served under protest? Yeh, that's it. I got a concentious
>ojector status to jump school.

"concentious ojector"...?!?!

>Only your imagination knows.

My imagination HAS to try and fill in the half-filled blanks your rants
and foolhearty stories leave, Brain. It get's quite a workout on occassion.

>So, your second pass at it failed. No suprise. At this point I would
>say you are a moron.

I am sure you would...NOW, where are your T5 logs, and what permission did
you have to operate from an area under UN jurisdiction?

>Would you like to try for moron squared? I think you're capable. Go
>for it.

Brain, Brain, Brain...you're reading YOUR quotes...Sorry. I am not the
one who cannot tell the difference between operational authorization and DXCC
validity.

>> You are as confused and idiotic as can be, Brain. And it get's more
>> hillarious as you try to deny it. Kinda like insisting how "legal" your T5
>> operations were, and NOT having any evidence of it.
>
>I don't live in the past.

Your contact with the present isn't very well established either.

>>It doesn't take more than one pass to undermine your rants, Brian.
>It's
>> very simple, really.
>
>No rant here. But you do get awfully wrapped around the axle on
>things you have little understanding of - such as words.

Pot/kettle/black.

>> >Someday when you go SK, someone is likely to see those wings
>> >in your collection and try to bury you in Arlington.
>>
>>Nope...Anyone who is anyone knows it's what's in your SRB that counts.
>
>So you really are out of luck.

For burial in Arlington...?!?! This time you got one right, but it's one
I never said otherwise, Brain. I don't deserve to be buried there. And even if
I did, I would decline it. There's a reserved plot for me right next to my
daughter, thank you ver much.

>So you really are out of luck

Not where you're concerned.

Steve, K4YZ

1040. Re: Hot Fun In The Summertime With Brian

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 15:41:13 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030126104113.02227.00000269@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 60173

>Subject: Re: Hot Fun In The Summertime With Brian
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 1/26/03 12:23 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030126012356.18366.00000266@mb-ma.aol.com>

>In article <f45722ac.0301251546.47ee33fa@posting.google.com>,
>brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>>I don't live in the past.
>
> All the PCTAs in here seem to do that.

Whew! Gee Lennie, coming from a guy whose one-and-only radio operating experience came from a 3-year active stint in the Army in the mid-fiftes, I'd say there's a whole lot of that "pot/kettle/black" thing going on with your commetns there, Buddy Boy!

Putz!~

1041. Re: Hot Fun In The Summertime With Brian

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 15:48:32 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030126104832.02227.00000270@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 60174

>Subject: Re: Hot Fun In The Summertime With Brian
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 1/26/03 6:13 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0301260413.26e9e8c7@posting.google.com>

>> A long time ago...like back when he was "in hostile action
>> seven times" in the USMC. Unverified, of course, not a
>> single reference.

>He's welcome to post his expeditionary awards if he likes. One thing
>though, he's got real "military background."

"Expeditionary awards" are presented to MOST excusions wherein a hostile force is faced.

Sorry you didn't get a chance to find that out.

>> Now watch Sgt Putz come roaring in on that one!

No roaring. Just facts. You may feel the need to re-create and embellish your Army "career" from time-to-time as you see fit, Lennie...I don't.

Watching the two of you dance together is really heartwarming!

A rear step forward for civil rights.

1042. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 16:39:02 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030126113902.02227.00000272@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 60175

>Subject: Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 1/26/03 12:23 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030126012359.18366.00000268@mb-ma.aol.com>

>There are many with that overt attitude in here. Stupid. None of the
> FCC operator license tests have any academic validity.

As pointed out to you repeatedly, at least two academic organizations in YOUR area, (at least as late as 1991), assigned elective credit to Amateur Radio and GROL licensure as well as Private/Commercial Pilots), those being Saddleback Community College in Mission Viej and Orange Coast Community College in Costa Mesa.

I've not been in CA since 1992 so cannot speak for current policy, however SBCC granted me 3 elective credits for my Amateur Extra license and 3 for my Airman's Certificate. I was granted another total of 3 credits based upon correspondence courses completed in the Marine Corps, and 6 hours for classroom work in the Corps. Lastly, I received 3 credits from OCCC for completing the US Navy Group Paced Instructor Course.

None of the courses I completed was conducted by an agency with "any academic validity" (ie: accredited secondary institution), yet the credit was accepted for degree purposes.

>The FCC is
> not chartered as an academic organization. Never was.

It doesn't have to be.

ACT-PEP assigns ton's of credit to countless licenses, certificates and other verifyable pursuits as credit towards any number of college degrees.

>Bad form, OM. You are scrabbling on more minutae in a classic
> reducto ad absurdum counter which is totally invalid.

Whew...Pot...kettle...black. I hate throwing facts in your face and serving you crow, Lennie, but you insist on it.

>No, no, no. You cannot RE-define things already defined...you are
> NOT the Final Arbiter of that.

And YOU are...?

>Try staying with the program and the very distinct difference between
> technical and legal subjects and a purely ear-mind cognition skill
> that involves absolutely NO theory whatsoever.

And please try remembering that the code issue has been dealt it's fate as far as the FCC is concerned...We are simply waiting for the finality of the ITU to change the legal bindings of it. That you don't accept it is irrelevent. I don't particularly like it, but I accept it.

>Sure looks like Andy...oops, I mean Jimmie spends much time
> in here trying to FORCE his old ideas into everyone.

Man-o-man...You ARE heavy on the "pot/kettle/black" mode today, aren't you?

>Stuff it, Jimmie. Quit trying to put words on someone else's messages
> that weren't written by others.

Like I said...

>>What it really comes down to is that you use phrases like "force", "hazing
>>ritual" and "jumping through hoops" selectively.
>
> ...there you go again, putting words in others' writings. BAD form, OM.

Ooooops! There goes Lennie ! ! LYING again. Those ARE words YOU use repetitively. You've used them in the context of Morse Code testing within the last 12 hours.

>You think it is OK to force morse code down everyone whether
> it is not justifiable. No problem, Jimmie. We all know what you
> are trying to do here...

And we know what YOU are trying to do...You've been "outted", and the funny thing is you did it to yourself.

>>More put-downs and loaded phraseology. Why not just say "there's no reason
>for
>>Morse to have it's own stand-alone pass-fail test anymore?"
>
> ...damn! There you go AGAIN trying to act the editor! You are NOT
> one of those, don't have the authority.

The problem for YOU is he's right, Lennie. That is the ONE and ONLY reason to "delete" Morse Code testing. While Morse Code use may not have any place with commercial shipping or widespread use in the Armed Forces, it DOES have wide basis and applicability in the AMATEUR Service.

>Try opening your mind to "listen" to others that don't believe in
> your little morse-ist cult following.

Like YOU open YOUR mind to getting licensed and PARTICIPATING in Amateur Radio...yeah...right....

>You think you have a hammer. If that's all you have then
> everything looks like a nail to you. Others don't have that
> viewpoint.

There we are with that "pot/kettle/black" thing again. I am willing to bet if we deleted all attributions, smileys, etc, you'd have a hard time differentiating your stuff from that of those whom you claim to be so "closed

minded".

>It was the commercial and military people who pioneered SSB
> beginning in the 1930s, based on landline frequency-division
> multiplex "carrier" systems of 15 years earlier.

But it was Amateur Radio that was the impetus for experimentation and
applications.

>Bwahahahaha...hehehehehehe...snicker, snicker...

Find your fly open again, did you...?!?!

1043. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 16:48:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030126114800.02227.00000273@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 60176

>Subject: Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 1/26/03 3:45 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3E33AE54.3010704D@earthlink.net>

>It is amazing just how quickly you snipped all the stuff referencing Key
>Officer listings and got the hell off that subject before revealing any
>more of your ignorance. You're quite the tap dancer

Yep! Give credit where credit is due I always say, Dave! If Lennie can do ANTYTHING well, it's two-step his way out of demostrations of ignorance that he got HIMSELF into. But lately he can't even do that well.

73

Steve, K4YZ

1044. Re: Hot Fun In The Summertime With Brian

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 16:59:52 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030126115952.02227.00000274@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 60177

>Subject: Re: Hot Fun In The Summertime With Brian
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
>Date: 1/26/03 9:48 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030126104832.02227.00000270@mb-bk.aol.com>

> "Expeditionary awards" are presented to MOST excusions wherein a hostile
>force is faced.

Oooops...My bust...NOT presented to MOST excursions wherein hostile force
is faced.

Steve, K4YZ

1045. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 17:36:59 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030126123659.00690.00000216@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 60179

In article <7dSY9.1052$N5.598152@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
>news:d22b54c3.0301260132.25ece4c1@posting.google.com...
>> I don't know how far along Ed was on the
>> academic path to his EE but I'll bet bucks on the fact that he was no
>> stranger to electronics when he "breezed" thru his General. Minnie
>> would have a much different view yes? Certainly.
>
>How many bucks??? IIRC, Ed was 13 or 14 when he got his
>general.

Yup - and it got him all amateur privileges back then, for the "price" of a 13 wpm code test and the written of that time.

Was Ed a stranger to electronics at that time, or had he been a Novice, assembled a working station, made QSOs, etc.etc.? Maybe even built a rig or two?

Certainly not a stranger to electronics.

For the record, I got my Tech (same written as General back when) and Advanced at the age of 14. 'Twas the summer between 8th and 9th grade. Wasn't unusual at all, back then. Extra took two more years, only because FCC used to make hams have at least 2 years experience as General or above before they could even try the Extra. Some might say FCC made us "jump through the experience hoop".

>Being a ham is way motivated him to a career in radio
>electronics.

"Radio electronics"? I thought he was an EE.

Being a ham motivated me to go to EE school, get a couple of EE degrees, and to have a career in EE.

But not all hams start out that way. Nor are all hams motivated towards EE or related areas. Many of the best hams I know are public-service types - EMTs, volunteer firefighters, etc. Also the type who help out at events like the NYC Marathon. They come from all walks of life, hold all classes of license, and have varied levels of technical knowledge. But in a real-world emergency, any one of them will do more good than a dozen clueless-about-emergencies EEs.

>
>> > The written tests aren't an EE final ... never were, never were meant
>> > to be, never should be.
>>
>> Could not agree more.

Been there, done that, got the sheepskin. Funny thing, though - lotta EEs are clueless about practical radio. EE is a very wide field, of which radio is a tiny part.
>>
>> > The issue is that some folks are PO'd that people who already know
>> > all the radio stuff don't have to work as hard as they did (because they
>> > didn't know the radio stuff ...
>>
>> That's stupid on their part.
>
>Tell THEM that ... it's "dog in the manger" and "work ethic" BS ...

"dog in the manger"??
>
>> > many still don't ... I know other
>> > extras
>> > who don't have a clue on the technical side.

Why single out Extras? Lots of clueless folks out there. As long as they don;t break the rules, what's the problem?
>>
>> Hell yeah! But is that necessarily bad? And if yes why?
>
>Any ham who doesn't meet the intended level of technial
>proficiency for his/her license class is a bad thing in my view,
>because we are supposed to be a technical service ... read
>97.1 again ...

So who determines what the "intended level of technical proficiency" for a given license class is? And who determines whether a given ham meets that level?

FCC seems to think most hams meet the intended level, given the fact that very few licenses are pulled for technical knowledge insufficiency, and practically all renewals and upgrades are routinely approved.

IOW, FCC sez those "extras who don't have a clue on the technical side" you mention meet the intended level, because FCC keeps renewing their licenses.
>
>> The last president of the club to which I belong is the recently
>> retired head of the department of opthalmology at one of the big-name
>> med schools. Another former prez is an EE who was a VP at General
>> Electric before he took a buyout. Neither of 'em could design a piece
>> of solid state ham equipment if their lives depended on it. Neither
>> can I. For instance.
>>
>> But then grease yer paddles and join those two in the ARRL CW dx bash
>> a few weeks from now out where the rubber actually hits road on the
>> airwaves. Normally they'll have logged another "DXCC" between 00 GMT
>> Friday evening and noon EST Sunday if not sooner. I understand you're
>> still working on your first, keep slugging and best of luck with it
>> Carl.
>

>I'm not "working on DXCC" ... I haven't haven't even been on HF
>since Dec. (something) ... does that sound like I'm a wild-eyed paper
>chaser to you???

They say the last 10 countries are as tough as the first 90.....
>
>> Then of course comes the current Prez who is a Postal Service truck
>> mechanic and the band-cleaning shop vac from hell . . . I'm sure you
>> get my drift eh?
>>
>> What yardstick do you use to quantify cluelessness? And why?
>
>Cluelessness is relative to the level of proficiency that the license
>class expects ... IOW, I would not consider a tech who didn't
>understand extra theory completely to be clueless ... he/she is
>a beginner and is supposed to be learning, not to know it all.
>On the other hand, since I used the phrase "know it all," I should
>clarify that I don't expect extras to "know it all" either ... because
>there is so much that goes beyond the content of the extra QP that
>NOBODY could be expected to know it ALL ...

So what's the yardstick?
>
>> > The point is that that the reason for licensing (and the tests) is NOT
>> > to
>> > "control the population" or to "keep out the 'unworthy' " ... it's
>> >simply
>> > to make sure that people have a reasonable minimum level of
>> >qualification
>> > to operate safely and with a minimum potential for interference to other
>> > radio services

what about interference to other hams?

>> >... nothing more, nothing less.

FCC thinks the Tech written is adequate qualification for showing that people
have a reasonable minimum level of
qualification to operate safely and with a minimum potential for interference
to other radio services on all amateur freqs and modes above 30 MHz. Why does
FCC require so much more written testing for full privs on amateur HF/MF? Sure,
there are HF/MF specific regs and propagation, but the General and Extra tests
go far beyond regs and propagation specific to HF/MF.

For example, how does knowing Thevenin equivalents and complex impedance
calculations help hams operate safely and with a minimum potential for
interference to other radio services?

>> >It is NOT to "make someone
>> > prove they are 'dedicated enough' by making them 'work hard' for their
>> > license."

Uh huh.
>> >
>> > Too

[expletive deleted]

>> >many people value their license for what they perceive as
>> > some sort of epic, heroic effort that they made to get it, rather than
>> >for
>> > what it allows them to do (and the latter is where the value of the
>license
>> > lies).

Who are you to judge why someone else values a thing? What is wrong with live
and let live?
>>
>> That's SOP human behavior, it's all about pecking orders. On the
>> job,in the hobbies, it's everywhere and it started when our
>> predecessors decided that living on the ground was a better idea than
>> living in trees. Fuggem all, I ignore it.

There's another angle, not just about pecking orders. People often do not value
that which they get easily. Until it's gone.
>
>But too much of ham culture is built around this pecking order (and
>attempting at all costs to maintain it) ... that hurts ham radio and I
>would like to see it die away with the new generation of hams.

Are you willing to give up your 2x1 vanity call to help make that happen? How
about reducing the number of license classes to one, so that all will be equal?
Perhaps we should all be limited to low power and simple antennas, to avoid
anyone being a "big gun". Maybe we need a Handicapper General, like in
"Harrison Bergeron", so that there will be no more "elitism" or "pecking
order".

I don't think so! But what about you?

Or does it come down to the idea that what bothers you is not the idea of a
pecking order, but rather the pecking order that exists vs. the one you want to
exist?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1046. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 17:37:34 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <y1VY9.7927$Gj3.6109@nwrddc02.gnilink.net>
Source record: 60178

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:uFlY9.609$N5.388816@nnrp1.ptd.net...
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> news:udeY9.5268$IN1.3658@nwrddc02.gnilink.net...
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> > news:GUdY9.532$N5.345124@nnrp1.ptd.net...
> > > Your argument goes back to the "work ethic" philosophy where folks
> > > argue that people shouldn't get a license without having to
"demonstrate
> > > their dedication by working hard (jumping through hoops) for it."
> > >
> > > Carl - wk3c
> >
> > Is "working hard (jumping through hoops)" in reference to the 5-wpm
exam?
> >
> > --
> > 73 de Bert
> > WA2SI
>
>
> Bert,
>
> It's in reference to any unnecessary requirement.

Why is a simple 5-wpm Morse exam an "unnecessary requirement?"

> Some folks think that
> the tests are "way easier" today than they were "in the good old days."

Probably not, but I could be wrong about that. I already had my GROL from my
college avionics curriculum when I took the writtens. I certainly
acknowledge that an interested soul would likely find the writtens
challenging without the benefit of prior electronics experience. The
equalizing factor being published Q&A pools, of course.

> The written tests aren't an EE final ... never were, never were meant
> to be, never should be.

Absolutely correct.

> The issue is that some folks are PO'd that people who already know
> all the radio stuff don't have to work as hard as they did (because they
> didn't know the radio stuff ... hell, many still don't ... I know other
> extras
> who don't have a clue on the technical side.

>
> The point is that that the reason for licensing (and the tests) is NOT to
> "control the population" or to "keep out the 'unworthy' " ... it's simply
> to make sure that people have a reasonable minimum level of qualification
> to operate safely and with a minimum potential for interference to other
> radio services ... nothing more, nothing less. It is NOT to "make someone
> prove they are 'dedicated enough' by making them 'work hard' for their
> license."

I agree, but I honestly don't know where all this "working hard" comes from.
I think many have lost sight of the bigger picture.

A. 5-wpm in NOT working hard, it's NOT "jumping through hoops, and many
believe (Myself included.) it's NOT an unnecessary requirement...it's a very
BASIC requirement. (Dare I say...entry-level.)

B. As for 5-wpm being an exclusionary tool...puh-lease. I'm also a CBer, the
very "malady" that some postulate that the "CW immunization" exists to
protect the bands from. The only group that a 5-wpm "discriminates" against
are those who don't even want to give it any serious effort to begin with.

C. The code test can no longer be considered exclusionary as there exists a
no-code license that allows entry into ham radio. Additional privileges
(Hey, remember that word?) can then be had by passing additional exams. (One
of them being Element 1.)

> Too damned many people value their license for what they perceive as
> some sort of epic, heroic effort that they made to get it, rather than for
> what it allows them to do (and the latter is where the value of the
license
> lies).

I agree, no heroic effort at all...just a "license to learn." ;-)

> 73,
> Carl - wk3c

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

1047. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 18:17:59 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E34263E.ABC93261@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60180

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> But too much of ham culture is built around this pecking order (and
> attempting at all costs to maintain it) ... that hurts ham radio and I
> would like to see it die away with the new generation of hams.

Ham culture? Carl, meet Vipul. Vipul, meet Carl. You two will get
along famously. Let me know when you guys decide on the definition of
an "only-coder".

Dave K8MN

1048. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 18:37:29 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030126133729.03156.00000158@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 60181

>Subject: Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade
>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>Date: 1/26/03 11:36 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030126123659.00690.00000216@mb-fm.aol.com>

>In article <7dSY9.1052$N5.598152@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
><wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>>Tell THEM that ... it's "dog in the manger" and "work ethic" BS ...
>
>"dog in the manger"??

To heck with the "dog in the manger", thing...I was shocked at the "work ethic BS" comment.

If we still had some of the 40's and 50's era "work ethic", perhaps we wouldn't be in the financial slump we are today...Instead, the 80's era "make it quick and effortlessly" has surpassed any real "work ethic", and we have since moved into the Burger King era of "My Way Right Away".

>FCC thinks the Tech written is adequate qualification for showing that people
>have a reasonable minimum level of
>qualification to operate safely and with a minimum potential for interference
>to other radio services on all amateur freqs and modes above 30 MHz. Why does
>FCC require so much more written testing for full privs on amateur HF/MF?
>Sure,
>there are HF/MF specific regs and propagation, but the General and Extra
>tests
>go far beyond regs and propagation specific to HF/MF.

This one's simple, Jim...Despite the rantings of "you-know-who" to the contrary, the FCC expects Amateurs to fulfill that "bureaucratic language" in 47CFR97.1 about creating a pool of technically qualified radio operators to fulfill that OTHER "bureaucratic language" about emergency communications.

If not, then the questions about why are there questions above and beyond mutual interference are valid.

The thing is the FCC does NOT write rules and regulations just for the sake of fulfilling some set pattern of "bureaucratic" writing style. They write rules and regulations to meet a need.

The present rules both meet a need and fulfill a goal.

>>> > Too
>
>[expletive deleted]

>
>>> >many people value their license for what they perceive as
>>> > some sort of epic, heroic effort that they made to get it, rather than
>>> >for
>>> > what it allows them to do (and the latter is where the value of the
>>license
>>> > lies).
>
>Who are you to judge why someone else values a thing? What is wrong with live
>and let live?

The fact of the matter is that SOME people must denigrate the fact that it
WAS a "epic" and "heroic" feat for others to complete. Failure to do so means
that someone did something better than the complainer did. All things are as
equally easy as THEY did it.

>There's another angle, not just about pecking orders. People often do not
>value
>that which they get easily. Until it's gone

Bingo.

>Or does it come down to the idea that what bothers you is not the idea of a
>pecking order, but rather the pecking order that exists vs. the one you want
>to
>exist?

Double bingo.

73

Steve, K4YZ

1049. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 18:53:15 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E342E82.3C27FAE1@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60182

Len Over 21 in Foghorn Lenhorn persona wrote:
>
> In article <20030125155347.04873.00000125@mb-cb.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes another volume in his on-going "Andy Rooney" wannabe
> column in here:
>
> >In article <kNyY9.652$N5.478853@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> ><wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>

> A single-crystal oscillator can make trouble just as easily as
> a PLL or DDS or Fractional-N synthesizer and produce RF
> outside of ham bands. US amateurs are not allowed to RF
> outside their alloted bands.

Part 15 aside, you aren't allowed to produce RF inside the amateur
bands.
It sort of evens out.

> Ahem. Morsemanship has NOTHING to do with ANY kind of
> technical smarts. None. Zip. Nada.

Who said it did? Morse testing addresses the operating side of things.
After all, an amateur license is, above all, permission to operate.
Permission to build a piece of amateur gear isn't required by the
government.

> >So the FCC is WRONG? But they are "the expert agency charged with managing
> >the non-federal-govt. use of the radio spectrum that belongs to all of us."!!!
>
> Stuff it, Jimmie. Quit trying to put words on someone else's messages
> that weren't written by others.

Your words. You use them or words like them all the time in here.
Don't forget your very recent, "Awwww. Don't like your own kind of
commentary coming right back to you? Tsk, tsk, tsk."

>
> >Yeah, me too, 1968, Philly FCC office. I was 14.
>
> You were LATE. Other kids did it at 6! You could have done it
> in 1960 and had 8 more years to brag about! Tsk, tsk, tsk.

Let's see...are you seventy yet, Len? How many decades back does your
supposed interest in amateur radio run? Wow--talk about LATE!

> >What it really comes down to is that you use phrases like "force", "hazing
> >ritual" and "jumping through hoops" selectively.
>
> ...there you go again, putting words in others' writings. BAD form, OM.

Really? You don't believe Carl's use of the terms to be selective? Did
he not use those terms?

> >You think it's OK to force new hams to take lots of written tests on
> >technical
> >material that is in no way necessary for the safe and legal operation of a
> >modern amateur radio station, yet you find even a 5 wpm code test to be
> >unacceptable.
>
> You think it is OK to force morse code down everyone whether
> it is not justifiable. No problem, Jimmie. We all know what you
> are trying to do here...
>
> >More put-downs and loaded phraseology. Why not just say "there's no reason for
> >Morse to have it's own stand-alone pass-fail test anymore?"
>
> ...damn! There you go AGAIN trying to act the editor! You are NOT
> one of those, don't have the authority.

Right. He should wise up to the fact that you consider yourself to have
filled the position. Tell him that we can't meet on HF to discuss
amateur radio policy matters while you're at it.

> >Try listening to the non-phone parts of the HF ham bands with an adequate
> >receiver, and see how much Morse is actually in use by hams today. Hardly
> >"arcane" or "cult". Hams use that mode by choice, not requirement.
>
> Try opening your mind to "listen" to others that don't believe in
> your little morse-ist cult following.

What is a "morse-ist cult"? Why is it "little"? Have you tried the
experiment Jim suggests? Regardless of what goes on in "the rest of the
radio world", radio amateurs use morse code widely today.

> You think you have a hammer. If that's all you have then
> everything looks like a nail to you. Others don't have that
> viewpoint.

Izzat your latest drill :)

> >Like what? SSB? It's a legacy from the 80 years ago.
>
> BWAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAH!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
>
> At best, Jimmie, FIFTY years ago. The 1950s. For amateur
> radio, that is...

> It was the commercial and military people who pioneered SSB
> beginning in the 1930s, based on landline frequency-division

> multiplex "carrier" systems of 15 years earlier.
>
> If less than ten amateurs "used SSB" in the 1930s, it is an
> exaggeration of the highest order to suddenly elevate those
> copiers-of-commercial techniques as "legacy operators."
>
> Bwahahahaha...hehehehehehe...snicker, snicker...

Why izzit that when you begin your rant of ancient morse tales, they
begin with landline telegraphy but when some mentions the age of SSB, it
has to be confined to amateur radio use? Can you say "double standard"?
You are soooooo
transparent.

Dave K8MN

1050. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 19:04:59 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <vjWY9.4607$d66.431261@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 60184

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote

:
: If we still had some of the 40's and 50's era "work ethic", perhaps
we
: wouldn't be in the financial slump we are today...Instead, the 80's era
"make
: it quick and effortlessly" has surpassed any real "work ethic", and we
have
: since moved into the Burger King era of "My Way Right Away".
:

An urban myth of gigantic proportions. Today's work force is so much more productive than the work force of the 40/50's that comparisons are made not in percentages, but in orders of magnitude.

73, de Hans, K0HB

1051. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 19:05:09 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E34314C.EA8533EF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60183

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3E32CE94.1407BB76@earthlink.net...
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> >
> > > At least those "hoops" are based on a demonstration of RELEVANT and
> > > important qualifications, rather than one's ability to practice an
> arcane
> > > method of communications that is more "art form" and "cult religion"
> than
> > > "necessary" in any reasonable way.
> >
> > Ahhh, the arrogant old Carl is back.
>
> What's arrogant about mu coment above? I consider it to be a purely
> accurate factual statement ... where's the arrogance?

The fact that you don't see the arrogance is interesting.

> > > What it demonstrates that reducing the code requirement allowed 10s of
> > > thousands of otherwise qualified individuals to upgrade ... the in
> itself
> > > clearly
> > > proves that 13 and 20 wpm Morse tests were an unnecessary and artificial
> > > barrier to entry into the higher classes of license and the additional
> privs
> > > that they convey.
> >
> > I love that "otherwise qualifed" phrase, Carl. Except for the part
> > about med school, I'm otherwise qualified to do heart surgery.
>
> Right ... and so is my Rotweiller ... your point is?

Yes! So is your Rotweiller! That IS my point. Like your tens of
thousands of "otherwise qualfied" amateur radio upgraders, neither your
dog nor I are really "otherwise qualified" unless the qualifications for
heart surgeons are significantly lowered.
>
> As long as people can pass the prescribed written tests, they are,
> by definition "otherwise qualified," with the exception of the remaining
> 5 wpm Morse test, to operate on HF.

You've used the same term, "otherwise qualified" individuals in
describing people who are not yet hams but who would flock to amateur

radio when and if morse testing is done away with.

> > The only
> > thing holding me back is that I'm not going to jump through their hoops.
>
> I think it would be more accurate to say that the only thing holding you
> back is a lack of the requisite intelligence and skill ... and that little
> thing called passing the tests and getting the license.

Yeah, that's what held back those "otherwise qualified" individuals who upgraded in amateur radio. They couldn't pass the test and get the license. A testing element had to be eased in order for them to do so.

Your comment about requisite intelligence and skill is an unknown to you.

> I have NEVER advocated that anyone should operate a radio without
> the prescribed license .. I would CERTAINLY recommend that you
> refrain from doing heart surgery ... I don't care if you get tossed into
> the can for practicing medicing without a license ... it's the potential
> victims that I'm thinking of.

Oh, I get it. You must have thought I was serious about heart surgery.

Dave K8MN

1052. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 19:07:16 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030126140716.03048.00000284@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 60185

>Subject: Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 1/26/03 12:53 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3E342E82.3C27FAE1@earthlink.net>

>Let's see...are you seventy yet, Len? How many decades back does your
>supposed interest in amateur radio run? Wow--talk about LATE!

Geeeeee......Wish we WERE talking about the late Lennie Anderson!

Be still my heart.

Steve, K4YZ

1053. Re: Why Dave has such a p*ss poor attitude

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 19:12:02 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E3432E5.8266EB56@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60186

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3E32CCE6.D8842848@earthlink.net...
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> >> > Yes ... assuming that you're refering to my behavior towards you,
> > > it's simple ... "Pompus, narrow-minded jerks irritate me>"
> >
> > I love it. Someone who can't spell "pompous" quotes himself. I assume
> > that your view assumes that anyone who doesn't buy into your grand
> > scheme is pompous and narrow-minded. You've not just used that method
> > with me.
>
> You have ADD, right Dave? I've mentioned several times that I have
> a bit of loss of feeling/coordination in my fingers due to a spinal injury.

I recall that. I don't see how your medical problem forced you to cut
and paste an old quote complete with its original spelling error.

> > > > How's the "experimentation" with chasing DX on SSB coming along?
> > >
> > > Another fiction of your warped mind, Dave ... I will work DX if I come
> > > across it, but I am not "chasing DX" in the sense of having a compulsion
> > > to collect wallpaper ... or, worse yet, participate in contests.
> >
> > Oh, excuse me. In one of your past incarnations here you were regaling
> > us with tales of your DXploits on SSB.
>
> Baloney ... I haven't bragged about "DXploits" ... I do believe I mentioned
> having a good time during a short stint at 4U1ITU while I was in Geneva
> for meetings at the ITU ... if I recall correctly, I said something like
> "What
> a change being at the center of a pileup ... worked 200 stations in 3
> hours."
> or something like that ... BFD ...

My recollection is of how many countries you'd worked from home on 10m.

> > > And, I have been so busy with important work work and 3 weeks
> > > of vacation with my wife's family in Mexico that I haven't even been
> > > on HF since Dec. 14th ...
> >
> > I'm sure you are doing very important work. How could they spare you
> > from the important work for three weeks in Mexico?
>

> 1) Even *I* get to take a vacation once in a while ... though this was the
> first in 2 years ...
> 2) It was the first time in the 10 years we've been together that my wife
> and I have been able to spend Christmas with her family ... I owed it to
> her ... we'd planned to do it a couple of other years, but something always
> came up.
> 3) Since most of my work these days is dealing with regulatory agencies,
> and most governments sort of shut down over the holiday season, it was
> easier to get away then than at other times
>
> (not that I have to justify my vacations to you ...)

I didn't ask for a travelogue or justification. I just wondered how you
could be spared from what you call "important work".

> > > As far as my "experimentation" goes, I'm in the design and simulation
> > > phase, but work obligations have limited the amount of time I've been
> > > able to devote ... but don't worry yourself... I seriously doubt that
> you
> > > are
> > > technically competent to actually understand it anyway ...
> >
> > Pompous, narrow-minded jerks irritate me. Did I mention your arrogance?
>
> In other words, you *wouldn't* understand it so you have to find some
> way to divert attention from that fact :-)

No, those aren't other words to describe what I typed. Your condescent
is noted.

Dave K8MN

1054. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 19:34:30 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <aLWY9.4663$d66.436249@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 60187

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote

:
: Geeeeee......Wish we WERE talking about the late Lennie Anderson!
:

What a sorry-assed comment that is!

I don't know Lennie very well --- I disagree with him on many issue related to amateur radio --- mostly he sounds like a pompous old grouch --- but publicly asserting that you wish he was "the late" Lennie Anderson goes way beyond even the bounds of "usenet" decency. The quote above makes you an industrial grade jerk --- no, make that an industrial grade asshole.

Hans

1055. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 20:03:36 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <saXY9.8421$Gj3.8255@nwrddc02.gnilink.net>
Source record: 60188

"K�HB" <k�hb@arrl.DOTORG> wrote in message
news:vjWY9.4607$d66.431261@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> An urban myth of gigantic proportions. Today's work force is so much more
> productive than the work force of the 40/50's that comparisons are made
not
> in percentages, but in orders of magnitude.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

The Element 1 issue notwithstanding, I have to agree with the above
statement in general wholeheartedly!

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

1056. Re: ONLY 8 HOURS UNTIL THE LIBERTY NET! (part II)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 20:59:27 UTC
From: porkbutt song <bigdicstuds@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3e344c75@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 60189
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

"RedOctober90" <RedOctober90@space.com> wrote in message
news:9553ed5f.0301260658.5101afd6@posting.google.com...
>
> Lol just kidding there..... I tuned into the net last night for the
> first time and listened for an hour or so. Absolutely hillarious, you
> had this one guy jamming the net with CW by literally pounding on the
> morse keyer. These other guys were saying "this isn't CB turn your
> microphone gain down now" And then this other guy came on and
> "nicely" asked for them to turn down the power.
>
> lmao!!

As someone once said....." I THINK HE'S GOT IT !! "

1057. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 21:02:32 UTC
From: porkbutt song <bigdicstuds@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3e344d34@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 60190

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030126101937.02227.00000265@mb-bk.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Why Dave has such a p*ss poor attitude
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >Date: 1/25/03 6:29 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20030125192917.03463.00000207@mb-cr.aol.com>
>
> >The "using CW (manual keying) as an order-wire...(SNIP)
>
> Whew...Lennie the Lame strikes again.
>
> He frequently chastises othrs for "1930-s era practice", yet can only
come
> up with ONE rant to supposedly undermine Dave Heil. And all of Lennie's
"radio
> operating (and what HE call's "DXing") comes from a 3 year active hitch in
the
> Army in the mid fifties)
>
> What a loser. The SAME loser who has no license, has no vested
interest in
> Amateur Radio, and who finds it necessary to embellish his service career
by
> making up war stories about rear area radio stations and how HE allegedly
> operated 24/7, single handedly passing 1.2 million pieces of traffic.
>
> The SAME loser who makes promises he doesn't keep, makes allegations
he
> cannot substantiate, and who has no real reason for being in this forum
save to
> antagonize and harrass.
>
> Lennie...we've heard your rant before. We see through the lies, and
NO
> ONE (except maybe Brian, who doesn't know regulations and Vipul, who
doesn't
> know anything) believes you.
>
> You are lying. You are untruthful. Your "facts" are "cut-and'paste"
at
> best, and usually a day late and a dollar short as it applies to AMATEUR
RADIO
> practice.
>

> You are OUTTED. Get over it.

Word floating around on 14.275 is Lennie is a big 20 Meter QRM'er.

1058. Re: Hot Fun In The Summertime With Brian

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 21:20:24 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030126162024.16280.00000697@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 60192

In article <f45722ac.0301260413.26e9e8c7@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> Now watch Sgt Putz come roaring in on that one! :-) :-) :-)
>
>He's welcome to post his expeditionary awards if he likes. One thing
>though, he's got real "military background."

Yes, it follows him around all over, then he sits on it. :-)

1059. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 21:20:24 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030126162024.16280.00000696@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 60194

In article <20030126101937.02227.00000265@mb-bk.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Sgt Putz Great American Hostile Action Hero) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Why Dave has such a p*ss poor attitude
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 1/25/03 6:29 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20030125192917.03463.00000207@mb-cr.aol.com>
>
>>The "using CW (manual keying) as an order-wire...(SNIP)
>
> Whew...Lennie the Lame strikes again.

Actually, I walk very well, no lameness at all.

The "use of CW as an RTTY order-wire" is ridiculous on the face of it...whether first claimed by Heil as an original innovation or, as later claimed, "State Department procedure."

Firstly, Sgt Putz, Renowned Hostile Action Hero, has NO experience in 24/7 military communications, any branch, any time, anywhere. His only claim to fame is as "communications officer" of some Tennessee STATE Guard, an organization NOT a part of any National Guard that doesn't take orders from any US military or even the President of the USA. [it's like a "sojer-in-da-woods" militia group but with pretty titles and medals]

Sgt Putz has NO real idea of what an "order wire" is, let alone any knowledge of how to use it. It has been explained in here but he still doesn't get it. He's never been on one. It is just the command circuit, one of many in one link to another station or terminal (in the case of landlines, where the term originated).

If one has a single RTTY circuit to someplace, the "order wire" is one and the same with regular message traffic, just a pause in the traffic to send information about the circuit.

Using manual telegraphy as an "order wire" on an RTTY circuit is a nonsense idea on the face of it. If the TTY works at all, then it can be used to send administrative information about the circuit just as well as regular message traffic. TTY does it faster than any manual telegraphy with the advantage of printed copies at both ends as well as the ability re-send in reverse to confirm good copy.

If "conditions are too bad to permit RTTY operation" (one of
Heil's original claims) then that single radio circuit cannot
handle either message traffic or order-wire information. It
should be a morse code radio circuit then, for both message
traffic and order-wire information. There is no mode mixing
and hasn't been so since the 1930s in worldwide
communications.

> He frequently chastises othrs for "1930-s era practice", yet can only
come
>up with ONE rant to supposedly undermine Dave Heil. And all of Lennie's
"radio
>operating (and what HE call's "DXing") comes from a 3 year active hitch in the
>Army in the mid fifties)

Incorrect in part. I make note of ADA and the entire ACAN because it
involved HF radio as the primary method of communications for the
Far East Command Headquarters in the 1950s. There were no satellites
then, no operational troposcatter, no reliable, secure undersea cables
to carry the mass of messages needed by an area command to/from
the USA. HF radio was primary.

Much has changed in military communications in the last half century.
DSN networking over fiber-optic cables includes various modes of
encryption and reaches all US military stations in the world. So does
military satellite communications. Multiple-circuit communications is
now a normal mode whether portable landline or portable troposcatter,
over military satellites, or over the DSN. HF radio is still available but
it has been relegated to a secondary or tertiary back-up status, not
used for much regular 24/7 communications.

For small-unit tactical communications digital radio (AN/PRC-119
family) has been operational for 14 years with excellent COMSEC
via FHSS and built-in (in SIP versions of the SINCGARS) digital
encryption for voice and/or data. VHF/UHF tactical radio has
secure modes compatible with SINCGARS, allowing networking
of ground, air, sea, or space (satellite) units. HF communications
capability is there but also relegated to secondary or tertiary back-
up status.

Some long-time radio AMATEURS still consider the ultimate peak
of radio practice to be "working DX on HF with CW." The US
military was phasing out manual telegraphy over 40 years ago.

US government agencies still maintain HF radio nets. SHARES
is a good example, principally in NVIS linking in under-500-mile
circuits. SHARES is incorporating ALE, Automatic Link
Establishment, to rapidly determine the best frequency and, if
selected as an option, automatically QSY to that best. There is
a Federal Standard for ALE developed by commercial and
government organizations working in concert. Manual telegraphy
is not a prime mode in SHARES and is not even available at
most SHARES stations.

Some long-time US radio amateurs consider the ultimate in
radio to be "working DX on HF with CW."

I do not mention the commercial side of my radio-electronics
career much for two reasons: Relatively-recent work may involve
sensitive areas still classified; some commercial development
is still protected by proprietary corporate classification.

> What a loser.

Only in trying to argue with stubborn, never-give-in ignorant
ex-military-idiots who would rather fight anyone not kissing
their "military backgrounds." :-)

I am retired with a comfortable income, real property having no
debts or liens. Is that "losing?" :-)

Let's look at Sgt Putz, self-renowned Hostile Action Hero. He
has never worked any real 24/7 military communications during
a military career terminated by a medical discharge. He has
never worked IN any radio-electronics engineering, only on the
sidelines as a purchasing agent, filling out orders. He seems
to travel around to many different residence addresses and has
claimed several different medical employers. That would
signify some instability after a military career.

>The SAME loser who has no license, ...

Actually, I was granted a First Class Radiotelephone (commercial)
Operator license in March, 1956. Without any formal classes,
just reading a borrowed copy of ALL the 1955 rules and regulations
of the FCC. One exam sitting at an FCC field office in Chicago.

No walking barefoot in the snow uphill both ways, I took the train
for the 90 mile trip and wore shoes the whole time. :-)

>... has no vested interest in Amateur Radio, ...

To have a "vested interest" implies being or having been granted
an amateur radio license or working for some concern supplying
goods or services to radio amateurs. I have no amateur license
and my contract work does not involve amateur radio.

Having a radio amateur license grant might be a fun hobby but
that would be only a hobby. I do not consider it some grande
exhalted life's work or ambition or a mystique-laden fantasy
land where licensees are somehow "better" than ordinary
mortals...or as a surrogate for a terminated military career
and rank therein.

>... and who finds it necessary to embellish his service career by
>making up war stories about rear area radio stations and how HE allegedly
>operated 24/7, single handedly passing 1.2 million pieces of traffic.

Contrary to famous hero Sgt Putz' allegations, I've told NO "war stories" in here. I've recounted an assignment at a signal battalion in Tokyo whose task was to provide primary communications over HF circuits to the USA and the rest of ACAN. N2JTV may be contacted for confirmation considering that Gene was assigned to the same battalion and company as I and at the same time.

The Korean War truce period began in July, 1953. Technically, the Korean War never terminated; it remains in a state of perpetual truce.

Area command headquarters are never at "front lines." Several former members of the FEC Sig Svc Bn agree that our battalion never gave up an inch of ground to the enemy in Tokyo from 1953 onwards. :-)

Anyone in military service is obligated to work as long as required (or ordered). That is a given and the "24/7" label is correct even if not implemented in someone's particular military service life.

Contrary to the self-described Hostile Action Hero's claims, I've never said I "single-handedly passed any traffic." [when using my military driver's license I always kept both hands on the jeep's wheel] ADA's message throughput in 1955 was about 220,000 messages a month [source: Pacific Stars & Stripes, mid-1955]. That rate is impossible for any sole human to maintain. What "HAH" (Hostile Action Hero) rewrites and misquotes is an estimate of the message traffic that I was responsible for maintaining during my assigned operating hours.

>> The SAME loser who makes promises he doesn't keep, makes allegations he
>cannot substantiate, and who has no real reason for being in this forum save
>to antagonize and harrass.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Exactly who is the "loser?" Those who are retired after having verified experience, present arguments in the subject without personal insult, note required references, and yield to those counter-arguments on the subject? I don't think so.

The REAL losers are those stubborn, conservative, my-way-or-the-highway whiny little creatures who use personal insults in place of arguments on the subject, misquoting others, and trying to imply that others wrote something they imagine. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

> Lennie...we've heard your rant before. We see through the lies, and NO

The multiple personality forum is on the second floor next to the meeting hall. Please take your "we" there and have a group meeting of all your personalities so as to arrive at a consensus.

> You are lying.

No. What I've said as to past experiences are verifiable from references presented in here.

>You are untruthful.

Redundant.

>Your "facts" are "cut-and'paste" at
>best, and usually a day late and a dollar short as it applies to AMATEUR
>RADIO practice.

Use of text editor "copy" and "paste" functions is commonplace and
not something illegal or unethical. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

GETTING INTO amateur radio cannot involve "amateur radio practice."
If one is ALREADY IN amateur radio, then they've passed the tests
of the PAST. The morse code test has been a part of the US amateur
license tests since the first US radio regulation agency was formed
in 1912. That it has "always been so" is no valid reason for maintaining
the test forever.

Since the FCC is the only body granting US amateur radio licenses,
they determine what is meaningful for their task of regulating US
civil radio. It is NOT up to the individual or collective (limited)
"amateur community" to judge or determine who shall enter the
area (or be granted a license). It is NOT up to some ego-driven
self-glorification long-timer to "judge" based on their own pet,
personal prerequisites.

My arguments started out on the morse code test issue four years
ago in here. Those PCTAs who commented publicly insisted that
all must do as they did (take the morse test), yet gave no valid
reasons for so doing other than to personally satisfy their own
wishes. That is not a valid reason for the FCC, just a selfish one
to satisfy their mythical idea of what constitutes amateur radio.

The ego-driven, the stubborn, the credentialists, the traditionalists
can all vent their personal mental spleens by all the pejoratives
against NCTAs they can imagine. Those live in an imaginary
world anyway, so all can expect misquoting, word-twisting, and
other fabrications as being part of the PCTA viewpoint. They
can't take the heat and should get the hell out of the kitchen.

> You are OUTTED. Get over it.

"Outed?" Yes, I am a public heterosexual! Two months
ago I was in one of our closets (painting). I've come out
of the closet! :-)

Most of the time I write in our home office so I am not "out."
The outside window is open, however, and the outside air
temperature hit 80 F a few minutes ago. Clear blue skies at
12:38 local, nice day and the Superbowl count-down has
begun. It's too bad some of you have to walk around angry
and frustrated, railing mightily at all who don't want your
imaginary world. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

1060. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 21:20:25 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030126162025.16280.00000699@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 60193

In article <3E33AE54.3010704D@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> Go for it, Herr Robust. Snarl your wurst. :-)
>
>Your apology will come only after you submit proof that you are not an
>American. I'm not going to do your leg work for you.

Why must I now "submit proof I am not an American?!?"

I've been one since birth. The US federal government,
three state governments, four county governments, two
city governments, FBI, IRS, FCC, FAA, US Army, USN,
USCG, USAF, DCAS, and some other alphabet-soup
organizations all agree with that and have the
documentation to prove it.

>It is amazing just how quickly you snipped all the stuff referencing Key
>Officer listings and got the hell off that subject before revealing any
>more of your ignorance.

What's to bother with on a listing of staff that looks like
a DSN directory listing (but without the numbers)?

Didn't you get the medal you think you deserved for all
that innovating, important communications work at those
big embassies?!? Tsk, tsk, tsk.

Geez, I would think anyone pioneering a New Method,
like using CW for an order-wire on an RTTY circuit
should at least get a write-up in the Radio Club of
America's annual awards dinner newsletter!

>You're quite the tap dancer.

Not all that good. I put away my Haney Plates many
years ago. :-)

Now soft-shoe is a different thing! :-)

Years ago in my bachelor days I went with a gypsy
(contract company dancer). She taught me several
things. It wasn't tap dancing. :-)

1061. Re: Why Dave has such a p*ss poor attitude

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 21:20:25 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030126162025.16280.00000698@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 60195

In article <3E33B5AA.FE4A238E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Oh, you probably think I had something to do with the export of
>cashews.

No, you're not nuts...just frustrated that you couldn't pull
of a snow-job on most of the others in here. :-)

>Just a couple
>of days ago you mentioned something about Key Officer lists.

I did that three years ago, Mr. FSO. Forgot again?

Looked like just a listing of staff at each embassy. I will
grant that staff had keys and official positions, therefore
listings of staff can be called "key lists."

In magazines such a listing is called the "masthead."
Names, titles. DSN phone directories also have them.

>What happened to that particular rant?

Everyone was waiting for your insufferable pride to boil
over. :-)

1062. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 21:20:26 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030126162026.16280.00000700@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 60191

In article <d22b54c3.0301260132.25ece4c1@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>That's SOP human behavior, it's all about pecking orders. On the
>job,in the hobbies, it's everywhere and it started when our
>predecessors decided that living on the ground was a better idea than
>living in trees. Fuggem all, I ignore it.

No, you don't. US amateur radio's best is "working DX on HF with CW." You continue the mantra (or sophistry).

"Grease those paddles." Etc., etc., etc.

Take a Tums after all those hoagies, tuff guy. Make you feel better.

Beep, beep, peck, peck.....

1063. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 21:33:57 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0301261333.776d717e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60196

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:<3E333DE1.85E0A54B@ix.netcom.com>...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> >
> > Years on rrap: 12
>
> Has rrap been around that long?

Larry was on Fidonet back before Windoze and the Web came along,
apparently there was an RRAP equivalent on Fido. Primeval Internet
days from the perspective of us Internet "newbies".

w3rv

1064. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 22:04:14 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030126170414.02994.00000198@mb-mn.aol.com>
Source record: 60197

>Subject: Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade
>From: "Kï¿½HB" kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG
>Date: 1/26/03 1:34 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <aLWY9.4663$d66.436249@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>

>Geeeeee......Wish we WERE talking about the late Lennie Anderson!

>What a sorry-assed comment that is!

Let me mail you a quarter (maybe fifty cents?) so you can call someone who CARES that you think it's what kind of commetn it is, Hans.

>I don't know Lennie very well...(SNIP)

Unfortunately I DO know Lennie that well, Hans. The world is full of abusive, arrogant, self-serving bullies the likes of him, and it's those dull nails that make holding the world together with a bit more civility that much more difficult.

>The quote above makes you an
>industrial grade jerk --- no, make that an industrial grade asshole.

I'll make it s dollar...

>Hans

Lack of ususal unsincere closing salutation noted...Finally, a bit of honesty.

Steve, K4YZ

1065. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 22:06:03 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030126170603.03463.00000241@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 60198

In article <aLWY9.4663$d66.436249@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG> writes:

>"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote
>
>: Geeeeee......Wish we WERE talking about the late Lennie Anderson!
>
>What a sorry-assed comment that is!
>
>I don't know Lennie very well --- I disagree with him on many issue related
>to amateur radio --- mostly he sounds like a pompous old grouch --- but
>publicly asserting that you wish he was "the late" Lennie Anderson goes way
>beyond even the bounds of "usenet" decency. The quote above makes you an
>industrial grade jerk --- no, make that an industrial grade asshole.

I disagree in part, Hans. The individual has a Death Wish
in full flower. He is frustrated and angry and not being a
"guru" in here and getting medals and credentials for all
his imagined glories.

On the other hand, he tries to "kill" older men to satisfy
his overdoses of testosterone supplements. That edges
him towards the "industrial grade asshole" category and
I must agree with you there. :-)

Len Anderson
very much alive and waiting for the Superbowl kickoff

1066. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 22:06:07 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030126170607.03463.00000242@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 60199

In article <3E342E82.3C27FAE1@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> In article <20030125155347.04873.00000125@mb-cb.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>> writes another volume in his on-going "Andy Rooney" wannabe
>> column in here:
>>
>> >In article <kNyY9.652$N5.478853@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>> ><wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
>> A single-crystal oscillator can make trouble just as easily as
>> a PLL or DDS or Fractional-N synthesizer and produce RF
>> outside of ham bands. US amateurs are not allowed to RF
>> outside their alloted bands.
>
>Part 15 aside, you aren't allowed to produce RF inside the amateur
>bands. It sort of evens out.

Herr Robust forgot some parts in Title 47 CFR. :-)

>> Ahem. Morsemanship has NOTHING to do with ANY kind of
>> technical smarts. None. Zip. Nada.
>
>Who said it did? Morse testing addresses the operating side of things.
>After all, an amateur license is, above all, permission to operate.
>Permission to build a piece of amateur gear isn't required by the
>government.

The US amateur radio license is BOTH an operator and a
station license. I'm surprised Herr Robust hasn't learned
that yet. Regulations may call the station a "control point"
but it IS the station nonetheless.

>Your words. You use them or words like them all the time in here.
>Don't forget your very recent, "Awwww. Don't like your own kind of
>commentary coming right back to you? Tsk, tsk, tsk."

Poor baby. You still do a BAD imitation of mighty morseman
Miccolis. Let him speak for himself.

>> >Yeah, me too, 1968, Philly FCC office. I was 14.
>>
>> You were LATE. Other kids did it at 6! You could have done it
>> in 1960 and had 8 more years to brag about! Tsk, tsk, tsk.
>

>Let's see...are you seventy yet, Len? How many decades back does your
>supposed interest in amateur radio run? Wow--talk about LATE!

Sigh...Herr Robust is still on the "interest = ham license"
kick. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

"Interest" does not require a license in anything.

Yes, I am 70. Did my first legal HF operating in February, 1953.
No ham license required there, so don't beef about fishing
around for nastygrams, senior.

>> >What it really comes down to is that you use phrases like "force", "hazing
>> >ritual" and "jumping through hoops" selectively.
>>
>> ...there you go again, putting words in others' writings. BAD form, OM.
>
>Really? You don't believe Carl's use of the terms to be selective? Did
>he not use those terms?

You've been requested to cease the BAD imitation of mighty
morseman Miccolis. Please comply, OM.

>Right. He should wise up to the fact that you consider yourself to have
>filled the position. Tell him that we can't meet on HF to discuss
>amateur radio policy matters while you're at it.

Why is it a "requirement to meet on HF to discuss amateur
radio policy matters?" Do you need some "privacy" from
perceived nasty "civilians?" ?

It's fairly obvious to all that Herr Robust can't handle negative
opinions of his viewpoints and resorted to personal insult
surrogates long ago. That's not "discussion," just cussin.

>What is a "morse-ist cult"? Why is it "little"? Have you tried the
>experiment Jim suggests? Regardless of what goes on in "the rest of the
>radio world", radio amateurs use morse code widely today.

Only on HF bands in the USA. Some European countries
allocate LF bands not yet allowed for US amateur use
(160-190 KHz is still license-free in the US).

Heil disagrees with the IARU position on morse code testing.
He is "superior" to them as well?!?

>Why izzit that when you begin your rant of ancient morse tales, they
>begin with landline telegraphy but when some mentions the age of SSB, it
>has to be confined to amateur radio use? Can you say "double standard"?
>You are soooooo transparent.

The "age (era to be exact) of amateur SSB" began about 1950.
It was in all the ham publications of the time and the decade
following.

Was Heil licensed then? Did he have an "interest" in radio then? If no to either, why is he prattling on like some whiny little opaque-to-light-of-newness poor baby who can't take opposition?

How much SSB equipment did the US embassies in Africa use, Mr. FSO? Did you invent the use of CW as an order wire on State's SSB circuits too?!?

1067. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 22:27:18 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E3460C6.8090100@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 60104

WA8ULX wrote:
>>Why are the writtens a sacred cow but the code a scapegoat?
>>
>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>
>
> Because no real knowledge is needed to pass them

ULX is a perfect example of that. How else do you think he got his
Extra?

1068. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 22:29:55 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E346163.8070900@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 60105

WA8ULX wrote:
>>Yup. Lookit 160 meters - major ham band before WW2, all but lost to LORAN
>>afterwards, then slowly regained. Now LORAN is no longer there, but hams are.
>>Many of them are using CW. BWAAHAAAHAAAA!!!!!
>>
>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>
>
> Its really the only real Ham Band left, most No-Coders and CBplussers, will
> never operate there, why, because most are to Dump to make a Antenna work.

Like you are to "dump" to type.

1069. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 22:31:09 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E3461AD.3000502@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 60106

WA8ULX wrote:
>>Not knowing (fill in some technical thing here) could also result in the ham
>>having no clue that his radio was malfunctioning and creating interference
>>(let alone how to fix it ...)
>
>
> Which is the present state of new HAMS
>
>
>>Yes, but if you are so technically ignorant (as you seem to be
>>advocating, at least as devil's advocate in an effort to prop up
>>the "equal legitimacy" of Morse testing) that you can't understand
>>those rules and apply them, having memorized them is useless.
>>
>
>
> Which is the present STATUS with the writtens now
>
>
>>in return, we owe an obligation to demonstrate at least a
>>minimum level of technical understanding and competence.
>>
>
>
> Which the present written does not do

Otherwise you would have never obtained the extra.

1070. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 22:33:50 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E34624E.5010605@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 60107

WA8ULX wrote:
>>Right ... and so is my Rotweiller ... your point is?
>>
>
>
> Well Carl it appears you have just answered the Question, what is your dogs NCI
> Number?
>
>
>>I think it would be more accurate to say that the only thing holding you
>>back is a lack of the requisite intelligence and skill ... and that little
>>thing
>>called passing the tests and getting the license.
>
>
> Carl that pretty much describes you and your NCI bunch. Just think Carl if they
> hadnt LOWERED the standards you wouldnt be an EXTRA.

Neither would you.

1071. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 23:02:49 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <tOZY9.1123$N5.645124@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 60200

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030126103650.20835.00000258@mb-fy.aol.com...
> In article <AWKY9.3471$d66.350878@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>,
"Kï¿½HB"
> <kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
> >:
> >: In other words, not that many, because you'd tell us the number if it
> >: were significant. I've never seen an NCI membership number over 4000,
> >
> >73, OM, de Hans, K0HB
> >--
> > FISTS 7419
> > NCI 4304
> >
> OK, make that 4400. Works out to no more than 3400 NCI members. And I know
of a
> few who have resigned their membership. Plus memberships do not expire,
even if
> the members do.
>
> Did someone say "majority"?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Jim,

I never asserted that NCI's membership constituted a majority of hams.
Nor, I might point out, does ARRL's membership constitute a majority
of US hams ... more like a bit less than 25% IIRC the last numbers I
noticed.

The majority I was referring to was a majority of all licensed US hams
(since you were talking about NCI's level of influence with the FCC)

73,
Carl - wk3c

1072. How Long until K1MAN receives his revocation letter?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 23:05:32 UTC
From: rfburns2003@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <634e00e4.0301261505.6306daf2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60101
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

I'm going to climb out on a limb here, and predict that K1MAN will get an FCC letter in the first week of February. The contents are anyone's guess, but my GUESS is, the contents will be based on previous letters written to the baby broadcaster. I predict the new letter will tell Baxter his license is suspended and scheduled for a revocation hearing, and will follow a format like this:

Dear Glenn A. Baxter (K1MAN),

The commission wrote you last year about deficiencies in the operation of K1MAN. You have had one full year to correct these deficiencies. Despite the commission giving you ample opportunity to correct those deficiencies, you have failed to do so. The following continued deficiencies were noted this past year:

Broadcasting

The format of the so-called K1MAN bulletin resembles a broadcast more than a bulletin. Accordingly, we will refer to it as a broadcast henceforth. K1MAN broadcasts news and views that could alternately be provided through other services. To the extent that K1MAN did not observe the prohibition regarding this practice; this practice was in violation.

Failure to Observe Frequency Sharing Rules

K1MAN has commenced broadcasting over numerous QSO's in progress. When asked to delay the K1MAN broadcast, the response from K1MAN was "No, I am not going to ruin a nine year precedent." This shows a gross misunderstanding of the basis and purpose of part 97 and the amateur service in general. No licensee is authorized exclusive use of any frequency. This practice was in violation.

Lack of Control Operator

Numerous stations from the US in the South; the Midwest; and the Northeast, attempted to contact K1MAN's control operator over the phone and on the radio. The fact that there was no response on several occasions indicates that either there was no control operator at the control point, or that the control operator was negligent, by beginning the K1MAN broadcast over ongoing QSO's and ignoring advice that the frequency was in use. This practice was in violation.

Defamation

Numerous incidents of defamation per se of other amateurs have occurred on the K1MAN broadcast. This practice was contrary to the basis and purpose of part 97 and was therefore, in violation.

Threats

You advised amateurs to visit the K1MAN web site for information. On the web site, K1MAN advised "foolish amateurs" to QSY or QRT, when the K1MAN was about to commence, or risk the filing of criminal charges. These threats were the subject of a commission letter dated January 2002; a letter from the office of US Attorney, Jay P. McCloskey in Maine; and a letter from FCC Counsel John P. Greenspan. You also advised other amateurs to file their own felony affidavits against amateurs who used the frequency on which you intended to operate, after being advised that this practice was illegal. This practice therefore, was also in violation.

Routine Solicitation of Donations for Benefit of a Business

Soliciting contributions for IARN on a daily basis constituted using amateur radio for the routine benefit of a business. This practice was in violation.

Use of Unauthorized Tape Recordings.

There have been numerous instances of unauthorized use of tape recordings played over the air. This practice was in violation. Walter Cronkite's Attorney recently wrote you a letter indicating you do not have authorization to use his tape recorded voice identification on your broadcast. This practice was in violation.

Copyright Infringement

The ARRL recently advised you that your distribution of the Walter Cronkite CD to AARA life members was in violation of their copyright of that material. You advertised the giveaway of copies of this CD on your broadcast. This practice was in violation.

Poor Engineering Practices

Distortion, malfunctioning equipment, drifting transmitters, and erratic starting and stopping times characterized your broadcasts over the past year. This practice was in violation.

Lack of the Character Qualifications to be a Commission Licensee

The FCC's John P Greenspan letter, and the Assistant US Attorney's letter, written by Gail Fiske Malone, pointed out that your actions indicated that you may very well lack the character qualifications to be an FCC licensee. Greenspan also stated, "You certainly lack the maturity but that is, unfortunately, not grounds for revocation." After reviewing ongoing complaints by numerous amateurs and after reviewing the record of your correspondence with the commission, we concur with the previous opinions. You do not possess the requisite character qualifications to be a licensee.

Accordingly we have suspended your station and operators licenses, effective immediately, and have designated your license for a revocation hearing before an administrative law judge, where you will have the burden of proving why you should remain a commission licensee.

Sincerely,

The Enforcer

1073. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 23:05:38 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030126180538.02994.00000199@mb-mn.aol.com>
Source record: 60102

>Subject: Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 1/26/03 3:20 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030126162024.16280.00000696@mb-mo.aol.com>

>> Whew...Lennie the Lame strikes again.

> Actually, I walk very well, no lameness at all.

Lameness applies to more than one's ability to demonstrate a steady gait.

>The "use of CW as an RTTY order-wire" is ridiculous on the
> face of it..(SNIP)

So's your claim to an extra lite out of the box.

So's your claim of ARRL dishonesty.

So's your claim of ARRL VE dishonesty.

So's your embellishment of your Army "service" by associating yourself
with KIA's who's names you don't even know...

So's your claim of radio services solely for recreational applications.

So's your claim of the LACK of "service to the nation" of Amateur Radio
public service providers.

>Firstly, Sgt Putz, Renowned Hostile Action Hero, has NO
> experience in 24/7 military communications...(SNIP)

The forum, Lennie, is AMATEUR RADIO POLICY.

>His only claim to fame is...(SNIP)

...not known to you. And whatever my experience in military
communications, it STILL does not have any relevence in this forum anymore than
YOURS does.

>Sgt Putz has NO real idea of what an "order wire" is...(SNIP)

Nor do I care. It's not germane to this forum. And besides, the simple
fact that you have made a career out of nit-picking it with Dave leads me to
believe it's not worthy of my time or interest. You've proven nothing.

>> He frequently chastises othrs for "1930-s era practice", yet can only
>come
>>up with ONE rant to supposedly undermine Dave Heil. And all of Lennie's
>"radio

>>operating (and what HE call's "DXing") comes from a 3 year active hitch in
>the
>>Army in the mid fifties)
>
> Incorrect in part. I make note of ADA and the entire ACAN because it
> involved HF radio as the primary method of communications for the
> Far East Command Headquarters in the 1950s.

Nothing is "incorrect". You are once again substituting military communications for Amateur Radio. Other than the basic physics of radiowave propagation, the two are NOT synonymous.

>Much has changed in military communications in the last half century.

Yes, it has, but like Lola sitting in the chair with faded feathers in her hair, NOT for you. You still seem to think that what you did in the Army pertains to Amateur Radio. It does not. Nor does what you can quote from industry journals...The ONLY thing that pertains to Amateur Radio policy is Amateur Radio...I know that's hard for you. Sorry.

>For small-unit tactical communications...(SNIP)

Small ARES units? Small REACT units? Red Cross or SATERN? If not, you just spent a lot more bandwidth delving into MORE military stuff, proving yet again that you are suffering from Acute Situational Substitution of Worthless Information for Policy Edification. You figure out the acronym.

>Some long-time radio AMATEURS still consider the ultimate peak
> of radio practice to be "working DX on HF with CW." The US
> military was phasing out manual telegraphy over 40 years ago.

The intent and purpose of Amateur Radio communications vs Armed Forces communications have been lost upon you, Oh Dimwitted One. why do you insist on trying to get orange juice from prunes?

>Some long-time US radio amateurs consider the ultimate in
> radio to be "working DX on HF with CW."

Some do...Some don't. You do not posses the experience base to determine who's who. Ignorant, as usual.

>I do not mention the commercial side of my radio-electronics
> career much for two reasons: Relatively-recent work may involve
> sensitive areas still classified; some commercial development
> is still protected by proprietary corporate classification.

Uh huh...I see...LENNIE'S A SECRET AGENT! He COULD tell us but then he'd have to shoot us! WhoooHooo! You go, Lennie!

Of course when others, myself included, have declined to discuss military or corporate matters, WE are lying, telling tales, or otherwise exercising "puffery" or "patriotic buffoonery"...But LENNIE can do it and it's "OK".

Uh huh...Riiiiiiiggggghhhhhhttttttt ! ! ! !

>Only in trying to argue with stubborn, never-give-in ignorant
> ex-military-idiots who would rather fight anyone not kissing
> their "military backgrounds."

My mlitary background doesn't NEED kissing, Lennie.

And as for the "never give in", etc etc, WHOSE ego needs polishing there, Lennie? Not mine. I've already made my concession speeches on the impending deletion of Code testing. That It wasn't in YOUR time frame is YOUR problem.

>I am retired with a comfortable income, real property having no
> debts or liens. Is that "losing?"

There's a difference between BEING a loser and "losing".

That you are retired and live without external support is laudible.

However the fact that you are an archived liar, cheat and social ner-do-well puts YOU in my "loser" column. Unless I hit the lottery, I will never be on the Forbes 500 Richest Persons list, but no one will be able to call me dishonest, untruthful or deceitful.

>Let's look at Sgt Putz, self-renowned Hostile Action Hero. He
> has never worked any real 24/7 military communications...(SNIP)

Where I have worked, where I have gone, what I have done professionally has nothing to do with AMATEUR RADIO.

That you can only squirm around trying to make some issue from what I have done or not done in the Armed Forces or civilian life is funny, Lennie...No..actually...it's pityful.

>>The SAME loser who has no license, ...
>
> Actually, I was granted...(SNIP)

...nothing that pertains to AMATEUR RADIO.

>Contrary to famous hero Sgt Putz' allegations, I've told NO "war
> stories" in here.

Whew! More LYING in the face of facts to the contrary.

We're back to the "loser" mode, Lennie. Try and exceed my expectations.

>Anyone in military service is obligated to work as long as required
> (or ordered). That is a given and the "24/7" label is correct even
> if not implemented in someone's particular military service life.

Nice dodge. Been working on it a while, haven't you..???

>Contrary to the self-described Hostile Action Hero's claims, I've
> never said I "single-handedly passed any traffic."...(SNIP)

It's not what >>I<< said Lennie, it's what YOU said...You repeatedly cited the volume of traffic in the first-person-singular until it was repeatedly pointed out to YOU that the math didn't add up.

>[when using
> my military driver's license I always kept both hands on the
> jeep's wheel]

And how did you shift gears...???

>Tsk, tsk, tsk. Exactly who is the "loser?"

You, Lennie.

>Those who are retired
> after having verified experience, present arguments in the subject
> without personal insult, note required references, and yield to
> those counter-arguments on the subject? I don't think so.

"Nazi" "Jackbooted thug" "elitist"...Some of the adjectives initiated by "NoCWTest", allegedly one of your many screen names.

And as for doing something "without personal insult", we need only scroll up through THIS post to see your repetitive use of even more less-that-complimentary adjectives and salutations.

Doesn't it get painful stepping on your own parts so often in the same post?

>The REAL losers are those stubborn, conservative, my-way-or-
> the-highway whiny little creatures who use personal insults in
> place of arguments on the subject, misquoting others, and trying
> to imply that others wrote something they imagine.

Which describes you to a tee, Lennie. Thanks.

>No. What I've said as to past experiences are verifiable from
> references presented in here.

"Experiences" alone are not your only violation of the truth, Lennie. Not by a long shot.

>GETTING INTO amateur radio cannot involve "amateur radio practice."

Sure it does. The Amateur Radio written examinations all have numerous questions on "how" Amateurs communicate. THAT, among other specifics, is Amateur Radio PRACTICE.

>> You are OUTTED. Get over it.
>
> "Outed?" Yes, I am a public heterosexual! Two months
> ago I was in one of our closets (painting). I've come out
> of the closet!

And no doubt the fumes still cloud your judgement.

L O S E R, Lennie. You keep trying to misrepresent the overall character and fiber of Amateur radio for some personal vendetta you obviously have against it.

There IS an "imaginary world" at work, Lennie, but it's not mine to deal with...It's yours...

Sorry you can't seem to find your way out of THAT.

1074. Re: Why Dave has such a p*ss poor attitude

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 23:16:17 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <5%ZY9.1125$N5.646106@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 60103

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3E3432E5.8266EB56@earthlink.net...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3E32CCE6.D8842848@earthlink.net...
> > > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > >> > Yes ... assuming that you're refering to my behavior towards you,
> > > > it's simple ... "Pompus, narrow-minded jerks irritate me>"
> > >
> > > I love it. Someone who can't spell "pompous" quotes himself. I
assume
> > > that your view assumes that anyone who doesn't buy into your grand
> > > scheme is pompous and narrow-minded. You've not just used that method
> > > with me.
> >
> > You have ADD, right Dave? I've mentioned several times that I have
> > a bit of loss of feeling/coordination in my fingers due to a spinal
injury.
>
> I recall that. I don't see how your medical problem forced you to cut
> and paste an old quote complete with its original spelling error.

The original typo was simply propagated by error ... I didn't look
closely enough at what I was reusing ... you want to hang me for that?
(sounds pretty petty to me ...)

> > > > > How's the "experimentation" with chasing DX on SSB coming along?
> > > >
> > > > Another fiction of your warped mind, Dave ... I will work DX if I
come
> > > > across it, but I am not "chasing DX" in the sense of having a
compulsion
> > > > to collect wallpaper ... or, worse yet, participate in contests.
> > >
> > > Oh, excuse me. In one of your past incarnations here you were
regaling
> > > us with tales of your DXploits on SSB.
> >
> > Baloney ... I haven't bragged about "DXploits" ... I do believe I
mentioned
> > having a good time during a short stint at 4U1ITU while I was in Geneva
> > for meetings at the ITU ... if I recall correctly, I said something like
> > "What
> > a change being at the center of a pileup ... worked 200 stations in 3

> > hours."
> > or something like that ... BFD ...
>
> My recollection is of how many countries you'd worked from home on 10m.

OK ... so what if I mentioned something about working some DX? ... again,
I'm not chasing it ... and currently I work all of the HF/VHF/UHF bands from
160m through 70 cm, not just 10m, and can do so without commercial power
with redundant rigs, just in case of emergency.

> I didn't ask for a travelogue or justification. I just wondered how you
> could be spared from what you call "important work".

The CEO of my company gets to take vacations, too ... the fact that
one's work is important doesn't mean they're required to work 24/7/365.

Carl - wk3c

1075. Re: How Long until K1MAN receives his revocation letter?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-26 23:55:47 UTC
From: porkbutt song <bigdicstuds@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3e3475d4@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 60108
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Chris" <rfburns2003@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:634e00e4.0301261505.6306daf2@posting.google.com...
> I'm going to climb out on a limb here, and predict that K1MAN will get
> an FCC letter in the first week of February. The contents are anyone's
> guess, but my GUESS is, the contents will be based on previous letters
> written to the baby broadcaster.

I wonder if, after just 12 hours of our
announcement of bombing in Baghdad, if Baxter
will start calling for his "jump teams" to go into Iraq...?

Hmmmmm.....great potential publicity for ham radio eh?

Can't you just picture a CNN video in the future
showing some of Saddam's elite Republican Guards
captured in a bunker alive someplace, along with
a cache of small arms, chemical munitions and
2 or 3 Yaesu or Kenwood HF rigs with 14.275
stored into adleast one of the channel memories?

GRIN

1076. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-27 00:05:50 UTC
From: jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu
Message-ID: <b11t4u$od6$1@news.hawaii.edu>
Source record: 60133

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>You didn't do radio 24/7 ever and there is no
>professional equivalent to DXing.

We keep 24/7 radio watch on the HF maritime frequencies.
Those ships are all DX, and we're certainly professionals.

Jeff KH6O
--
Operations Specialist Mathematics Lecturer
U.S. Coast Guard Kapiolani College
Dept. of Homeland Security University of Hawaii System

1077. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-27 00:19:05 UTC
From: jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu
Message-ID: <b11ttpoog1@news.hawaii.edu>
Source record: 60135

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote:
>There is no professional or military equivalent of DXing.

"DX" is an ITU prosign for "distant station."

I didn't realize just how many amateur terms originally came from ITU maritime usage until I attended Coast Guard radioman school: GM, GA, GE, OM, 73, TKS, CUL, dit-dit, CQ, R, SK, AR, and dozens of others.

73, Jeff KH6O

--
Operations Specialist Mathematics Lecturer
U.S. Coast Guard Kapiolani College
Dept. of Homeland Security University of Hawaii System

1078. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-27 02:21:17 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030126212117.03858.00000551@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 60109

In article <20030125192919.03463.00000209@mb-cr.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

> The FCC requires ALL US radio amateurs to be responsible for the
> technical and legal requirements of amateurs' operation. All.
> No exceptions.
>
> The FCC does NOT require any US amateur to operate OOK CW
> over and above any other mode. All modes are optional within
> allocated bands.
>
> Ergo, there is NO justification for any morse code test other than
> a politically-biased (in favor of morsemen) recommendation.
>
> A morse code test is thus little more than a hazing ritual demanded
> by some long-time amateur morsemen to make all newcomers
> jump through the same hoops they had to long ago.
>

Translation:

"I'm too stinking lazy to learn a useful communications skill at a level which does not even ensure reasonable proficiency (5 WPM) in order to obtain FULL amateur operating privileges."

We've got your number, Lennie.

Putz!

(Sorry for working your side of the street for a few minutes, Steve!)

73 de Larry, K3LT

1079. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-27 02:21:18 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030126212118.03858.00000552@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 60110

In article <3E333D78.C34CCB56@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>Another 200KHz and you'd be on 2 meter simplex (146.52). :-)
>
>19 years in the military. Did you get a pension? Or just miss out?

Robert:

Full pension and benefits. Nobody "retires" without them. The armed
forces began offering 15-year pro-rated early retirements in the early
90's. My career field in the Air Force became eligible in '93, but I
waited until I was safely past the 18-year point before applying for
early retirement. With 18 years of service, you're already, by public
law, vested for retirement, so there's no way they can "take back" your
retirement if some future Congress decides that all those early retirements
weren't such a good deal after all (highly unlikely - but I wasn't taking any
chances!). Also, the "pro rata" retired pay after 18 years represents
such a small percentage loss that it is actually recuperated by virtue
of your annual Cost Of Living Allowance (COLA) increase. In my case,
I had a 20-year retirement date of Aug. 1996, but retired in November, '94.
I got my first COLA only a month after retiring -- and by the time I reached
my "normal" retirement date, my retired pay was already a couple of
pennies more than it would have been if I had retired "on time" -- assuming
no further promotions. Since I came into the Air Force late in life (age 23),
and had already had more than my share of challenging assignments, I
decided to join just about every other Master Sergeant I knew and get out
while the getting was good. I could have stayed in, been promoted again,
and spent the rest of my time "deployed" to some place where I could
live in a tent, shivering and baking, working 16-hour days 7 days a week,
and tiptoeing through a minefield of Political Correctness, while trying to
lead a bunch of Welfare Warriors through the challenges of making an
attempt to look like they're doing something useful. That's what did it
for me -- I got too damn sick and tired of having to always try to find the
right button to push to make today's lazy, unmotivated, self-centered and
disrespectful young people do some actual work.

BTW the year I was "downsized" and took my early retirement, my
squadron lost all six of it's Master Sergeants! My Wing commander tried
everything he could think of to "bribe" me to stay in, but I wanted him
to fire our Squadron's Operations Officer and our Senior Enlisted
Advisor -- and he couldn't do that!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1080. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-27 02:45:05 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030126214505.05850.00000230@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 60111

>Subject: Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade
>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>Date: 1/26/03 8:21 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030126212117.03858.00000551@mb-ba.aol.com>

>(Sorry for working your side of the street for a few minutes, Steve!)

No problem, Larry. With the possible exception of Vipul, Hans and BrianB, this side's a lot more populated than you might think...I am just a bit more verbose about it!

Oh...and I forgot...all those "anonymous" Lennie supporters that seem to come out of the woodwork when Lennie is "absent" (yeah...right...)

73

Steve, K4YZ

1081. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-27 02:56:35 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030126215635.20835.00000268@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 60112

In article <20030126133729.03156.00000158@mb-cr.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>In article <7dSY9.1052$N5.598152@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>><wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
>>>Tell THEM that ... it's "dog in the manger" and "work ethic" BS ...
>>
>>"dog in the manger"??
>
> To heck with the "dog in the manger", thing...I was shocked at the "work
>ethic BS" comment.

> If we still had some of the 40's and 50's era "work ethic", perhaps we
>wouldn't be in the financial slump we are today...Instead, the 80's era "make
>it quick and effortlessly" has surpassed any real "work ethic", and we have
>since moved into the Burger King era of "My Way Right Away".

Maybe yes, maybe no. There have always been those who went for the quick and easy way, and devil take the hindmost. Do you think David Sarnoff was a paragon of business virtue?
>
>>FCC thinks the Tech written is adequate qualification for showing that
>>people have a reasonable minimum level of
>>qualification to operate safely and with a minimum potential for
>>interference
>>to other radio services on all amateur freqs and modes above 30 MHz. Why
>>does
>>FCC require so much more written testing for full privs on amateur HF/MF?
>>Sure,
>>there are HF/MF specific regs and propagation, but the General and Extra
>>tests
>>go far beyond regs and propagation specific to HF/MF.
>
> This one's simple, Jim...Despite the rantings of "you-know-who" to the
>contrary, the FCC expects Amateurs to fulfill that "bureaucratic language" in
>47CFR97.1 about creating a pool of technically qualified radio operators to
>fulfill that OTHER "bureaucratic language" about emergency communications.

But why does fulfilling that language require so much more written testing?

> If not, then the questions about why are there questions above and
>beyond mutual interference are valid.

I'm not sure what you mean.
>

> The thing is the FCC does NOT write rules and regulations just for the
>sake of fulfilling some set pattern of "bureaucratic" writing style. They
>write rules and regulations to meet a need.
>
> The present rules both meet a need and fulfill a goal.

What is that need and goal? Are you saying that FCC intends for the license tests to do more than insure that "people have a reasonable minimum level of qualification to operate safely and with a minimum potential for interference to other radio services"?

>
>>>> > Too
>>
>>[expletive deleted]
>>
>>>> >many people value their license for what they perceive as
>>>> > some sort of epic, heroic effort that they made to get it, rather than
>>>> >for
>>>> > what it allows them to do (and the latter is where the value of the
>>>license
>>>> > lies).
>>
>>Who are you to judge why someone else values a thing? What is wrong with
>>live and let live?
>
> The fact of the matter is that SOME people must denigrate the fact that
>it
>WAS a "epic" and "heroic" feat for others to complete. Failure to do so
>means
>that someone did something better than the complainer did. All things are as
>equally easy as THEY did it.

Not what I'm talking about, Steve. The tests were not that hard for me, even as a young teenager. They were much harder for others.

My point is that the statement

"many people value their license for what they perceive as some sort of epic, heroic effort that they made to get it, rather than for what it allows them to do (and the latter is where the value of the license lies)."

says that there is only one valid reason to value the license. I disagree with that concept.

>>There's another angle, not just about pecking orders. People often do not
>>value
>>that which they get easily. Until it's gone
>
> Bingo.

As a health care professional, you have probably seen more examples of this than I can imagine.

>
>>Or does it come down to the idea that what bothers you is not the idea of a
>>pecking order, but rather the pecking order that exists vs. the one you want
>>to exist?
>
> Double bingo.
>
Well, there you have it.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1082. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-27 02:56:36 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030126215636.20835.00000269@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 60113

In article <y1VY9.7927$Gj3.6109@nwrddc02.gnilink.net>, "Bert Craig"
<wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> writes:

>"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
>news:uFlY9.609$N5.388816@nnrp1.ptd.net...
>> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
>> news:udeY9.5268$IN1.3658@nwrddc02.gnilink.net...
>> > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
>> > news:GUdY9.532$N5.345124@nnrp1.ptd.net...
>> > > Your argument goes back to the "work ethic" philosophy where folks
>> > > argue that people shouldn't get a license without having to
>"demonstrate
>> > > their dedication by working hard (jumping through hoops) for it."
>> > >
>> > > Carl - wk3c
>> >
>> > Is "working hard (jumping through hoops)" in reference to the 5-wpm
>exam?
>> >
>> > --
>> > 73 de Bert
>> > WA2SI
>>
>>
>> Bert,
>>
>> It's in reference to any unnecessary requirement.
>
>Why is a simple 5-wpm Morse exam an "unnecessary requirement?"

Because some folks don;t like the idea of having a code test.

Some will tell you that the Morse test is "unnecessary" because no US ham is
required to use Morse. IOW, it's possible to operate a ham station in
compliance with all rules and regs, yet have no Morse skill at all.

Yet what those folks forget is the fact that the same thing can be said about
almost everything in the written tests, as well. Go down that road far enough,
and the "necessary" part of the tests boils down to the rules &regs plus some
basic theory needed to understand the rules. The rest is "unnecessary" if that
minimal philosophy is taken.
>
>> Some folks think that
>> the tests are "way easier" today than they were "in the good old days."
>

>Probably not, but I could be wrong about that. I already had my GROL from my
>college avionics curriculum when I took the writtens. I certainly
>acknowledge that an interested soul would likely find the writtens
>challenging without the benefit of prior electronics experience. The
>equalizing factor being published Q&A pools, of course.

I took the writtens way back in the days of FCC-office testing. Even before
Bash books. How "hard" the tests were is purely a subjective opinion, because
we don't have the old tests available for comparison.
>
One thing I do know, however, is that most hams I knew back then over-prepared
for the tests, because the cost and inconvenience of testing and re-testing
were considerable.

Example: Back in 1968, the test fee was $9 - that's $50 or more in today's
money. Quite a bit of money for an eighth-grader like me. Since the tests were
only given on Mon-Wed mornings that were not holidays, I had to wait until
either Xmas break or the summer to take the test - IF the holidays did not
interfere. And due to the mandatory 30 day wait to retest, the maximum number
of tests in a calendar year for me was 4.

And I had it easy, 'cause the FCC office was just a subway ride away. Exam at
8, home for lunch.

>> The written tests aren't an EE final ... never were, never were meant
>> to be, never should be.
>
>Absolutely correct.

I've taken and passed many "EE finals" and I agree. Funny thing, though - even
a Ph.D in EE does not give one a pass on the ham license tests. I remember
Elmering my advisor in college, (a full professor in EE) who eventually became
a ham. Brilliant guy, but had no experience with practical radio until he ran
into me.
>
>> The issue is that some folks are PO'd that people who already know
>> all the radio stuff don't have to work as hard as they did (because they
>> didn't know the radio stuff ... hell, many still don't ... I know other
>> extras
>> who don't have a clue on the technical side.
>>
>> The point is that that the reason for licensing (and the tests) is NOT to
>> "control the population" or to "keep out the 'unworthy' " ... it's simply
>> to make sure that people have a reasonable minimum level of qualification
>> to operate safely and with a minimum potential for interference to other
>> radio services ... nothing more, nothing less. It is NOT to "make someone
>> prove they are 'dedicated enough' by making them 'work hard' for their
>> license."
>
>I agree, but I honestly don't know where all this "working hard" comes from.
>I think many have lost sight of the bigger picture.

Yup. Including the fact that what constitutes "a reasonable minimum level of qualification to operate safely and with a minimum potential for interference to other radio services" is a very subjective thing.
>
>A. 5-wpm in NOT working hard, it's NOT "jumping through hoops, and many
>believe (Myself included.) it's NOT an unnecessary requirement...it's a very
>BASIC requirement. (Dare I say...entry-level.)

I agree 100%.

>B. As for 5-wpm being an exclusionary tool...puh-lease. I'm also a CBer, the
>very "malady" that some postulate that the "CW immunization" exists to
>protect the bands from. The only group that a 5-wpm "discriminates" against
>are those who don't even want to give it any serious effort to begin with.

Again, agree 100%
>
>C. The code test can no longer be considered exclusionary as there exists a
>no-code license that allows entry into ham radio. Additional privileges
>(Hey, remember that word?) can then be had by passing additional exams. (One
>of them being Element 1.)

Some folks think that there should only be one or two classes of license. I'm not one of them.
>
Let me add:

D. An amateur radio license grants permission for its holder to set up and operate an amateur radio station. Not a broadcasting station, not a military radio station, not any other sort of radio station. Therefore, it is only logical that the tests for said license should be based on what radio amatuers actually DO (like use Morse code) rather than what other types of radio stations do.

>> Too damned many people value their license for what they perceive as
>> some sort of epic, heroic effort that they made to get it, rather than for
>> what it allows them to do (and the latter is where the value of the
>license
>> lies).
>
>I agree, no heroic effort at all...just a "license to learn." ;-)

'zactly.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1083. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-27 02:56:37 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030126215637.20835.00000270@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 60114

In article <tOZY9.1123$N5.645124@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030126103650.20835.00000258@mb-fy.aol.com...
>> In article <AWKY9.3471$d66.350878@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>,
>"Kï¿½HB"
>> <kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG> writes:
>>
>> >"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
>> >:
>> >: In other words, not that many, because you'd tell us the number if it
>> >: were significant. I've never seen an NCI membership number over 4000,
>> >
>> >73, OM, de Hans, K0HB
>> >--
>> > FISTS 7419
>> > NCI 4304
>> >
>> OK, make that 4400. Works out to no more than 3400 NCI members.

Are there more than 3400 current NCI members? If so, how many more?

> > And I know
> >of a
>> few who have resigned their membership. Plus memberships do not expire,
> > even if
>> the members do.
>>
>> Did someone say "majority"?
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>
>Jim,
>
>I never asserted that NCI's membership constituted a majority of hams.

That's true. However, you have not stated how small the membership actually is.

>Nor, I might point out, does ARRL's membership constitute a majority
>of US hams ... more like a bit less than 25% IIRC the last numbers I
>noticed.

Quite true. Nor does ARRL claim to constitute a majority, either.

Let's see....NCI has maybe 3,400 US hams as members out of 685,000 US hams, that's just under 1/2 of one percent. That's a lot smaller than 25%, doncha think?
>
>The majority I was referring to was a majority of all licensed US hams

How do you know what the majority of all licensed US hams think about code testing? Do you have a valid, recent survey, or just wishful thinking?

The FCC went with the MINORITY opinion on the code test issue, based on the comments and various surveys. Of course, they are in no way required to follow the majority opinion on anything.

>(since you were talking about NCI's level of influence with the FCC)

No, I was talking about what the majority opinion of US hams is, and was. Also other interested parties.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1084. Re: Why Hams feel they are superior to CBers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-27 03:02:41 UTC
From: Scott <scott@scotti.sh!t>
Message-ID: <IPudnegSaMjRPKmjXTWcow@comcast.com>
Source record: 60115
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Charles Crow wrote:
>
> Because they are smarter, because they respect other users in other parts of
> the rf spectrum and do not transmit spurious signals that will be heard
> several bands away. Because they realize that 300% modulation is not better
> than 100% modulation unless you want to sound like shit. That this does not
> make you transmit further just radiate harmonics and shit on other bands.
> Because they can have a conversation on the air without using words like:
> roger, mud duck, or good buddy. This list can go on and on. Any Questions?

Why does the Liberty Net exist?

1085. Re: Hot Fun In The Summertime With Brian

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-27 03:26:22 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301261926.2d19822a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60116

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030126103806.02227.00000268@mb-bk.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Hot Fun In The Summertime With Brian
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 1/25/03 5:46 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0301251546.47ee33fa@posting.google.com>
>
> >Yes, I declined to go to jump school, yet my service continued. How
> >can that be if I declined further service? How could I decline if it
> >were involuntary?
>
> Do you read what you write, Brian? Do you read what was quoted?
>
> I don't think so...

Steav, what was quoted was me. I wrote it. I know what I wrote. But
it isn't my reading comprehension that's in question; its yours. Now
tell me why you got my service record wrong, again.

You've soared past being a simple moron, and for your singularly
distinctive accomplishment, HQ has approved the moron squared award.
You have their permission to put it in your collection with the things
you did and didn't earn.

1086. Re: This Is How KB1HMW "Supports" Amateur Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-27 03:30:17 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301261930.6bd053a4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60117

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030126102539.02227.00000267@mb-bk.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: This Is How KB1HMW "Supports" Amateur Radio
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 1/25/03 5:17 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0301251517.6ef25c74@posting.google.com>
>
>
> >I see a trend. Wings and Halo's. He must be an angel.
>
> Compared to you two...?!?!...I dare say!
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Lucifer was an angel. But I don't think of you as evil. Just unbalanced.

1087. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-27 03:32:32 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301261932.615093fd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60118

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030126102431.02227.00000266@mb-bk.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >Date: 1/26/03 12:43 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20030126014351.20835.00000254@mb-fy.aol.com>
>
> >> I get "feely" too.... <ggg>
> > > Poor baby.
>
> "Poor baby"...?!?! How long is it since YOU touched ANYTHING that wasn't
> attached to you at birth?
>
> >> Yeah - my pro bono clients want discounts... <ggg>
> > > I would think the anti-Bono clients want much more.
> > > Or do you favor modern music?
>
> More insensitive crap at the expense of a dead man.

Bono is too busy making political statements to be dead. He should
take some time off to make some music.

1088. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-27 03:43:46 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301261943.4df5faaf@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60119

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0301260719.4750d2df@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0301251525.4a3c0e3e@posting.google.com>...
> > kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0301250813.66af407e@posting.google.com>...
> > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0301241515.5018da17@posting.google.com>...
> > > > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030124100213.01401.00000141@mb-mk.aol.com>...
> > > > > >Subject: Re: NR-1 Book
> > > > > >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> > > > > >Date: 1/24/03 7:18 AM Central Standard Time
> > > > > >Message-id: <f45722ac.0301240518.184ce709@posting.google.com>
>
> > > > > >RRAA is full of character assassination
> > > > >
> > > > > It's not "character assassination" if it's true, Brain.
> > > > >
> > > > > Steve
> > > >
> > > > Have you followed the Fractenna assassination for the last 4 years or so, Steav?
> > >
> > > Right: One little piece of completely ignorable ongoing nonsense in
> > > RRAA and you just had to land on it. No surprise at all, the other 98%
> > > of RRAA is so far over yer empty head you can't even start to deal
> > > with it.
> > >
> > > Go back to yer rubber ducky.
> > >
> > > w3rv
> >
> > Empty Head, I've discussed the t2fd and similar antennas on rraa.
> > According to your experts they do not work and they cannot work (dummy
> > load).
>
> That's right, the t2fd is an extremely inefficient antenna on most
> freqs because most of the power ya put to one is wasted heating the
> resistor in the thing. It's a terrible antenna for ham purposes,
> anybody with half a brain and the same space a t3fd needs can put up a
> far more efficient antenna for 1/10 the cost of a t2fd. That leaves
> you out.

Empty Head, why must t2fd cost more than other antennas of its kind? Why must a discussion about such an antenna in military and government use pass amateur "standards?" What is the amateur standard, and where is it codified?Why must amateurs run their antenna preferences by you and your cronies on rraa? Are you now saying that amateur radio operators with half a brain lack freedom of choice in the kind of antennas they choose to implement? Do full brained amateurs get to choose their own antennas, or must they march lock step with you?

> Then they'll tell you how they contacted Australia with a
> > light bulb when they were kid hams.
>
> That leaves you out again.

I was never a ham kid. You're no longer a kid.

> > You deal with it.
>
> I have, no problem.

Obviously a false statement.

1089. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-27 04:18:27 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030126231827.05722.00000260@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 60120

>Subject: Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 1/26/03 9:16 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0301261916.6b572c5d@posting.google.com>

>I think Steve went to mental jump school as he's been limping along
>for some time now.

Perhaps...but I have two things on you and Lennie.

(1) I don't lie.

(2) I know the diffrence between an authorization to operate and validity for DXCC.

Great company you keep, Brian. A known pathological liar who's entire purpose in this forum is deceit and antagonism.

Sure says a lot about you, huh...?!?!

1090. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-27 04:21:51 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030126232151.00111.00000641@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 60121

In article <d22b54c3.0301261333.776d717e@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
>news:<3E333DE1.85E0A54B@ix.netcom.com>...
>> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>>
>> >
>> > Years on rrap: 12
>>
>> Has rrap been around that long?
>
>
>Larry was on Fidonet back before Windoze and the Web came along,
>apparently there was an RRAP equivalent on Fido. Primeval Internet
>days from the perspective of us Internet "newbies".
>
>
>w3rv

Usenet dates back to the very beginning of the Internet. I started using both back in 1990, when I got my first 1200-baud modem while stationed in England. Upgraded to the blazing speed of 2400-baud in Colorado Springs in 1991, where I became a serious Fidonet/Usenet/AOL user. I subscribed to a dozen Bulletin Board Services in Colorado Springs as a member of the Colorado Springs PC Users Group (COSUG), where I was a member of the Database and Communications user's groups. I participated mainly in the Fidonet Ham and Ham Radio (they were much different) echos, and made an occasional appearance on rec. radio.amateur.misc, which was starting to get really bogged down with the whining of the NCTA, thereby causing the creation of rec.radio. amateur.policy. rrap seemed to generate a lot of interesting message traffic, and it became quite satisfactory to deliver laser-guided logic bombs into the argument bunkers of the NCTA whiners, so that's where I concentrated my efforts from then on.

I would do anything to possess a complete archive of all messages I've posted on Fidonet/Usenet over the past dozen years. My old computer's hard drive has about a couple of years's worth of the old Fidonet stuff, but none of my early Usenet postings.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1091. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-27 04:21:51 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030126232151.00111.00000640@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 60122

In article <2RRY9.1014$N5.598924@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>> And those of us with a more mature, enlightened, and rational attitude
>> toward the Morse/CW mode realize that the USE of this mode will not
>> continue at it's former levels unless there *is* a requirement for Morse
>> code testing at useful proficiency levels!
>
>SO, you publicly admit that your motivation to force all to learn Morse
>in order to pass a test is based SOLELY on your desire for more "recruits"
>(willing or not) to the ranks of Morsedom ... in hopes that at least a few
>will stick to using the mode.

Carl:

Yes, I do. What's wrong with that? I don't recall ever attempting to disguise
this "motivation."

>Frankly, while I have no desire to see Morse USE dwindle, I don't give
>a rat's arse if it does either.

Right, and you've made no secret of this over the years. I, OTOH, very much
care if Morse Code continues to be used, because as a long-time user of this
mode, I know the benefits and advantages of it, and would not care to see it
disappear from disuse.

>Modes should survive on the basis of a free-market approach ... if people use
them fine, if >nobody finds them useful or attractive enough to pursue, that's
fine too. In the REAL >world, it's NOT religion ... that fantasy only exists
in the minds of the rabid PCTA crowd.

No, this false construct of supporting Morse Code testing requirements as being
some sort of "religion" is just more empty NCTA rhetoric. Whenever I see
rhetoric like this being used, the first conclusion I must draw is that those
spouting it are plum out of any sort of logical arguments to support their
cause, and must therefore rely on inane analogies such as this.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1092. Re: Hot Fun In The Summertime With Brian

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-27 04:32:41 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030126233241.05722.00000265@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 60123

>Subject: Re: Hot Fun In The Summertime With Brian
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 1/26/03 9:26 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0301261926.2d19822a@posting.google.com>

>Steav, what was quoted was me. I wrote it. I know what I wrote. But
>it isn't my reading comprehension that's in question; its yours. Now
>tell me why you got my service record wrong, again.

Then you need to re-read what you wrote, Brain, becasue in the space of two sentences, you contradicted yourself.

My reading comprehension's just fine...except when trying to decode Idiotese. You write in Idiotese.

>You've soared past being a simple moron, and for your singularly
>distinctive accomplishment, HQ has approved the moron squared award.

If saying this makes you feel better, Brian, be my guest. When I lost my daughter I lashed out at things too, and while it made me feel better at that moment, it was still wrong.

One day you'll know this too, for you are wrong now.

>You have their permission to put it in your collection with the things
>you did and didn't earn.

At least I know the difference, Brian.

You and your "good buddy" still have some problems in that regard. You with the difference between "authorization" vs "valid", and Lennie for "Amateur Radio" vs "Anything else".

It's really cute.

Steve, K4YZ

1093. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-27 04:35:04 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030126233504.05722.00000266@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 60125

>Subject: Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 1/26/03 9:32 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0301261932.615093fd@posting.google.com>

>Bono is too busy making political statements to be dead. He should
>take some time off to make some music.

Sonny Bono's been dead for several years now. Who are you talking about?

1094. Re: The coders embarrass themselves on 14.275 MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-27 04:35:30 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns930FEFFD5E116elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 60124
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

haaaynorton@comnospam (Ed Norton) wrote in
news:296332854.FF1640746@lloyds.lover.boy:

> I've been reading all of this hoopla about K1MAN and the activities on
> 14.275 MHz, but have never really paid much attention to it until
> today when I tuned in to see what could be heard.
>
> It was then that I heard some CW operators making real asses of
> themselves, proving that CW confers no virtue upon its practitioners.
>
> A short listen at approximately 2100Z quickly turned up a CW operator
> sending "shit" over and over again at about 10 wpm. Fifteen minutes
> later, another CW operator joined in with the word "fuck," this time
> repeated over and over at around 20 wpm.
>
> Yes sir. CW capability sure improves the hobby. NOT!

Riley Hollingsworth recently visited our local club. One of the things he said in his talk was that he had never heard of a complaint of a CW op jamming. It occurred to me at the time, although I didn't get the chance to tell him, that I had heard someone sending 'fuck' repeatedly in CW on a repeater. It's a myth that there's no jamming or swearing on CW.

73 de N3KIP

1095. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-27 04:40:28 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030126234028.05722.00000268@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 60126

>Subject: Re: NR-1 Book
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 1/26/03 9:43 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0301261943.4df5faaf@posting.google.com>

>Do full brained amateurs get to
>choose their own antennas, or must they march lock step with you?

Whew! First he sounds like Lennie, then he talks like Lennie.

Must be Lennie!

>I was never a ham kid.

No...just a porker.

>You're no longer a kid.

You don't have to be a kid to be a kid at heart. Your Putzmaster never learned how to have fun, ergo his current state of angst at an entire subset of the radiocommunications community.

You are not far behind.

>> I have, no problem.
>
>Obviously a false statement.

Only if YOU utter it, Brian.

Steve, K4YZ

1096. Re: How Long until K1MAN receives his revocation letter?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-27 04:47:56 UTC
From: Ed Norton <SewerSpecialist@EDnortonSewers.org>
Message-ID: <b12dl8feh0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 60127
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Dream on Fool! Never Happen. My position with the
DOD gives me inside info. It ain't never gonna happen.

Ed Norton
DOD Sewer Specialist

"Chris" <rfburns2003@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:634e00e4.0301261505.6306daf2@posting.google.com...
> I'm going to climb out on a limb here, and predict that K1MAN will get
> an FCC letter in the first week of February. The contents are anyone's
> guess, but my GUESS is, the contents will be based on previous letters
> written to the baby broadcaster. I predict the new letter will tell
> Baxter his license is suspended and scheduled for a revocation
> hearing, and will follow a format like this:
>
> Dear Glenn A. Baxter (K1MAN),
>
> The commission wrote you last year about deficiencies in the operation
> of K1MAN. You have had one full year to correct these deficiencies.
> Despite the commission giving you ample opportunity to correct those
> deficiencies, you have failed to do so. The following continued
> deficiencies were noted this past year:
>
> Broadcasting
>
>
> The format of the so-called K1MAN bulletin resembles a broadcast more
> than a bulletin. Accordingly, we will refer to it as a broadcast
> henceforth. K1MAN broadcasts news and views that could alternately be
> provided through other services. To the extent that K1MAN did not
> observe the prohibition regarding this practice; this practice was in
> violation.
>
> Failure to Observe Frequency Sharing Rules
>
>
> K1MAN has commenced broadcasting over numerous QSO's in progress. When
> asked to delay the K1MAN broadcast, the response from K1MAN was "No, I
> am not going to ruin a nine year precedent." This shows a gross
> misunderstanding of the basis and purpose of part 97 and the amateur
> service in general. No licensee is authorized exclusive use of any
> frequency. This practice was in violation.
>
>

> Lack of Control Operator
>
>
> Numerous stations from the US in the South; the Midwest; and the
> Northeast, attempted to contact K1MAN's control operator over the
> phone and on the radio. The fact that there was no response on several
> occasions indicates that either there was no control operator at the
> control point, or that the control operator was negligent, by
> beginning the K1MAN broadcast over ongoing QSO's and ignoring advice
> that the frequency was in use. This practice was in violation.
>
>
> Defamation
>
>
> Numerous incidents of defamation per se of other amateurs have
> occurred on the K1MAN broadcast. This practice was contrary to the
> basis and purpose of part 97 and was therefore, in violation.
>
>
> Threats
>
>
> You advised amateurs to visit the K1MAN web site for information. On
> the web site, K1MAN advised "foolish amateurs" to QSY or QRT, when the
> K1MAN was about to commence, or risk the filing of criminal charges.
> These threats were the subject of a commission letter dated January
> 2002; a letter from the office of US Attorney, Jay P. McCloskey in
> Maine; and a letter from FCC Counsel John P. Greenspan. You also
> advised other amateurs to file their own felony affidavits against
> amateurs who used the frequency on which you intended to operate,
> after being advised that this practice was illegal. This practice
> therefore, was also in violation.
>
>
> Routine Solicitation of Donations for Benefit of a Business
>
>
> Soliciting contributions for IARN on a daily basis constituted using
> amateur radio for the routine benefit of a business. This practice was
> in violation.
>
>
> Use of Unauthorized Tape Recordings.
>
>
> There have been numerous instances of unauthorized use of tape
> recordings played over the air. This practice was in violation. Walter
> Cronkite's Attorney recently wrote you a letter indicating you do not
> have authorization to use his tape recorded voice identification on

> your broadcast. This practice was in violation.
>
>
> Copyright Infringement
>
> The ARRL recently advised you that your distribution of the Walter
> Cronkite CD to AARA life members was in violation of their copyright
> of that material. You advertised the giveaway of copies of this CD on
> your broadcast. This practice was in violation.
>
> Poor Engineering Practices
>
>
> Distortion, malfunctioning equipment, drifting transmitters, and
> erratic starting and stopping times characterized your broadcasts over
> the past year. This practice was in violation.
>
>
> Lack of the Character Qualifications to be a Commission Licensee
>
>
> The FCC's John P Greenspan letter, and the Assistant US Attorney's
> letter, written by Gail Fiske Malone, pointed out that your actions
> indicated that you may very well lack the character qualifications to
> be an FCC licensee. Greenspan also stated, "You certainly lack the
> maturity but that is, unfortunately, not grounds for revocation."
> After reviewing ongoing complaints by numerous amateurs and after
> reviewing the record of your correspondence with the commission, we
> concur with the previous opinions. You do not possess the requisite
> character qualifications to be a licensee.
>
> Accordingly we have suspended your station and operators licenses,
> effective immediately, and have designated your license for a
> revocation hearing before an administrative law judge, where you will
> have the burden of proving why you should remain a commission
> licensee.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> The Enforcer

1097. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-27 04:58:45 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E34BC85.7070704@adelphia.net>
Source record: 60128

N2EY wrote:

> Some will tell you that the Morse test is "unnecessary" because no US ham is
> required to use Morse. IOW, it's possible to operate a ham station in
> compliance with all rules and regs, yet have no Morse skill at all.
>
> Yet what those folks forget is the fact that the same thing can be said about
> almost everything in the written tests, as well. Go down that road far enough,
> and the "necessary" part of the tests boils down to the rules &regs plus some
> basic theory needed to understand the rules. The rest is "unnecessary" if that
> minimal philosophy is taken.

That argument is bogus on so many levels. "I doubt I'll ever do satellite operations. So no questions on that for me"! "I'm only doing QRP so why am I forced to learn about RF safety". So on and so on.....

>
> I took the writtens way back in the days of FCC-office testing. Even before
> Bash books. How "hard" the tests were is purely a subjective opinion, because
> we don't have the old tests available for comparison.

The old study guides look to be easier, however. I think it was Hans who noted that there will be a natural tendency for people to believe that the tests they took were harder, due to their memory of the difficulty encountered when they took the tests, and looking at new tests with the jaundiced eye of accumulated knowledge over the years.

> One thing I do know, however, is that most hams I knew back then over-prepared
> for the tests, because the cost and inconvenience of testing and re-testing
> were considerable.

I over prepped for the tests too. I took a good while studying the guides. Any question I didn't "get", I looked up in the reference books I had. By the time I was done, I could answer any question in the test.

And before anyon speaks of memorization of the Extra (and I think the general) the answers are mixed up. answer "A" in the study guide ain't "A" in the real test

> Example: Back in 1968, the test fee was $9 - that's $50 or more in today's
> money. Quite a bit of money for an eighth-grader like me. Since the tests were
> only given on Mon-Wed mornings that were not holidays, I had to wait until
> either Xmas break or the summer to take the test - IF the holidays did not
> interfere. And due to the mandatory 30 day wait to retest, the maximum number
> of tests in a calendar year for me was 4.

It was uphill both ways too? Just kidding! 8^)

> I've taken and passed many "EE finals" and I agree. Funny thing, though - even
> a Ph.D in EE does not give one a pass on the ham license tests. I remember
> Elmering my advisor in college, (a full professor in EE) who eventually became
> a ham. Brilliant guy, but had no experience with practical radio until he ran
> into me.

Myself, I had almost no RF experience even though I've been an
electroniker for 30 years now. So it was weird for me. Many things I
knew easily, but some took quite a bit of study.

> Yup. Including the fact that what constitutes "a reasonable minimum level of
> qualification to operate safely and with a minimum potential for interference
> to other radio services" is a very subjective thing.
>
>>A. 5-wpm in NOT working hard, it's NOT "jumping through hoops, and many
>>believe (Myself included.) it's NOT an unnecessary requirement...it's a very
>>BASIC requirement. (Dare I say...entry-level.)
>>
> I agree 100%.

Here is where i disagree a bit. Perhaps you might agree that if a Phd can
have to expend some effort to learn the written, some people might have
some trouble with the code test.

This is the area in which some of the Pro-coders mess up big time. Just
because it might be easy for you does not mean that it is easy for me.

>>B. As for 5-wpm being an exclusionary tool...puh-lease. I'm also a CBer, the
>>very "malady" that some postulate that the "CW immunization" exists to
>>protect the bands from. The only group that a 5-wpm "discriminates" against
>>are those who don't even want to give it any serious effort to begin with.
>>
> Again, agree 100%

I'm a pro-coder, but I like to let you guys know that all people who have
trouble with Morse code are not people who "don't want to give it
serious effort or are lazy. Some get it easily, some do not. Its a
physical/mental skill.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1098. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-27 05:14:03 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.h9cou3t.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 60129

On 27 Jan 2003 04:35:04 GMT, Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:

>>Bono is too busy making political statements to be dead. He should
>>take some time off to make some music.
>
>Sonny Bono's been dead for several years now. Who are you talking about?

There's some British rock star called Bono. To my musically-trained
ear (yes, I have formal music training) neither of them made music,
just noise.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1099. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-27 05:26:27 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <7q3Z9.5584$d66.509328@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 60130

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote

:
: Sonny Bono's been dead for several years now. Who are you talking
about?
:

You need to get out more, Sarge!

Even an old fossil like me knows that Bono, a singer with U2, centerpiece of
last years Super Bowl halftime, and generally the current god of pop music,
is very much alive and well.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

1100. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-27 06:05:48 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b14di221cuv@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 60214

From all the research as well as the many debates I have seen here and elsewhere, that is the best way I now can describe my feelings as stated immediately below about the whole code issue.... Ryan

> Frankly, while I have no desire to see Morse USE dwindle, I don't give
> a rat's arse if it does either. Modes should survive on the basis of a
> free-market approach ... if people use them fine, if nobody finds them useful
> or attractive enough to pursue, that's fine too.

1101. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-27 06:30:17 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030127013017.09027.00000151@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 60131

>Subject: Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking
>From: "Kï¿½HB" kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG
>Date: 1/26/03 11:26 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <7q3Z9.5584$d66.509328@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>

>Even an old fossil like me knows that Bono, a singer with U2, centerpiece of
>last years Super Bowl halftime, and generally the current god of pop music,
>is very much alive and well.

"Ahhhhhhh....I see", said the blind man...

73 de K4YZ

1102. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-27 06:35:48 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030127013548.09027.00000152@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 60132

>Subject: Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking
>From: "Phil Kane" Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop
>Date: 1/26/03 11:14 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <cuvyxnansvbet.h9cou3t.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>

>There's some British rock star called Bono. To my musically-trained
> ear (yes, I have formal music training) neither of them made music,
> just noise

I agree on Sonny Bono's "musical" abilties, however he acquitted himself rather nicely, I thought, as the Mayor of Palm Springs.

A friend of mine was a Paramedic there and was there when a school bus rolled over. The Mayor went to the scene and lent a hand with IV's, first aid, etc. When the media tried to make him the center of attention, he redirected them brusquely to the Paramedics and Firemen trying to effect the rescue in the bus.

Perhaps not as popular as his ex-wife, but certainly far greater character.

73

Steve, K4YZ

1103. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-27 06:52:18 UTC
From: jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu
Message-ID: <b12kv2$8q3$1@news.hawaii.edu>
Source record: 60136

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote:

>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> Years on rrap: 12

>Has rrap been around that long?

I came aboard the RRA NGs in 1992, 11 years ago, so
RRAP has been around at least that many years.

Jeff KH6O

--
Operations Specialist Mathematics Lecturer
U.S. Coast Guard Kapiolani College
Dept. of Homeland Security University of Hawaii System

1104. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-27 06:58:12 UTC
From: jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu
Message-ID: <b12la4$8u1$1@news.hawaii.edu>
Source record: 60134

K&#65533;HB <K&#65533;HB@ARRL.ORG> wrote:
> NCI 4304

How many of those 4304 are current members? Were/are they all licensed
hams? How many were/are coded hams?

Jeff KH6O

--
Operations Specialist Mathematics Lecturer
U.S. Coast Guard Kapiolani College
Dept. of Homeland Security University of Hawaii System

1105. Re: Why Hams feel they are superior to CBers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-27 12:48:26 UTC
From: Scott <scott@scotti.sh!t>
Message-ID: <WaqcneLYO8MJt6ijXTWcpQ@comcast.com>
Source record: 60137
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

> "Glenn Baxter for President, 2004"

I'd have a much better chance of making that orifice then you.

1106. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-27 13:07:13 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030127080713.02398.00000183@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 60142

>Subject: Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking
>From: jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu (Jeffrey Herman)
>Date: 1/26/03 6:05 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <b11t4u$od6$1@news.hawaii.edu>

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>
>>You didn't do radio 24/7 ever and there is no
>>professional equivalent to DXing.
>
>We keep 24/7 radio watch on the HF maritime frequencies.
>Those ships are all DX, and we're certainly professionals.

Hey Jeff. Good to see you.

I think you go the attribute wrong. It was Lennie who was asserting HE did raido "24/7", and was once again trying to draw an analogy between the concept of talking to someone far away, and the Amateur comcept of "DXing".

Yes..."DXing" by it's very nature means talking to people far away, but it is also akin to hunting. On a military or maritime channel you don't have to go hunting for your prey nor do you have to contend with 10,000 other folks calling him all at once.

As usual, Lennie's references were in the"first-person-singular" until he was called on it, and only then did he change his story to mean that the >radio station< at which he was a clerk was doing this 24/7, not he.

Hope the WX is a bit warmer in HI tahn it is in TN today! =)

73

Steve, K4YZ

1107. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-27 13:08:10 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301270508.161c6672@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60138

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.h9cou3t.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> On 27 Jan 2003 04:35:04 GMT, Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
> >>Bono is too busy making political statements to be dead. He should
> >>take some time off to make some music.
> >
> >Sonny Bono's been dead for several years now. Who are you talking about?
>
> There's some British rock star called Bono. To my musically-trained
> ear (yes, I have formal music training) neither of them made music,
> just noise.
>
> ---
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

Phil, it is quite easy for you to dismiss the career of others, isn't
it? Most on here would argue that if you do not have a professional
music career, you have no say in what constitutes musical ability,
much in the way they claim if you do not have an amateur radio
license, you have no say in amateur radio.

So, tell us about your music career.

1108. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-27 13:12:45 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301270512.f2f0144@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60139

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030124015037.07681.00000246@mb-fk.aol.com>...
> In article <3E2F0DA7.48BD0A0E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
>
>
> >Right. I probably should have used the term "proficient in morse". We
> >certainly wouldn't want to see you "bothered" by those pesky amateur
> >radio license exams. You didn't do radio 24/7 ever and there is no
> >professional equivalent to DXing.
>
> "DX" is a worldwide term, long in use by the radio world, an
> abbreviation for "distance." ADA, as part of the Army
> Command and Administrative Network, did communications
> for the United Nations Far East Headquarters and for Army
> Forces Far East from 1946 through 1963...on HF 24 hours a
> day, 7 days a week.

Military stations will ocassionally QSL a SW listener, if they have time.

1109. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-27 13:13:04 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030127081304.02398.00000184@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 60143

>Subject: Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 1/27/03 7:08 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0301270508.161c6672@posting.google.com>

>So, tell us about your music career.

While he's doing that, why don't you explain to us again how you justified breaking international law to operate from a UN controlled entity without written permission?

Steve, K4YZ

1110. Re: Pisswilly Babies

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-27 13:15:23 UTC
From: Lloyd <Expert@LloydExpert.edu>
Message-ID: <b13bcnpka0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 60144

"Lois" <Winer@anon.com> wrote in message news:b10drf$6ef$0@pita.alt.net...
> And here you see it. Pisswilly Babies sniping and disecting the posts of
> others. It goes on and on and on to the point of nausea. Will the real 11
> meter Pisswilly please bend over???
> You are making Lloyd proud.
>

Oh my, you couldn't possibly referring to the San Hedrin of r.r.a.p.?
Put these egomaniacs on a CB channel, and we would have endless
entertainment. From the rantings of a former FCC paralegal to the
blatherings of a self-styled medical expert, can you imagine it? These
fruits claim to have credentials and education that the president of
Yale would be envious of. r.r.a.p., source of endless laughs and
home of fruits and nuts. HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA HA

Lloyd

1111. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-27 13:17:22 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301270517.400795b9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60140

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030126234028.05722.00000268@mb-fx.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: NR-1 Book
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 1/26/03 9:43 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0301261943.4df5faaf@posting.google.com>
>
> >Do full brained amateurs get to
> >choose their own antennas, or must they march lock step with you?
>
> Whew! First he sounds like Lennie, then he talks like Lennie.
>
> Must be Lennie!
>
> >I was never a ham kid.
>
> No...just a porker.
>
> >You're no longer a kid.
>
> You don't have to be a kid to be a kid at heart. Your Putzmaster never
> learned how to have fun, ergo his current state of angst at an entire subset of
> the radiocommunications community.
>
> You are not far behind.
>
> >> I have, no problem.
> >
> >Obviously a false statement.
>
> Only if YOU utter it, Brian.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Steve, next time intersperse something substantive with your insults,
instead of just insult after insult. Criticism CAN be constructuve if
you don't mind putting a little thought into it.

Brian

1112. Re: The coders embarrass themselves on 14.275 MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-27 13:23:16 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301270523.72888bff@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60141
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns930FEFFD5E116elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> haaaynorton@comnospam (Ed Norton) wrote in
> news:296332854.FF1640746@lloyds.lover.boy:
>
> > I've been reading all of this hoopla about K1MAN and the activities on
> > 14.275 MHz, but have never really paid much attention to it until
> > today when I tuned in to see what could be heard.
> >
> > It was then that I heard some CW operators making real asses of
> > themselves, proving that CW confers no virtue upon its practitioners.
> >
> > A short listen at approximately 2100Z quickly turned up a CW operator
> > sending "shit" over and over again at about 10 wpm. Fifteen minutes
> > later, another CW operator joined in with the word "fuck," this time
> > repeated over and over at around 20 wpm.
> >
> > Yes sir. CW capability sure improves the hobby. NOT!
>
> Riley Hollingsworth recently visited our local club. One of the things he
> said in his talk was that he had never heard of a complaint of a CW op
> jamming. It occurred to me at the time, although I didn't get the chance
> to tell him, that I had heard someone sending 'fuck' repeatedly in CW on a
> repeater. It's a myth that there's no jamming or swearing on CW.
>
> 73 de N3KIP

That's really bizarre for someone of such vast experience and
reputation as Riley to make such a claim. If Aaron Jones were still
on here he would add it to his Morse Myths list.

Nearly every case of "jamming" I've ever heard was with CW. Even
K3LT's "friend" is reported to send "QFU" on code.

1113. Re: Hot Fun In The Summertime With Brian

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-27 13:28:47 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301270528.2e737cd8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60145

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030126233241.05722.00000265@mb-fx.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Hot Fun In The Summertime With Brian
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 1/26/03 9:26 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0301261926.2d19822a@posting.google.com>
>
> >Steav, what was quoted was me. I wrote it. I know what I wrote. But
> >it isn't my reading comprehension that's in question; its yours. Now
> >tell me why you got my service record wrong, again.
>
> Then you need to re-read what you wrote, Brain, becasue in the space of two
> sentences, you contradicted yourself.

No, Steav, you tell me what is wrong with my statements. You cannot.

You merely misunderstood that declining jump school scuttled me out of
the service. The contradiction is in your mind, along with a lot of
other stuff. Blow your nose, maybe your mind will clear.

You've earned "cubed."

1114. Re: The coders embarrass themselves on 14.275 MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-27 13:36:47 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030127083647.16889.00000237@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 60146

In article <Xns930FEFFD5E116elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
<elektros@yahoo.com> writes:

>Riley Hollingsworth recently visited our local club. One of the things he
>said in his talk was that he had never heard of a complaint of a CW op
>jamming.

I think what he meant was CW ops jamming other CW/digital ops.

In other words, jamming in the 'phone bands is much, much more common that in
the CW/digital bands.

> It occurred to me at the time, although I didn't get the chance
>to tell him, that I had heard someone sending

(expletive deleted)

> repeatedly in CW on a
>repeater.

I don't doubt it, even though I've never heard such on a ham repeater.

>It's a myth that there's no jamming or swearing on CW.
>
Of curse it's a myth. The point is, however, that it's far less common on CW
than on voice modes. Just read the FCC enforcement letters. Lots of enforcement
actions against hams using voice in the voice bands, extremely few (if any)
against hams using CW or digital in the CW/digital bands.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1115. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-27 13:42:40 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0301270542.4baf70a0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60147

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message news:<3E34BC85.7070704@adelphia.net>...
> N2EY wrote:
>
> > Some will tell you that the Morse test is "unnecessary" because no US ham is
> > required to use Morse. IOW, it's possible to operate a ham station in
> > compliance with all rules and regs, yet have no Morse skill at all.
> >
> > Yet what those folks forget is the fact that the same thing can be said about
> > almost everything in the written tests, as well. Go down that road far enough,
> > and the "necessary" part of the tests boils down to the rules &regs plus some
> > basic theory needed to understand the rules. The rest is "unnecessary" if that
> > minimal philosophy is taken.
>
>
> That argument is bogus on so many levels.

Of course it's bogus, but some (not all!) anti-code-test folks keep
using it. And they use terms like "hoop jumping" and "forcing it down
people's throats" very selectively.

>"I doubt I'll ever do satellite
> operations. So no questions on that for me"! "I'm only doing QRP so why
> am I forced to learn about RF safety". So on and so on.....
>
Exactly! Particularly when the questions deal with specific
technologies rather than rules & regs.

Of course no other mode has a stand-alone, pass-fail test. But if you
look at the number of written questions that fail the "necessary"
critierion, it's clear that most of the written falls into the "hoop"
category.

> > I took the writtens way back in the days of FCC-office testing. Even before
> > Bash books. How "hard" the tests were is purely a subjective opinion,
> >because
> > we don't have the old tests available for comparison.
>
>
> The old study guides look to be easier, however.

I disagree! The old guides, when looked at in their entirety, covered
a lot of ground. And since they were not the exact Q&A, but rather
essays, one could not be sure what would and would not be the focus of
a test question.

However, unless we have the actual tests to compare, it's not only
subjective, but based solely on decades-old memories.

> I think it was Hans who
> noted that there will be a natural tendency for people to believe that
> the tests they took were harder, due to their memory of the difficulty
> encountered when they took the tests, and looking at new tests with the
> jaundiced eye of accumulated knowledge over the years.

Quite true, in some cases anyway.

Plus there is the "total difficulty" effect. FCC's old policy of
making test session access inconvenient and expensive (see below)
increased the perceived difficulty of the test process, regardless of
the test difficulty.

I think it's a GOOD thing that the exam sessions are much more
accessible today.
>
> > One thing I do know, however, is that most hams I knew back then over-prepared
> > for the tests, because the cost and inconvenience of testing and re-testing
> > were considerable.
>
>
> I over prepped for the tests too. I took a good while studying the
> guides. Any question I didn't "get", I looked up in the reference books
> I had. By the time I was done, I could answer any question in the test.

Same here! But we also hear of hams who take the test with little or
no preparation, and those who retest several times on the same day and
finally manage to pass.
>
> And before anyon speaks of memorization of the Extra (and I think the
> general) the answers are mixed up. answer "A" in the study guide ain't
> "A" in the real test

Sure - but that's not how most folks would memorize the test.
>
> > Example: Back in 1968, the test fee was $9 - that's $50 or more in today's
> > money. Quite a bit of money for an eighth-grader like me. Since the tests were
> > only given on Mon-Wed mornings that were not holidays, I had to wait until
> > either Xmas break or the summer to take the test - IF the holidays did not
> > interfere. And due to the mandatory 30 day wait to retest, the maximum number
> > of tests in a calendar year for me was 4.
>
>
> It was uphill both ways too? Just kidding! 8^)

Actually, it was downhill to the FCC office and uphill going back
home!
>
> > I've taken and passed many "EE finals" and I agree. Funny thing, though - even
> > a Ph.D in EE does not give one a pass on the ham license tests. I remember

> > Elmering my advisor in college, (a full professor in EE) who eventually became
> > a ham. Brilliant guy, but had no experience with practical radio until he ran
> > into me.
>
>
> Myself, I had almost no RF experience even though I've been an
> electroniker for 30 years now. So it was weird for me. Many things I
> knew easily, but some took quite a bit of study.

Well, there you have it.
>
> > Yup. Including the fact that what constitutes "a reasonable minimum level of
> > qualification to operate safely and with a minimum potential for interference
> > to other radio services" is a very subjective thing.
> >
> >>A. 5-wpm in NOT working hard, it's NOT "jumping through hoops, and many
> >>believe (Myself included.) it's NOT an unnecessary requirement...it's a very
> >>BASIC requirement. (Dare I say...entry-level.)
> >>
> > I agree 100%.
>
> Here is where i disagree a bit. Perhaps you might agree that if a Phd
> can
> have to expend some effort to learn the written, some people might have
> some trouble with the code test.

Of course the difficulty varies widely with the individual. Most of
what my advisor had to learn was rules/regs and practical stuff vs.
theory.
>
> This is the area in which some of the Pro-coders mess up big time. Just
> because it might be easy for you does not mean that it is easy for me.

Of course!

The main point Bert and I are making is that 5 wpm is not
"unreasonable" or "irrelevant" to an HF amateur radio license.

> >>B. As for 5-wpm being an exclusionary tool...puh-lease. I'm also a CBer, the
> >>very "malady" that some postulate that the "CW immunization" exists to
> >>protect the bands from. The only group that a 5-wpm "discriminates" against
> >>are those who don't even want to give it any serious effort to begin with.
> >>
> > Again, agree 100%
>
> I'm a pro-coder, but I like to let you guys know that all people who have
> trouble with Morse code are not people who "don't want to give it
> serious effort or are lazy. Some get it easily, some do not. Its a
> physical/mental skill.

True - but in many cases presented here, the person simply refuses to
even try.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1116. Re: The coders embarrass themselves on 14.275 MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-27 13:48:07 UTC
From: Ernie Bilko <SgtBilko@armysgtbilko.org>
Message-ID: <b13da4$1ru$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 60148
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Riley is the model PR man, makes it up as he goes along,
always pleasant. Enough reliable information from the proverbial
"informed sources" in the commission has leaked out about what
Riley's marching orders were when he assumed his current position.
Ever notice how there are not any license revocation hearings, even
for the worse of the worst offenders? Don't count on any either,
especially all you experts who think K1MAN's license is going to
be suspened or revoked. Don't hold your breath! Riley is aware
of amateurs who have used their licenese privliges in the commission
of felonies, and he has done squat, as far as suspending or
revoking their ham radio licenses.

Sgt Bilko

1117. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-27 14:44:36 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0301270644.50785d0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60149

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<7dSY9.1052$N5.598152@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
> news:d22b54c3.0301260132.25ece4c1@posting.google.com...
> > I don't know how far along Ed was on the
> > academic path to his EE but I'll bet bucks on the fact that he was no
> > stranger to electronics when he "breezed" thru his General. Minnie
> > would have a much different view yes? Certainly.
>
> How many bucks??? IIRC, Ed was 13 or 14 when he got his
> general. Being a ham is way motivated him to a career in radio
> electronics.

But what had Ed being doing before he earned his General? Which is the
kernel of my point. I was an adolescent technoid too, I got my Novice
when I was 14 or so and my General within the following twelve months.
But I did not just get outta bed one morning and decide to take the
tests and become a ham. I was futzing radios in my late single-digit
age years and by the time I got around to taking the Novice test I'd
built several simple SWL & HF ham rcvrs which led me to ham radio. My
bet is that Ed followed a very similar course and that's what I'll lay
my cash on. So of course the General writtens were a piece of cake for
Ed and myself and 'most everybody else around here given those kinds
of preparatory educational experiences. Thus my contention is that
Ed's comment about how easy the tests are only applies to those with a
background in electronics before they take the tests.

> > > The issue is that some folks are PO'd that people who already know
> > > all the radio stuff don't have to work as hard as they did (because they
> > > didn't know the radio stuff ...
> >
> > That's stupid on their part.
>
> Tell THEM that ... it's "dog in the manger" and "work ethic" BS ...

Tell 'em yerself, I ain't this week's designated RRAP attitude cop.

>
> > > hell, many still don't ... I know other
> > > extras
> > > who don't have a clue on the technical side.
> >
> > Hell yeah! But is that necessarily bad? And if yes why?
>
> Any ham who doesn't meet the intended level of technial

> proficiency for his/her license class is a bad thing in my view,
> because we are supposed to be a technical service ... read
> 97.1 again ...

When was the last time Riley lifted the ticket of an Extra who didn't
know how to open the top of his 756 Pro?

> > Friday evening and noon EST Sunday if not sooner. I understand you're
> > still working on your first, keep slugging and best of luck with it
> > Carl.
>
> I'm not "working on DXCC" ... I haven't haven't even been on HF
> since Dec. (something) ... does that sound like I'm a wild-eyed paper
> chaser to you???

Slacker.

> > What yardstick do you use to quantify cluelessness? And why?
>
> Cluelessness is relative to the level of proficiency that the license
> class expects ...

Proficiency at WHAT??

> IOW, I would not consider a tech who didn't
> understand extra theory completely to be clueless ... he/she is
> a beginner and is supposed to be learning, not to know it all.

What about all the Techs out there today who have been licensed for
decades and could care less about "learning enough" to take a test to
get on HF? Any number of those are far-end electronics gurus who can
give you and every other EE in this NG a real run for yer money on the
"technical" side.

> On the other hand, since I used the phrase "know it all," I should
> clarify that I don't expect extras to "know it all" either ... because
> there is so much that goes beyond the content of the extra QP that
> NOBODY could be expected to know it ALL ...

OK, well then what defines the line which separates Extras who are
"technical enough" from those who are not "technical enough" as it
relates to 97.1?

> But too much of ham culture is built around this pecking order (and
> attempting at all costs to maintain it) ... that hurts ham radio and I
> would like to see it die away with the new generation of hams.

So lets run with this one a bit: Right off yer pissing upwind in a
hurricane if perchance you think that any changes at all in the tests
are about to ameliorate The Pecking Order syndrome in ham radio. Let's
take it out to the limit. All hams have the Uniclass license which
does not require a code test. So the 40wpm types will continue to
beast the crap outta the codeless motormouths. "I'm more of a ham then
you are because I *built* my reddio". "Whatta ya mean ya only have 115

confirmed? I have 315." "What's this nonsense about you needing an apartment balcony vertical? I have a 15 acre antenna farm, what's yer problem?" Then comes the guys running a pair of 4CX1500s in the 75m Arthritis Net.

None of it is gonna go away just because the code tests go away if that's your bottom line. Ridiclous concept. Egalitarianism is a wet dream. Particularly in ham radio.

>
> 73,
> Carl - wk3c

w3rv

1118. Re: The coders embarrass themselves on 14.275 MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-27 15:09:03 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9310674182842elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 60150

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
news:20030127083647.16889.00000237@mb-cc.aol.com:

> In article <Xns930FEFFD5E116elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>
>>Riley Hollingsworth recently visited our local club. One of the things
>>he said in his talk was that he had never heard of a complaint of a CW
>>op jamming.
>
> I think what he meant was CW ops jamming other CW/digital ops.
>
> In other words, jamming in the 'phone bands is much, much more common
> that in the CW/digital bands.
>
>> It occurred to me at the time, although I didn't get the chance to
>> tell him, that I had heard someone sending
>
> (expletive deleted)
>
>> repeatedly in CW on a repeater.
>
> I don't doubt it, even though I've never heard such on a ham repeater.
>
>>It's a myth that there's no jamming or swearing on CW.
>>
> Of curse it's a myth. The point is, however, that it's far less common
> on CW than on voice modes. Just read the FCC enforcement letters. Lots
> of enforcement actions against hams using voice in the voice bands,
> extremely few (if any) against hams using CW or digital in the
> CW/digital bands.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

So, let me see if I've got this right. You're saying that only us phone
ops are the victims, and just because they don't send obscene CW at the CW
end of the band that somehow makes CW better?

1119. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-27 15:22:59 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030127102259.01441.00000229@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 60201

>Subject: Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 1/27/03 7:12 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0301270512.f2f0144@posting.google.com>

>Military stations will ocassionally QSL a SW listener, if they have time

.....and if the QSL doesn't compromise some other aspect of an on-going
operation.

Steve, K4YZ

1120. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-27 15:25:52 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030127102552.01441.00000230@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 60202

>Subject: Re: NR-1 Book
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 1/27/03 7:17 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0301270517.400795b9@posting.google.com>

>Steve, next time intersperse something substantive with your insults,
>instead of just insult after insult.

Why...?!?! Nothing YOU had to offer was anything close to "substantive".

Do you need something to PROMPT you to MAKE substantial comments, Brian?
Kinda like "Name That Tune" where they play a note or two to get you
started...?!?!

1121. Re: Hot Fun In The Summertime With Brian

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-27 15:28:08 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030127102808.01441.00000231@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 60203

>Subject: Re: Hot Fun In The Summertime With Brian
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 1/27/03 7:28 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0301270528.2e737cd8@posting.google.com>

>No, Steav, you tell me what is wrong with my statements. You cannot.

I already did. You choose to ignore it. Do you treat red lights and
"Bridge Out" signs with the same disregard?

>You've earned "cubed."

Not by you I haven't. Where are those T5 logs and permission to operate
at...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

1122. Re: How Long until K1MAN receives his revocation letter?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-27 16:05:44 UTC
From: Haaaynorton@aol.com
Message-ID: <999c58d3.0301270805.5391cc5a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60204
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Ed Norton" <SewerSpecialist@EDnortonSewers.org> wrote in message
news:<b12dl8feh0@pita.alt.net>...
> Dream on Fool! Never Happen. My position with the
> DOD gives me inside info. It ain't never gonna happen.
>
> Ed Norton
> DOD Sewer Specialist
>
>
> <<Huge Snip>>

Unless the posts say "Haaaynorton@aol.com", they didn't come from me.

I despise glenn baxter and his little sucky boy lloyd da toid davies.

lloyd da toid is a follower of any wacko club, scheme, person or anything that is out of kilter with the real world. lloyd da toid is desparately looking for attention of any kind, just like his old master, Herb KV4FZ, "say anything you want about me, good or bad just say it."

Ed Norton

1123. Re: How Long until K1MAN receives his revocation letter?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-27 16:10:14 UTC
From: Haaaynorton@aol.com
Message-ID: <999c58d3.0301270810.218de3f1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60205
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Ed Norton" <SewerSpecialist@EDnortonSewers.org> wrote in message
news:<b12dl8feh0@pita.alt.net>...
> Dream on Fool! Never Happen. My position with the
> DOD gives me inside info. It ain't never gonna happen.
>
> Ed Norton
> DOD Sewer Specialist
>
>
> <<Huge Snip>>

Unless the post says from: "Haaaynorton@aol.com", they didn't come
from me.

I despise glenn baxter and his little suck boy lloyd da toid davies.
lloyd da toid is a follower of anything that is wrong in this world,
such as Profit Stair, Hal Turder, and all the other "Wackos" who are
present on SW and the internet. glenn is just like a boil in the crack
of your ass, constantly irritating......

Ed Norton

1124. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-27 16:26:45 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030127112645.11824.00000342@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 60206

>Subject: Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 1/27/03 7:53 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0301270553.52f61cf8@posting.google.com>

>Steve, I don't keep company.

That's apparent. Perhaps if you did you might assimilate some knowledge about Amateur Radio, especially as it pertains to regulatory matters vis-a-vis licensure and authorizations.

>Len and I happen to agree on many
>things. One is free speech, and the right to petition our government.
> Both are in the Bill of Rights that you must have sworn to defend and
>protect at one time or another in your life.

And both of you may and neither of you have been impeded by anyone that I am aware of, least of all me.

BTW, I know Lennie the Lame loves to wave that "petition the government" and "free speech" thing, but he sure hates having his rants blunted. So do you. Birds of a feather. You love to TRY and make an issue of "your rights" when your rights were never infringed upon.

You see, you and Lennie have another trait in common...You like to try and "shame" others into not posting by somehow insinuating that your rights are being infringed upon. What a bunch of mularkey, and I don't fall for it.

>You see, if Len were not on here without a license, there are those in
>the PCTA who would insist that only Amateur Extras

No...If Lennie HAD a license and PARTICIPATED in Amateur Radio, he MIGHT have a broader knowledge base upon which to make his many "opinions". However he does NOT have that benefit and continuues to step on his own toes all-the-while asserting this "information" as fact.

His frequent spamming of this NG with retelling after retelling of the development of SINCGARS and his railing aginst Dave Heil over "order wires" is his attempt to hide his own ignorance as it pretains to a radio service of which he knows little but hates so much.

Unfortuntely YOU are falling for THAT.

My arguments with Lennie are NOT about Code testing. It's about his blatant lying and gross misrepresentation of what Amateur Radio is about and what it does. His misrepresentations are so easily disproven as to be laughable. However I refuse to allow it to go unchallenged. Pathological liars SHOULD be confronted and thier lies exposed for what they are.

Have you seen him provide one iota of "evidence" about ARRL "dishonesty"...?!?!

My arguments with Lennie are about his cowardly misrepresentation of his association with U. S. Army KIA's in order to make himself look more "heroic". He is anything but....

My arguments with Lennie also extend to his blatant use of offensive and denigrating adjectives that HE uses to "describe" his "opponents", yet flails about as "VICTIM!" when it is revisited upon him. He's a two-faced punk, and that's my LIBERAL opinion of the putz.

Intended or not, you're rubbing up against him pretty closely, Brian. And like it or not, you ARE "keeping company" with him. You do it when you publically defend him...

Kinda like the post this is quoted from....

Getting the picture...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

1125. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-27 17:17:27 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030127121727.05625.00000275@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 60207

>Subject: Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 1/27/03 8:03 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0301270603.61b1fc7e@posting.google.com>

>Steve, I'm sorry you feel that way. But as I have found trying to
>make my point about so many other subjects on rrap, you have your mind
>made up before you have the facts. You close yourself off to facts,
>and choose to remain misinformed, ignorant, and wrong.

Quite the contrary. My "position" on Morse Code testing bearing witness.

On the matter of your alleged T5 operation, Brian, I sat back for quite a while on that. It was apparent that you didn't have a thourough understanding of what your obligations were IRT "authorization" to operate, and were equally confused about that "authorization" as opposed to "DXCC" "acceptance.

>Brian and Len
>and Mark Morgan and Carl and Cutie Boy and Hans and Mike Deignan and
>on and on are not your real problem.

Talking about yourself in the third person? And yuo say >I< ahve a problem?

As for Mark Morgan, you were right about one thing...I swore an oath in the Armed Forces. As a matter of fact, I recited it each time I was "discharged" and subsequently re-enlisted, and on each promotion, so count that 9 times. And between my experiences in CAP and the United States Marine Corps, I am not about to let some low-life like Morgan misrepresent himself as an officer of ANY rank when in the same breath he boldly proclaims his willingness to lie...especially for such silly goings-on as this forum.

And Lennie...?!?! Well, his dubious experience notwithstanding, Lennie is a pathological liar. He feels quite at liberty to make up what ever story he cares to in order perpetuate his "cause", the truth and other people's reputations be damned, just as long as everyone else think HIM untarnished.

He brings it on himself.

Carl? I just let him roll on. He's got his points to make, is brash about it, but manages to do it without the name calling and character abuses of Lennie.

Cutie Boy? Just a punk with an audience.

I basically blow off most of Hans' retorts s the usual MasterChief vs Marines kinda stuff, and I don't know WHAT makes you think I have any issues with Mike Deignan.

>You are your own worst enemy.
>When you figure that one out you'll get back on track to sane living.
>Good luck. I mean it.

I know you think this is appropriate, but I see it as an attempt to redirect from what some see as a failed attempt to dig yourself from the T5 debacle.

>And I apologize for the moron and mental jump school remarks.

Not necessary, but acknowledeged and appreicated. Thank-you.

Steve, K4YZ

1126. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-27 17:42:56 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0301270942.1cbde93d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60208

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0301260719.4750d2df@posting.google.com>...

> That's right, the t2fd is an extremely inefficient antenna on most
> freqs because most of the power ya put to one is wasted heating the
> resistor in the thing. It's a terrible antenna for ham purposes,
> anybody with half a brain and the same space a t3fd needs can put up a
> far more efficient antenna for 1/10 the cost of a t2fd.

W4RNL has modeled the antenna known as the "T2FD" and the results are on his excellent website. He calls it a "WBFD" (wide band folded dipole) which is a more accurate name.

His modeling shows the WBFD to be, at best, about an S-unit worse than a doublet of equal size. At worst, the WBFD is several S-units worse. And that's free-space modeling - the effects of ground loss and loss in nearby objects must be added to get realistic numbers.

A typical HF halfwave dipole in free space is pretty close to 100% efficient (nearly all of the power fed to it gets radiated). The WBFD's efficiency varies from maybe 30% at best to only a few percent at worst. The WBFD is least efficient at the low-frequency end of its range. Power that is not radiated is converted to heat in the loading resistor. There is nothing new in the design - it dates from the mid-1940s.

The only advantage the WBFD offers is its ability to present a low SWR on any frequency within its range without the need for adjustment. This can be of some use in other radio services, particularly those who can compensate for the WBFD's inefficiency by using higher transmitter power.

But since amateurs are limited to narrow slices of HF, and transmitter power is often at a premium, the WBFD is of questionable value as an amateur antenna.

Of course even an inefficient antenna will work some stations under the right conditions, as evidenced by the results obtained by hams using makeshift antennas, and those running HF mobile. In those cases, efficiency is traded for compactness.

But since the WBFD is at least the size of a G5RV or trap dipole, and costs at least as much as a conventional dipole plus a tuner, it is a mystery why any ham would use a WBFD.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1127. Re: The coders embarrass themselves on 14.275 MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-27 17:58:47 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b13rvg$69r$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 60209
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

All that shows is that a SSB operator remembers four letters of the
International Morse Code. Considering the 'fists' and the 'speeds' I
seriously doubt the offender is a real CW operator.

Dan/W4NTI

"Ed Norton" <haaaynorton@comnospam> wrote in message
news:296332854.FF1640746@lloyds.lover.boy...
> I've been reading all of this hoopla about K1MAN and the activities on
> 14.275 MHz, but have never really paid much attention to it until
> today when I tuned in to see what could be heard.
>
> It was then that I heard some CW operators making real asses of
> themselves, proving that CW confers no virtue upon its practitioners.
>
> A short listen at approximately 2100Z quickly turned up a CW operator
> sending "shit" over and over again at about 10 wpm. Fifteen minutes
> later, another CW operator joined in with the word "fuck," this time
> repeated over and over at around 20 wpm.
>
> Yes sir. CW capability sure improves the hobby. NOT!

1128. Re: The coders embarrass themselves on 14.275 MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-27 19:05:12 UTC
From: Mike Yetsko <joe@user.com>
Message-ID: <v3b0o1pft5o8a5@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 60210
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:b13rvg$69r$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
> All that shows is that a SSB operator remembers four letters of the
> International Morse Code. Considering the 'fists' and the 'speeds' I
> seriously doubt the offender is a real CW operator.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

What SSBer would sit there and do that over and over?

Well, OK, there are a few.

But MUCH more likely is someone just put that into a memory keyer.

Now how many SSB only types would own a keyer?

I wonder... How many rigs would have that capability 'built in' nowadays...

Mike

1129. Re: The coders embarrass themselves on 14.275 MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-27 22:10:37 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b14anngqb1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 60211
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

That still don't make him a CW operator.

From what I have heard (CW Jammers) they are not bright enough to realize they need to put an offset to make the 'note' readable. Unless their rig just happens to offset they end up being zero-beat.

For you slopers zero beat means...you hear nothing. Your carrier is dead on frequency.

As mentioned earlier the fists I have heard is just a example of a very poor sender. Bad spacing, slow and choppy. etc.

No...its not a CW guy doing this trash.

Dan/W4NTI

"Mike Yetsko" <joe@user.com> wrote in message
news:v3b0o1pft5o8a5@corp.supernews.com...
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:b13rvg$69r$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
> > All that shows is that a SSB operator remembers four letters of the
> > International Morse Code. Considering the 'fists' and the 'speeds' I
> > seriously doubt the offender is a real CW operator.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
>
> What SSBer would sit there and do that over and over?
>
> Well, OK, there are a few.
>
> But MUCH more likely is someone just put that into a memory keyer.
>
> Now how many SSB only types would own a keyer?
>
> I wonder... How many rigs would have that capability 'built in'
nowadays...
>
> Mike
>
>
>

1130. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-27 22:25:24 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <oliZ9.6698$d66.604847@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 60212

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote

:
: But since the WBFD is at least the size of a G5RV or trap dipole, and
: costs at least as much as a conventional dipole plus a tuner, it is a
: mystery why any ham would use a WBFD.
:

Translation: N.I.H.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

1131. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-27 23:19:21 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0301271519.4fe046a2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60213

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0301261943.4df5faaf@posting.google.com>...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0301260719.4750d2df@posting.google.com>...

> > That's right, the t2fd is an extremely inefficient antenna on most
> > freqs because most of the power ya put to one is wasted heating the
> > resistor in the thing. It's a terrible antenna for ham purposes,
> > anybody with half a brain and the same space a t3fd needs can put up a
> > far more efficient antenna for 1/10 the cost of a t2fd. That leaves
> > you out.
>
> Empty Head, why must t2fd cost more than other antennas of its kind?

What antenna or antennas is/are "like a t2fd"??

> Why must a discussion about such an antenna in military and government
> use pass amateur "standards?"

If you actually bothered studying even 1/4 of the innumerable threads
in RRAA abt the t2fd you would know why t2fd's are not a very good
idea in ham radio except under unusual circumstances. 'Course then agn
a t2fd might be just the ticket for you, if there was ever an "unusual
circumstance" it's YOU.

> What is the amateur standard, and where
> is it codified?

Ya buy the ARRL Antenna Book. Ya open it to page one. Even you can't
possibly need the map from there.

UhOh . . wrong.

> Why must amateurs run their antenna preferences by you
> and your cronies on rraa? Are you now saying that amateur radio
> operators with half a brain lack freedom of choice in the kind of
> antennas they choose to implement? Do full brained amateurs get to
> choose their own antennas, or must they march lock step with you?

Nobody out here gives a rat's patooie abt what antennas you use, knock
yerself out, go work yer dummy load. You're not "arguing" with me or
anybody else in RRAP or RRAA, you're tripping out on some goofy
tangent trying to "politicize" simple dipole physics. Or something
only you could come off the wall with. Nobody gives a rat's patooie
abt that either.

1132. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-27 23:39:26 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b14g3d$7gg$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 60215

"Jeffrey Herman" <jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu> wrote in message
news:b12kv2$8q3$1@news.hawaii.edu...
> Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote:
>
> >Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >> Years on rrap: 12
>
> >Has rrap been around that long?
>
> I came aboard the RRA NGs in 1992, 11 years ago, so
> RRAP has been around at least that many years.
> Jeff KH6O

I was in the amateur ewsgroups before the rrap was
split off. Before that (not sure exactly when), the code
debates were going on in r.r.a.misc.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1133. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-27 23:43:10 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b14ga0jjc1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 60216

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030126232151.00111.00000640@mb-mv.aol.com...
> In article <2RRY9.1014$N5.598924@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
> >> And those of us with a more mature, enlightened, and rational attitude
> >> toward the Morse/CW mode realize that the USE of this mode will not
> >> continue at it's former levels unless there *is* a requirement for
Morse
> >> code testing at useful proficiency levels!
> >
> >SO, you publicly admit that your motivation to force all to learn Morse
> >in order to pass a test is based SOLELY on your desire for more
"recruits"
> >(willing or not) to the ranks of Morsedom ... in hopes that at least a
few
> >will stick to using the mode.
>
> Carl:
>
> Yes, I do. What's wrong with that? I don't recall ever attempting to
disguise
> this "motivation."
>
> >Frankly, while I have no desire to see Morse USE dwindle, I don't give
> >a rat's arse if it does either.
>
> Right, and you've made no secret of this over the years. I, OTOH, very
much
> care if Morse Code continues to be used, because as a long-time user of
this
> mode, I know the benefits and advantages of it, and would not care to see
it
> disappear from disuse.

But you don't care enough about to allow the future of morse
to be a free choice decision. You want code testing to be that
recruiting effort. Well at least that's an honest statement.

Cheers
Bill K2UNK

1134. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-27 23:55:22 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0301271555.51525e21@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60217

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0301270942.1cbde93d@posting.google.com>...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0301260719.4750d2df@posting.google.com>...
>
> > That's right, the t2fd is an extremely inefficient antenna on most
> > freqs because most of the power ya put to one is wasted heating the
> > resistor in the thing. It's a terrible antenna for ham purposes,
> > anybody with half a brain and the same space a t3fd needs can put up a
> > far more efficient antenna for 1/10 the cost of a t2fd.
>
> W4RNL has modeled the antenna known as the "T2FD" and the results are
> on his excellent website. He calls it a "WBFD" (wide band folded
> dipole) which is a more accurate name.
>
> His modeling shows the WBFD to be, at best, about an S-unit worse than
> a doublet of equal size. At worst, the WBFD is several S-units worse.
> And that's free-space modeling - the effects of ground loss and loss
> in nearby objects must be added to get realistic numbers.
>
> A typical HF halfwave dipole in free space is pretty close to 100%
> efficient (nearly all of the power fed to it gets radiated). The
> WBFD's efficiency varies from maybe 30% at best to only a few percent
> at worst. The WBFD is least efficient at the low-frequency end of its
> range. Power that is not radiated is converted to heat in the loading
> resistor. There is nothing new in the design - it dates from the
> mid-1940s.
>
> The only advantage the WBFD offers is its ability to present a low SWR
> on any frequency within its range without the need for adjustment.
> This can be of some use in other radio services, particularly those
> who can compensate for the WBFD's inefficiency by using higher
> transmitter power.
>
> But since amateurs are limited to narrow slices of HF, and transmitter
> power is often at a premium, the WBFD is of questionable value as an
> amateur antenna.
>
> Of course even an inefficient antenna will work some stations under
> the right conditions, as evidenced by the results obtained by hams
> using makeshift antennas, and those running HF mobile. In those cases,
> efficiency is traded for compactness.
>
> But since the WBFD is at least the size of a G5RV or trap dipole, and

> costs at least as much as a conventional dipole plus a tuner, it is a
> mystery why any ham would use a WBFD.

BOINK !!!!

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

1135. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-28 00:07:08 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0301271607.14f0e5b9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60218

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0301241853.69a8b913@posting.google.com>...
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030124152428.27873.00000163@mb-mj.aol.com>...
> > In article <f45722ac.0301240518.184ce709@posting.google.com>,
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> >
> > >> I noticed you din spend much time in dot antennas. At least yer smart
> > >> enough not to do that.
> > >>
> > >> w3rv
> > >
> > >Aw joos fuggit. I dinah wanna tawk injunearing wid yous jeannios guys.
> > >
> > >RRAA is full of character assassination. Same stuff, different year.
> >
> > Be careful, Brian. You are replying to a tuff-tawkin hoagie
> > muncher who knows all about radios, was "in military
> > service" as a civilian catapult expert, did "intelligence duty"
> > taking pictures of overflying USSR aircraft and has "26 patents."
> > :-)
> >
> > He doan wan no tecknikal stuf ta inter-fear wid his dreamin...
>
> I wonder which college took him as an ESL student?

ESL yer ass, I got mine from same injuneering collitch which bestowed
N2EY's MSEE upon Hisself. Afyer he glomed his Ivy League BSEE.

w3rv

1136. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-28 00:13:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030127191330.08866.00000148@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 60222

In article <20030127112645.11824.00000342@mb-mr.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It
>>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>>Date: 1/27/03 7:53 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <f45722ac.0301270553.52f61cf8@posting.google.com>
>
>>Steve, I don't keep company.
>
> That's apparent. Perhaps if you did you might assimilate some knowledge
>about Amateur Radio, especially as it pertains to regulatory matters
>vis-a-vis licensure and authorizations.

Translation: One would have to crawl into the miasma of
Robeson's selfish little mind to understand the Glory and
Honor in what He says is "true." :-)

The FCC *set* the regulations for US amateur radio. Not a single
staff member or commissioner is required to be granted a US
amateur radio license in order to make and enforce those
regulations. Why is it so "necessary" for all in a discussion
to be granted such a license?

>>Len and I happen to agree on many
>>things. One is free speech, and the right to petition our government.
>> Both are in the Bill of Rights that you must have sworn to defend and
>>protect at one time or another in your life.
>
> And both of you may and neither of you have been impeded by anyone that I
>am aware of, least of all me.

Oh? Robeson's output in this newsgroup is a constant, almost
unremitting calumny of anyone who does not agree with his
Dill Sergeant pronouncements.

> BTW, I know Lennie the Lame loves to wave that "petition the government"
>and "free speech" thing, but he sure hates having his rants blunted.

Robeson's constant insult output does require wasted time in
showing that his Lies and Distortions ARE lies and distortions.

One of the classic attempts at intimidation was the home page
on AOL, all because of his childish rage over a mistake. That
lasted less than three days since it was a blatant piece of
evidence for a civil case that could have hurt AOL and broken
Robeson financially. Robeson doesn't think, flies into a rage

at the slightest provocation. Emotional instability, QED.

>So do
>you. Birds of a feather. You love to TRY and make an issue of "your rights"
>when your rights were never infringed upon.

Sorry, badass Dill Instructor, but LIBEL, however slight, is still
LIBEL with or without capital letters. Robeson continually puts
himself into a libelous position that he cannot extricate.

Robeson continually states that discussion opponents have
"really" said something even though what was written was
obviously not so. Again, that is libelous.

> You see, you and Lennie have another trait in common...You like to try
and
>"shame" others into not posting by somehow insinuating that your rights are
>being infringed upon. What a bunch of mularkey, and I don't fall for it.

No such thing. Robeson seems to want full "NCO control" over
the troops even though US amateur radio is NOT the Corps and
he has no "rank" in here. Robeson cannot tolerate opposite
opinions, does not control his rage and displeasure...yet demands
that of his opponents.

>>You see, if Len were not on here without a license, there are those in
>>the PCTA who would insist that only Amateur Extras
>
> No...If Lennie HAD a license and PARTICIPATED in Amateur Radio, he MIGHT
>have a broader knowledge base upon which to make his many "opinions". However
>he does NOT have that benefit and continuues to step on his own toes
>all-the-while asserting this "information" as fact.

QED. Robeson issuing a "commandment" even though his
"tablets" are only a Bayer product out of a bottle and his
mountain was just the third step on the front walk. :-)

Only the FCC grants US amateur radio licenses. Not a single
staffer or commissioner of the FCC is required to be granted an
amateur radio license in order to make and enforce the amateur
radio regulations. The FCC decides on regulation alterations
but allows ALL citizens to comment freely.

Commentary on GETTING INTO US amateur radio does NOT
require already being into it. If it did, how could the very first
amateur licensee get that license? :-)

US amateur radio is NOT some "strange technology" that can
"only be understood by already-licensed amateurs." Amateur
radio as defined by humans is only a legal classification...the
physics of radio technology is the same regardless of human
classification.

Robeson seems enraged that others could have gathered
experience in radio communication before him (including his
birth) on HF...and then gone on to LF, VLF, VHF, UHF, and
higher as a professional. It seems to be a greater rage
because he had NO prior military radio experience and had
NO working experience in radio engineering (purchasing
agent order-filling does not count) in civilian life.

All that is Robeson's obvious problem. Personal rage is not
justified nor an excuse for dishonorable behavior.

> His frequent spamming of this NG with retelling after retelling of the
>development of SINCGARS and his railing aginst Dave Heil over "order wires" is
>his attempt to hide his own ignorance as it pretains to a radio service of
>which he knows little but hates so much.

Once again, a LIE about "hating amateur radio." Disinformation
certainly.

Amateur radio is a fun hobby, a recreation. It is NOT the Corps
that demands unswerving, undying devotion to "Corps, god, and
country" [in that order]. Robeson is NOT a Dill Sergeant NCO
in amateur radio. He is very confused in civilian life.

The "AN/PRC-119 family" of military radios is the standard small-
unit (battalion size units and below) radio in the US military. Over
a quarter million of them have been produced in the last 14 years.
It provides a plateau-jump in portable size in performance that
could be a springboard for new designs in amateur radio.
Robeson seems angry over the mention of a military model that
He did not know about nor ever handled even though quantities
make it the largest and longest production run radio model ever
made for the US military.

Roughly three years ago, Heil attempted a small snow job of
amateur participants in here with the tale of "using CW for an
RTTY circuit order-wire as a clever idea." The term "order-
wire" is not used much in US amateur radio yet is a common
term in commercial and military communications, both in
landline and radio. Robeson has no experience in such
communications thus increasing his displeasure at loss of
control over subjects.

> Unfortuntely YOU are falling for THAT.

No one "falls" for any arguments that are based on spite, rage,
displeasure, or against the credo of the USHC (US Ham Corps).

Arguments for and against are simply made coherently and
with some detail to state a particular case. Where necessary,
references can be given to augment positions or statements.
Robeson has a habit of simply making declarations or just
pejoratives against a communicator's person. In the last year
he has succumbed to dishonoring US military veterans who

argue against his viewpoints.

Robeson has a selfish little habit of modeling all of US amateur radio on what He believes, what He experiences, what He does. Sometimes he does not bother with such modeling but rather DEMANDS that All Believe As He Does...about nearly everything.

> My arguments with Lennie are NOT about Code testing.

Robeson cannot argue. On the issue of code testing necessity, he did not bother with rational arguments to support his side but indulged in a remarkable long-time constant barrage of lies, distortions, personal insults, "rewriting" of what was clearly written, attempts at character assassination, and general rage that was clearly libelous.

Robeson simply cannot tolerate an opposite opinion.

>It's about his
>blatant lying and gross misrepresentation of what Amateur Radio is about and
>what it does.

US amateur radio has been adequately defined in all aspects by its participants and organizations in the various media since before 1912. That definition and description is multi-faceted, varied, widely-ranging. Amateur radio is a fun hobby, fine recreation, technically challenging and rewarding for those who venture into the various radio technologies.

Robeson, Heil, and Kelly all seem fixated in here on Their Idea of US amateur radio is what "everyone must believe" (or be subject to the usual pejoratives). In Robeson's case he goes too far with his insults, moving from disinformation to outright lies...because Robeson cannot divorce himself from His Idea of what amateur radio is and what amateur radio really is to 620+ thousand licensed radio amateurs.

>His misrepresentations are so easily disproven as to be
>laughable.

Robeson has NOT "disproven" anything. He has presented only His Idea of what amateur radio "is" and demands that others obey that viewpoint. That's another manifestation of the "ex-military-NCO Dill Sergeant" attitude. All must march on his command, to his cadence.

>However I refuse to allow it to go unchallenged.

That's the pity of all this, the cause for a constant barrage of pejoratives, commands, disinformation, and general uncivil and dishonorable behavior of Robeson.

Robeson cannot stand opposition in anything. QED.

>Pathological
>liars SHOULD be confronted and thier lies exposed for what they are.

Robeson has no credentials in psychology nor is he a medical
doctor. The use of "pathological liar" labeling is interesting, but
it only reinforces his own petty personal demand that everyone
Believe in what He Believes.

> My arguments with Lennie also extend to his blatant use of offensive and
>denigrating adjectives that HE uses to "describe" his "opponents", yet flails
>about as "VICTIM!" when it is revisited upon him. He's a two-faced punk, and
>that's my LIBERAL opinion of the putz.

No, it is just Robeson indulging in another immature, uncontrolled
spasm of rage at being opposed in anything. Robeson cannot
tolerate opposition of any kind. His "solution" is to disregard
civility for invective, seek "destruction" of his opposition by any
means possible.

In a clinical sort of way, Robeson's output can be interesting to
those interested in human psychology. It's a small melange of
psychological disorders manifesting themselves in rather classic
elementary syndromes. Sort of an on-line "Psych 101" workbook.

It does waste nearly everyone's time in here and that's a pity for
all the rest. It may have some cathartic effect for Robeson so all
is not a waste. :-)

1137. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-28 00:13:32 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030127191332.08866.00000149@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 60223

In article <20030126180538.02994.00000199@mb-mn.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Sgt Hostile Action Hero Putz) writes:

>>> Whew...Lennie the Lame strikes again.
>
>> Actually, I walk very well, no lameness at all.
>
> Lameness applies to more than one's ability to demonstrate a steady
>gait.

A horse has "gait." Are you a veterinary nurse too used to four-footed creatures? Why do you treat others a mere animals?

>>The "use of CW as an RTTY order-wire" is ridiculous on the
>> face of it..(SNIP)
>
> So's your claim to an extra lite out of the box.

I made no claims of going for that, only that it COULD be done.

Why not? I got my First Class Radiotelephone (commercial) license in one examination session in 1956 at an FCC field office in Chicago. Without using any Q&A book.

Sgt "Steam" Putz wasn't able to do that in later years.

> So's your claim of ARRL dishonesty.
>
> So's your claim of ARRL VE dishonesty.

I never said ARRL was "dishonest," just that their actions on "examining" two six-year-olds and "passing" them, then publicizing them on their website was SUSPICIOUS.

But, never mind that...you expect everyone to Believe in ARRL, that they Never Do Wrong (for They are Holy).

> So's your embellishment of your Army "service" by associating yourself
>with KIA's who's names you don't even know...

I was assigned to the 8235th AU, Tokyo, Japan, beginning in February 1953 when it was named the 71st Signal Signal Service Battalion. During the beginning of July, 1950, the Far East Command sent 19 members of the 71st to Korea along with radio equipment to bolster communications there after the North Korean forces had

invaded South Korea. Their transport aircraft crashed on landing, killing all, including the four of the aircraft crew.

The 71st Signal Service Battalion (later renamed Far East Command Signal Service Battalion, same Army Unit number, in late 1955) was one of the first to be formed during the Japanese Occupation in 1945. That signal battalion was attached directly to Far East Command headquarters.

I have the name, rank, Army Serial Number, of each one of the 19 signalmen who died in that July, 1950, crash. I also have the name, rank, ASN, of each of the six members of the 71st who were wounded in action in Korea after July, 1950. That's a form of respect and honor for those men lost or wounded in the service of their country in wartime. I was proud to be in the same battalion as they were.

I know the entire history of my former military unit, before, during, and after my military service, all from referencible sources and most being official Army sources.

The Putzman seems to think that NO ONE can possibly take pride in the service of their country unless his Royal Hindness "approves" of it. But, what does the Putzman say about his own service?

"Seven times in hostile action!" No references, no details, no names, no verification, no nothing except a very general statement of standard braggadoccio.

Putzman never did any military communications. He can't even name on of the standard radios of the USMC for small (or large) unit operations.

Putzman once claimed he "can't speak about 'classified' equipment" as if US DoD contract awards and Defense Electronics trade magazine were "classified" documents!

Total BULLSHIT on the "classified" claim. US military communications equipment is known and named in public disclosures. Putzman just doesn't know military radio equipment so he blusters and bluffs trying to avoid the appearance of ignorance only to emphasize it.

Putzman wants to chastise others for not talking about amateur radio subjects...while he goes on and on about the Civil Air Patrol, hang gliding, Tennessee STATE guard (not affiliated with any US military or national guard), national politics, and old popular singers of two or more decades in the past. Then he wants to insult and demean others who served their country because their opinions about amateur radio do not "live up to His credo of the

amateur corps, God, and country." Sad case of psycho "transference," substituting amateur radio for The Corps.

US amateur radio is NOT a branch of the US military. It is called a "service" only in that the word "service" in Title 47 CFR is a regulatory term denoting a type and kind of radio activity.

US amateur radio is a hobby activity, recreation, and NOT vital to national defense. Amateur radio could cease tomorrow and the nation, the states, the cities could all go on as before without interruption or dimished operation. All amateur radio transmissions during World War 2 were banned yet the USA was one of the winners of that conflict.

Putzman won't accept reality. He lives in a fantasy of glory and honor in his mind, putting down everyone who does not share that fantasy. He wants to drag all discussion oponents to the ground in order to make himself look superior. He will not hesitate to insult, demean, and garbage-mouth any US military veteran just to satisfy his little personal fantasy of glory and honor that exists only in his mind. He is a discredit to the Corps, god, and the country.

To be honest, prior military service does NOT have any direct bearing on amateur radio...but Robeson is obsessed with that, continuing to demean and insult veterans of the US military that won't agree with his writing in here.

That is DISHONORABLE conduct for one who claims to be a veteran of the US military.

It may be greater than DISHONOR by Robeson to dismiss 19 casualties of a war that happened before he was born because of his little personal feud with another. Sad.

1138. Re: Hot Fun In The Summertime With Brian

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-28 00:13:35 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030127191335.08866.00000150@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 60219

In article <20030127102808.01441.00000231@mb-mk.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Sgt HAH Putz) writes:

>>No, Steav, you tell me what is wrong with my statements. You cannot.
>
> I already did. You choose to ignore it. Do you treat red lights and
>"Bridge Out" signs with the same disregard?
>
>>You've earned "cubed."
>
> Not by you I haven't. Where are those T5 logs and permission to operate
>at...?!?!

The rest of us are waiting for details, references, or other verification of those "seven hostile action" experiences.

I think most readers have given up waiting for the Putzman's claims of expertise in military communications. Since he had none all he can do is mean-mouth and insult others who'd done it. <shrug>

1139. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-28 00:13:36 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030127191336.08866.00000151@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 60220

In article <20030127102259.01441.00000229@mb-mk.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Sgt HAH Putz) writes:

>>Military stations will ocassionally QSL a SW listener, if they have time
>
> .....and if the QSL doesn't compromise some other aspect of an on-going
>operation.

We are all waiting for the claims of experience in military communications from the Putzman. Total so far: ZERO.

In order to "rule" on "compromising an on-going operation" the Putzman has to explain how SW listeners can decode the encryption used by the military. Maybe an NG unit using an old VINSON-compatible mode? :-)

Even more interesting is that "modern" (since before the Gulf War) military communications is primarily above 30 MHz (to 88 MHz) or on 225-400 MHz (UHF hasn't been solely for aircraft for years). But then the Putzman hasn't carried a little '25 or a '77 to "save his whole brigade in 'Nam." Another miseryite claimed that in here.

Whooo! All the "expertise in radio" floating around here, all from memorizing the advertisements in QST every month!
:-)

1140. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-28 00:13:36 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030127191336.08866.00000152@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 60221

In article <f45722ac.0301270512.f2f0144@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> >Right. I probably should have used the term "proficient in morse". We
>> >certainly wouldn't want to see you "bothered" by those pesky amateur
>> >radio license exams. You didn't do radio 24/7 ever and there is no
>> >professional equivalent to DXing.
>>
>> "DX" is a worldwide term, long in use by the radio world, an
>> abbreviation for "distance." ADA, as part of the Army
>> Command and Administrative Network, did communications
>> for the United Nations Far East Headquarters and for Army
>> Forces Far East from 1946 through 1963...on HF 24 hours a
>> day, 7 days a week.
>
>Military stations will ocassionally QSL a SW listener, if they have time.

AFRTS or MARS stations, perhaps. :-)

Must be an extraordinarily-equipped "SW listener" to identify
a military or commercial SSB transmitter with four channels
of audio, two of those channels carrying four to eight TTY
circuits. 12 KHz bandwidth, voice order-wire mostly silent.

The same goes for any ALE transmitter doing the handshaking
digital thing. Undeciperable without a signal format decoder.

Digital data noises abound on SW (Pactor, etc.) but not much
of that inside the amateur bands. Same with WEFAX but
there are available decoder add-ons for those.

SW BC has been doing digital modulation for three years,
despite the protestations of long-term hams who say "It
can't possibly work!" :-)

1141. Re: The coders embarrass themselves on 14.275 MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-28 00:23:24 UTC
From: tom shytski <kiebasatoy@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3e35cdc1$1@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 60224
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Ed Norton" <haaaynorton@comnospam> wrote in message
news:296332854.FF1640746@lloyds.lover.boy...

> A short listen at approximately 2100Z quickly turned up a CW operator
> sending "shit" over and over again at about 10 wpm. Fifteen minutes
> later, another CW operator joined in with the word "fuck," this time
> repeated over and over at around 20 wpm.

The douchebag sending vulgarities on CW on 14.279 is likely
located in 9-Land. Rumored to be one of the "Polish Bozo Net"
as Mike calls them, who hang out several KC's down
from 14.275 and QRM's Mike and Rube almost every day.
They ain't the brightest bulbs in the chandelier and qrm Baxter's
taped broadcast using reduced power trying to fool others
into think it's the regulars on .275 doing the QRM'ing.

How pathetic!

1142. Re: The coders embarrass themselves on 14.275 MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-28 00:50:55 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b14k4b$i76$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 60225
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

DANG YOU LET THE *(#& OUT OF THE BAG. Now they are gonna have to go get the PIs 2 khz above 275...Just like they did with me and then called Riley and said Mike and Dan were doing it.

Oh wait a minute....thats already been done...and guess what? Riley is on to their little stunt. Won't work this time guys. Try something new.

Dan/W4NTI

"tom shytski" <kiebasatoy@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:3e35cdc1$1@snipnews.snip.net...
>
> "Ed Norton" <haaaynorton@comnospam> wrote in message
> news:296332854.FF1640746@lloyds.lover.boy...
>
> > A short listen at approximately 2100Z quickly turned up a CW operator
> > sending "shit" over and over again at about 10 wpm. Fifteen minutes
> > later, another CW operator joined in with the word "fuck," this time
> > repeated over and over at around 20 wpm.
>
> The douchebag sending vulgarities on CW on 14.279 is likely
> located in 9-Land. Rumored to be one of the "Polish Bozo Net"
> as Mike calls them, who hang out several KC's down
> from 14.275 and QRM's Mike and Rube almost every day.
> They ain't the brightest bulbs in the chandelier and qrm Baxter's
> taped broadcast using reduced power trying to fool others
> into think it's the regulars on .275 doing the QRM'ing.
>
> How pathetic!
>
>
>

1143. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-28 01:38:35 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.h9e5qh1.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 60226

On 27 Jan 2003 05:08:10 -0800, Brian wrote:

>Phil, it is quite easy for you to dismiss the career of others, isn't
>it? Most on here would argue that if you do not have a professional
>music career, you have no say in what constitutes musical ability,
>much in the way they claim if you do not have an amateur radio
>license, you have no say in amateur radio.
>
>So, tell us about your music career.

Those who know me know that I am intensely involved in choral liturgy - both studying the developent of liturgy as part of worship and participating in same - for over 40 years. After several college-level courses in music theory and performance, I took private voice lessons in solo and choral music during the 1970s and 80s. More bucks than I want to think about have been paid (and continue to be paid) to my voice coach who is quite a liturgical star in her own right. I have long been a member of sunagogue choirs and have served (and still serve) as a fill-in cantor for several synagogues on a regular basis over the years. I have sung in several presentations of major choral liturgy by recognized choral societies - both religious and secular - in the San Francisco area.

I don't do this for a living but it certainly is on a professional level. Any fees or honoraria that come my way are donated to my congregation.

As do most of us here, I have many interests (and hobbies) in addition to ham radio.

I leave appreciation of "pop-rock" "music" to my ex-wife -- that's her taste, certainly not mine.

And my comment was not about anyone's musical ability but about the stuff that they are performing. Sorry, my classical-training snobbishness - may it live forever - is showing through.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1144. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-28 01:53:52 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301271753.4119316e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60227

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030127112645.11824.00000342@mb-mr.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 1/27/03 7:53 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0301270553.52f61cf8@posting.google.com>
>
> >Steve, I don't keep company.
>
> That's apparent. Perhaps if you did you might assimilate some knowledge
> about Amateur Radio, especially as it pertains to regulatory matters vis-a-vis
> licensure and authorizations.
>
> >Len and I happen to agree on many
> >things. One is free speech, and the right to petition our government.
> > Both are in the Bill of Rights that you must have sworn to defend and
> >protect at one time or another in your life.
>
> And both of you may and neither of you have been impeded by anyone that I
> am aware of, least of all me.
>
> BTW, I know Lennie the Lame loves to wave that "petition the government"
> and "free speech" thing, but he sure hates having his rants blunted. So do
> you. Birds of a feather. You love to TRY and make an issue of "your rights"
> when your rights were never infringed upon.
>
> You see, you and Lennie have another trait in common...You like to try and
> "shame" others into not posting by somehow insinuating that your rights are
> being infringed upon. What a bunch of mularkey, and I don't fall for it.

Not at all. I welcome not only free speech, but open debate. You on
the other hand wish to silence Len in amateur radio matters as he does
not have a license.

> >You see, if Len were not on here without a license, there are those in
> >the PCTA who would insist that only Amateur Extras
>
> No...If Lennie HAD a license and PARTICIPATED in Amateur Radio, he MIGHT
> have a broader knowledge base upon which to make his many "opinions". However
> he does NOT have that benefit and continuues to step on his own toes
> all-the-while asserting this "information" as fact.
>
> His frequent spamming of this NG with retelling after retelling of the
> development of SINCGARS and his railing aginst Dave Heil over "order wires" is
> his attempt to hide his own ignorance as it pretains to a radio service of

> which he knows little but hates so much.

And what of your endless spamming?

> Unfortuntely YOU are falling for THAT.
>
> My arguments with Lennie are NOT about Code testing.

They ought to be. This group is supposed to be about that.

It's about his
> blatant lying and gross misrepresentation of what Amateur Radio is about and
> what it does. His misrepresentations are so easily disproven as to be
> laughable. However I refuse to allow it to go unchallenged. Pathological
> liars SHOULD be confronted and thier lies exposed for what they are.

Your zeal only exposes you for what you are.

> Have you seen him provide one iota of "evidence" about ARRL
> "dishonesty"...?!?!

Ask him if he has one iota of evidence concerning Watergate,
Iran-Contra, Savings and Loan scams, Monica-gate, or Dangling Chads.

> My arguments with Lennie are about his cowardly misrepresentation of his
> association with U. S. Army KIA's in order to make himself look more "heroic".
> He is anything but....
>
> My arguments with Lennie also extend to his blatant use of offensive and
> denigrating adjectives that HE uses to "describe" his "opponents", yet flails
> about as "VICTIM!" when it is revisited upon him. He's a two-faced punk, and
> that's my LIBERAL opinion of the putz.

He sure does pull your strings.

> Intended or not, you're rubbing up against him pretty closely, Brian. And
> like it or not, you ARE "keeping company" with him. You do it when you
> publically defend him...

Like now?

> Kinda like the post this is quoted from....
>
> Getting the picture...?!?!
>
> Steve, K4YZ

I've got the picture. Had it a long time. Len has made many astute
observations about the amateur radio fraternity. Like it or not, you
keep falling into the characature mold that Len has described. And I
know you don't like it. Sorry.

Brian

1145. 14.275 mhz Proves FCC's Ineffectiveness ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-28 01:54:10 UTC
From: Trebb@webtv.net
Message-ID: <20705-3E35E2C2-441@storefull-2278.public.lawson.webtv.net>
Source record: 60234

The truth of 275 can be heard on all modes. One need only listen day in and day out to realize that the frequency makes a mockery of our hobby.

More than the chaotic qrmers is the ever-expanding bulletin of Glenn Baxter, K1MAN. Yesterday, Baxter announced he was punishing us all with non-stop bulletins from 1-5 -- and he did. We know on this frequency his organization conducts its own foreign policy in Iraq, Somalia, Jordan and other places. A few days ago, he declared an emergency that didn't exist. Everyday he clearly advertises his business: "the AARU, your alternative to ARRL."

Our regulator, Riley Hollingsworth, is only one person with his own bosses, and the FCC obviously does not want to be tied into costly litigation. (In the past, Baxter as always litigated in his own name, and I can tell you, he is a paper tiger.)

If the Commission fails to take constructive, exemplary action, the voluntary compliance it has come to expect from us will deteriorate.

Why are some with far weaker cases regulated while K1MAN with the strongest case for regulation carries on with impunity?

For the FCC, it is the hour of decision!

Bob Sherin, W4ASX

Get to know us; visit our Web Site
http://community.webtv.net/AllAmericn/BobW4ASXandMaryAnn/

1146. Re: Hot Fun In The Summertime With Brian

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-28 01:55:34 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301271755.74e30a07@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60228

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030127102808.01441.00000231@mb-mk.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Hot Fun In The Summertime With Brian
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 1/27/03 7:28 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0301270528.2e737cd8@posting.google.com>
>
> >No, Steav, you tell me what is wrong with my statements. You cannot.
>
> I already did. You choose to ignore it. Do you treat red lights and
> "Bridge Out" signs with the same disregard?
>
> >You've earned "cubed."
>
> Not by you I haven't. Where are those T5 logs and permission to operate
> at...?!?!
>
> Steve, K4YZ

What is wrong with my statements?

1147. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-28 02:00:14 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <OulZ9.1420$N5.819411@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 60229

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030126215637.20835.00000270@mb-fy.aol.com...
>>
> Are there more than 3400 current NCI members?

Yes ...

> >Nor, I might point out, does ARRL's membership constitute a majority
> >of US hams ... more like a bit less than 25% IIRC the last numbers I
> >noticed.
>
> Quite true. Nor does ARRL claim to constitute a majority, either.

ARRL claims to be "THE National Society for Amateur Radio" ... they
most certainly claim to speak for all when they file comments with the
FCC etc. Not directly in so many words, but it is CLEARLY implied.
Fortunately, the FCC understands the reality.

Carl - wk3c

1148. Re: Hot Fun In The Summertime With Brian

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-28 02:10:08 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301271810.561ad23@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60230

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030126104832.02227.00000270@mb-bk.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Hot Fun In The Summertime With Brian
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 1/26/03 6:13 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0301260413.26e9e8c7@posting.google.com>
>
> >> A long time ago...like back when he was "in hostile action
> >> seven times" in the USMC. Unverified, of course, not a
> >> single reference.
>
> >He's welcome to post his expeditionary awards if he likes. One thing
> >though, he's got real "military background."
>
> "Expeditionary awards" are presented to MOST excusions wherein a hostile
> force is faced.

And yours are?

> Sorry you didn't get a chance to find that out.

The Air Force knows the truth. You obviously don't. Making such
statements as the one above lands you squarely in the "liar" category.

> >> Now watch Sgt Putz come roaring in on that one!
>
> No roaring. Just facts. You may feel the need to re-create and embellish
> your Army "career" from time-to-time as you see fit, Lennie...I don't.

If you abhor it so, then why do you recreate and/or embellish my
career?

> Watching the two of you dance together is really heartwarming!
>
> A rear step forward for civil rights.

Which direction would one be facing to take "a rear step forward?"
You must have been loved in formation. Scuffed up shoes and all.

1149. Re: Hot Fun In The Summertime With Brian

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-28 02:11:24 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301271811.1aec8324@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60231

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030126115952.02227.00000274@mb-bk.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Hot Fun In The Summertime With Brian
> >From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
> >Date: 1/26/03 9:48 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20030126104832.02227.00000270@mb-bk.aol.com>
>
> > "Expeditionary awards" are presented to MOST excusions wherein a hostile
> >force is faced.
>
> Oooops...My bust...NOT presented to MOST excursions wherein hostile force
> is faced.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Which ones were those?

1150. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-28 02:11:50 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030127211150.09614.00000152@mb-cd.aol.com>
Source record: 60232

In article <f45722ac.0301271753.4119316e@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>I've got the picture. Had it a long time. Len has made many astute
>observations about the amateur radio fraternity. Like it or not, you
>keep falling into the characature mold that Len has described. And I
>know you don't like it. Sorry.

That he "doesn't like it" is a massive understatement! :-)

1151. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-28 02:12:54 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301271812.19d3713f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60233

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030127102259.01441.00000229@mb-mk.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 1/27/03 7:12 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0301270512.f2f0144@posting.google.com>
>
> >Military stations will ocassionally QSL a SW listener, if they have time
>
> .....and if the QSL doesn't compromise some other aspect of an on-going
> operation.

You mean if the SW station had cryptological gear to monitor? Now who
could that be?

1152. Re: The coders embarrass themselves on 14.275 MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-28 02:18:17 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301271818.383f3557@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60235

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message news:<20030127083647.16889.00000237@mb-cc.aol.com>...

> Of curse it's a myth. The point is, however, that it's far less common on CW
> than on voice modes. Just read the FCC enforcement letters. Lots of enforcement
> actions against hams using voice in the voice bands, extremely few (if any)
> against hams using CW or digital in the CW/digital bands.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Could it be that the FCC no longer has a pool of trained CW operators
to monitor amateur CW communications?

Don't forget that Dick Carrol sends code so attrociously that machine
copy is not possible.

1153. Re: Hot Fun In The Summertime With Brian

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-28 02:21:05 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030127212105.21366.00000695@mb-mu.aol.com>
Source record: 60236

In article <f45722ac.0301271755.74e30a07@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> Not by you I haven't. Where are those T5 logs and permission to
operate
>> at...?!?!
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>What is wrong with my statements?

You've not followed the Dill Sergeant's ORDERS to the troops
on comportment in his mystical idea of amateur radio. If you
sass the Dill Sergeant you wind up on company punishment
:-)

That's in parallel with the "26-patent" kid in Pennsy who
gave you implicit ORDERS on which antenna to use. :-)

There is only ONE way...their way. That's the way is IS!

What next, close-order drill? :-)

1154. Re: Lets face it ... we're just communicators.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-28 04:03:58 UTC
From: jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu
Message-ID: <b14vfe$n78$1@news.hawaii.edu>
Source record: 60246

KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote:
>Thanks for the "backup" Steve. As I was instructed, the fact that a rib
>fracture "could" occur, was not a reason to not do CPR, just a consequence.

I was a fireman in Orange County (CA) back in the early 70s. I can
remember being a rookie doing CPR on an elderly gentleman -- I was
applying the O2 and the other fireman was doing the chest compressions,
making remarks about the ribs breaking. The eerie thing was seeing
tears well up in the victim's lifeless eyes. If that wasn't enough,
once we got him into the ER room I almost passed out (literally)
when I saw the doctor jab him in the heart with a very long needle.
You never forget the first person who dies on you...

Jeff KH6O

--
Operations Specialist Mathematics Lecturer
U.S. Coast Guard Kapiolani College
Dept. of Homeland Security University of Hawaii System

1155. Re: 14.275 mhz Proves FCC's Ineffectiveness ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-28 04:54:24 UTC
From: Ed Norton <EdNorton@bullshit14275.net>
Message-ID: <b152dnvch0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 60237

"Bob Sherin" <Trebb@webtv.net> wrote in message
news:20705-3E35E2C2-441@storefull-2278.public.lawson.webtv.net...
>
> The truth of 275 can be heard on all modes. One need only listen day in
> and day out to realize that //// PSYCHO - BABBLE flushed ////

BULLSHIT! get a clue!

Ed Norton (The Real One)
DOD Bullshit Expert
"something stinks"

1156. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-28 06:23:30 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0301272223.6e80002f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60238

"K HB" <k hb@arrl.DOTORG> wrote in message
news:<oliZ9.6698$d66.604847@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
>
> :
> : But since the WBFD is at least the size of a G5RV or trap dipole, and
> : costs at least as much as a conventional dipole plus a tuner, it is a
> : mystery why any ham would use a WBFD.
> :
>
> Translation: N.I.H.

Kindly note that neither Jim or I have stated that t2fd's do not have
their appropriate applications Chief.

>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB

w3rv

1157. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-28 11:22:07 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030128062207.12173.00000216@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 60240

In article <oliZ9.6698$d66.604847@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG> writes:

>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
>
>:
>: But since the WBFD is at least the size of a G5RV or trap dipole, and
>: costs at least as much as a conventional dipole plus a tuner, it is a
>: mystery why any ham would use a WBFD.
>:
>
>Translation: N.I.H.

Do you mean "Not Invented Here", Hans?

If so, that's not the case. The WBFD has been around a long time - I learned about it from a 1948 QST article.

What the WBFD offers is convenience at the price of efficiency. As both an EE and amateur radio operator, I say the tradeoff is not worthwhile for most amateur radio applications.

Tell us, Hans - would YOU use a WBFD at your ham station instead of a conventional dipole of equivalent size?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1158. Re: The coders embarrass themselves on 14.275 MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-28 11:22:08 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030128062208.12173.00000217@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 60239

In article <Xns9310674182842elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
<elektros@yahoo.com> writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
>news:20030127083647.16889.00000237@mb-cc.aol.com:
>
>> In article <Xns930FEFFD5E116elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
>> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>>
>>>Riley Hollingsworth recently visited our local club. One of the things
>>>he said in his talk was that he had never heard of a complaint of a CW
>>>op jamming.
>>
>> I think what he meant was CW ops jamming other CW/digital ops.
>>
>> In other words, jamming in the 'phone bands is much, much more common
>> that in the CW/digital bands.
>>
>>> It occurred to me at the time, although I didn't get the chance to
>>> tell him, that I had heard someone sending
>>
>> (expletive deleted)
>>
>>> repeatedly in CW on a repeater.
>>
>> I don't doubt it, even though I've never heard such on a ham repeater.
>>
>>>It's a myth that there's no jamming or swearing on CW.
>>>
>> Of curse it's a myth. The point is, however, that it's far less common
>> on CW than on voice modes. Just read the FCC enforcement letters. Lots
>> of enforcement actions against hams using voice in the voice bands,
>> extremely few (if any) against hams using CW or digital in the
>> CW/digital bands.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>>
>
>So, let me see if I've got this right. You're saying that only us phone
>ops are the victims, and just because they don't send obscene CW at the CW
>end of the band that somehow makes CW better?

Nope.

I'm saying that jamming and obscenity are extremely rare in the CW/digital parts of the bands. So rare that enforcement actions against them are practically unknown. Much rarer than those sorts of violations in the 'phone bands. Since many if not most HF ham rigs manufactured in the past 20 years or so have built-in electronic keyers, and many have a memory feature, sending a word or two of Morse with them does not require a lot of skill.

There are certain frequencies in the 'phone bands, (3950, 14313) and some VHF/UHF repeaters (W6NUT) that have become infamous for poor operator behavior. No such freqs exist in the CW/digital bands. Interesting.

If the use of a certain mode results in far fewer violations by those using the mode, doesn't that make the mode somewhat better?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1159. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-28 11:43:18 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E366D23.DBC4D171@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60241

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20030126101937.02227.00000265@mb-bk.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Sgt
> Putz Great American Hostile Action Hero) writes:
>
> >>Subject: Re: Why Dave has such a p*ss poor attitude
> >>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >>Date: 1/25/03 6:29 PM Central Standard Time
> >>Message-id: <20030125192917.03463.00000207@mb-cr.aol.com>

> The "use of CW as an RTTY order-wire" is ridiculous on the
> face of it...whether first claimed by Heil as an original
> innovation or, as later claimed, "State Department procedure."

You've been chided quite often in the past for your distortion of
facts. Where is the evidence of your statement that I claimed
originality of the system used?
>
> Using manual telegraphy as an "order wire" on an RTTY
> circuit is a nonsense idea on the face of it.

Reasoning has been explained often enough for it to have sunk into your
noggin by now.

> If the TTY works
> at all, then it can be used to send administrative information
> about the circuit just as well as regular message traffic.

Yep, and if it doesn't work, you could send information about the
circuit until your next birthday and you'll never be able to pass any
information about the RTTY circuit.

> TTY
> does it faster than any manual telegraphy with the advantage
> of printed copies at both ends as well as the ability re-send
> in reverse to confirm good copy.

...or it doesn't do it at all.

> If "conditions are too bad to permit RTTY operation" (one of
> Heil's original claims) then that single radio circuit cannot
> handle either message traffic or order-wire information. It
> should be a morse code radio circuit then, for both message
> traffic and order-wire information. There is no mode mixing
> and hasn't been so since the 1930s in worldwide
> communications.

Who said anything about mode mixing? The fact that propagation could be poor enough to prevent either the RTTY circuit to pass traffic or for a RTTY order wire circuit to work are precisely why CW was used.

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr. Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

>
> Let's look at Sgt Putz, self-renowned Hostile Action Hero. He
> has never worked any real 24/7 military communications during
> a military career terminated by a medical discharge. He has
> never worked IN any radio-electronics engineering, only on the
> sidelines as a purchasing agent, filling out orders. He seems
> to travel around to many different residence addresses and has
> claimed several different medical employers. That would
> signify some instability after a military career.

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr. Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

I've believe he has you clocked, Leonard.

Dave K8MN

1160. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-28 11:57:32 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E367079.4166AA2F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60242

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E33AE54.3010704D@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >> Go for it, Herr Robust. Snarl your wurst. :-)
> > >
> > >Your apology will come only after you submit proof that you are not an
> > >American. I'm not going to do your leg work for you.
> >
> > Why must I now "submit proof I am not an American?!?"
> >
> > I've been one since birth. The US federal government,
> > three state governments, four county governments, two
> > city governments, FBI, IRS, FCC, FAA, US Army, USN,
> > USCG, USAF, DCAS, and some other alphabet-soup
> > organizations all agree with that and have the
> > documentation to prove it.

Those "senior moments" must be overtaking you on a more frequent basis.
You made some stupid comment about me being an "Ugly American". For it
to stick, you'd have to show evidence that I'd exhibited such behavior
toward a foreigner. My comments directed to you certainly can't be
considered such unless you are other than a citizen of the United
States. Since it appears that you ARE a citizen of the U.S., you're
full of beans.

> > >It is amazing just how quickly you snipped all the stuff referencing Key
> > >Officer listings and got the hell off that subject before revealing any
> > >more of your ignorance.
> >
> > What's to bother with on a listing of staff that looks like
> > a DSN directory listing (but without the numbers)?

...so providing the urls wasn't enough evidence for you? You might try
using one of them (I highly recommend the State Department url). Read
the header information where it states "Key Officers of Foreign Service
Posts". The same information is published twice yearly in book form.
The book is called, "Key Officers of Foreign Service Posts". You've
already made one stupid statement. Now you've followed it up with a
second. You can then remove the second foot from your mouth now.

> Didn't you get the medal you think you deserved for all
> that innovating, important communications work at those
> big embassies?!? Tsk, tsk, tsk.

>
> Geez, I would think anyone pioneering a New Method,
> like using CW for an order-wire on an RTTY circuit
> should at least get a write-up in the Radio Club of
> America's annual awards dinner newsletter!

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

Dave K8MN

1161. Re: Why Dave has such a p*ss poor attitude

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-28 12:06:10 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E36727F.6E44D33B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60243

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E33B5AA.FE4A238E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Oh, you probably think I had something to do with the export of
> >cashews.
>
> No, you're not nuts...just frustrated that you couldn't pull
> of a snow-job on most of the others in here. :-)
>
> >Just a couple
> >of days ago you mentioned something about Key Officer lists.
>
> I did that three years ago, Mr. FSO. Forgot again?
>
> Looked like just a listing of staff at each embassy. I will
> grant that staff had keys and official positions, therefore
> listings of staff can be called "key lists."

You'd be wrong yet again. Go look at the State Department url
provided. Let me know what the list is titled. Funny that none of the
people who worked for me are listed in any of those lists. I don't see
a listing of all Econ or Political officers, only the heads of section.
I guess it isn't a listing of embassy staff.

> In magazines such a listing is called the "masthead."
> Names, titles. DSN phone directories also have them.

The information provided was in response to another incorrect assertion
from you. It wasn't a masthead from a magazine and it wasn't a
telephone directory though the State Department does have a telephone
directory.

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

> >What happened to that particular rant?
>
> Everyone was waiting for your insufferable pride to boil
> over. :-)

I'll bet that my refuting your silly statement with cold, hard fact must have been difficult for you. Whose insufferable pride took the hit, oh "exhaulted" one?

Dave K8MN

1162. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-28 12:20:58 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E3675F6.88A32B3B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60244

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E342E82.3C27FAE1@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >> In article <20030125155347.04873.00000125@mb-cb.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
> >(N2EY)
> >> writes another volume in his on-going "Andy Rooney" wannabe
> >> column in here:
> >>
> >> >In article <kNyY9.652$N5.478853@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> >> ><wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
> > >
> >> A single-crystal oscillator can make trouble just as easily as
> >> a PLL or DDS or Fractional-N synthesizer and produce RF
> >> outside of ham bands. US amateurs are not allowed to RF
> >> outside their alloted bands.
> > >
> >>Part 15 aside, you aren't allowed to produce RF inside the amateur
> >bands. It sort of evens out.
>
> Herr Robust forgot some parts in Title 47 CFR. :-)

Fine. You just continue to sit around waiting for your opportunity.

> >> Ahem. Morsemanship has NOTHING to do with ANY kind of
> >> technical smarts. None. Zip. Nada.
> > >
> >>Who said it did? Morse testing addresses the operating side of things.
> >>After all, an amateur license is, above all, permission to operate.
> >>Permission to build a piece of amateur gear isn't required by the
> >>government.
>
> The US amateur radio license is BOTH an operator and a
> station license. I'm surprised Herr Robust hasn't learned
> that yet. Regulations may call the station a "control point"
> but it IS the station nonetheless.

What is your point? I know what an amateur radio license is. I have
one.
It is not required to build any piece of equipment. It is required to
operate in the amateur bands.

> >Your words. You use them or words like them all the time in here.
> >Don't forget your very recent, "Awwww. Don't like your own kind of

> >commentary coming right back to you? Tsk, tsk, tsk."
>
> Poor baby. You still do a BAD imitation of mighty morseman
> Miccolis. Let him speak for himself.

...the way you're letting Carl speak for himself? You do, by the way, a
pretty good imitation of Carl.

> >> >Yeah, me too, 1968, Philly FCC office. I was 14.
> >>
> >> You were LATE. Other kids did it at 6! You could have done it
> >> in 1960 and had 8 more years to brag about! Tsk, tsk, tsk.
> >
> >Let's see...are you seventy yet, Len? How many decades back does your
> >supposed interest in amateur radio run? Wow--talk about LATE!
>
> Sigh...Herr Robust is still on the "interest = ham license"
> kick. Tsk, tsk, tsk.
>
> "Interest" does not require a license in anything.

Then why the comment that another was "late" in obtaining his license.
If he was late, you're later by quite a number of decades.

> Yes, I am 70. Did my first legal HF operating in February, 1953.
> No ham license required there, so don't beef about fishing
> around for nastygrams, senior.

Dandy. Unfortunately for you, an amateur license is required for ham
radio--you know, the service for which this particular newsgroup was
created.

> >> >What it really comes down to is that you use phrases like "force", "hazing
> >> >ritual" and "jumping through hoops" selectively.
> >>
> >> ...there you go again, putting words in others' writings. BAD form, OM.
> >
> >Really? You don't believe Carl's use of the terms to be selective? Did
> >he not use those terms?
>
> You've been requested to cease the BAD imitation of mighty
> morseman Miccolis. Please comply, OM.

I was addressing Carl's comments. Tell me once again how you got
involved?
>
> >Right. He should wise up to the fact that you consider yourself to have
> >filled the position. Tell him that we can't meet on HF to discuss
> >amateur radio policy matters while you're at it.
>
> Why is it a "requirement to meet on HF to discuss amateur
> radio policy matters?" Do you need some "privacy" from

> perceived nasty "civilians?" ?

A requirement? Noooooo, Len. While not a requirement, neither is it
prohibited despite your earlier bleatings.

> It's fairly obvious to all that Herr Robust can't handle negative
> opinions of his viewpoints and resorted to personal insult
> surrogates long ago. That's not "discussion," just cussin.

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

I guess this one falls under ethnic slurs, Leonard.

> >What is a "morse-ist cult"? Why is it "little"? Have you tried the
> >experiment Jim suggests? Regardless of what goes on in "the rest of the
> >radio world", radio amateurs use morse code widely today.
>
> Only on HF bands in the USA. Some European countries
> allocate LF bands not yet allowed for US amateur use
> (160-190 KHz is still license-free in the US).

So you hold that morse isn't in wide use at VHF or in Europe or Asia?

> Heil disagrees with the IARU position on morse code testing.
> He is "superior" to them as well?!?

I don't recall ever commenting one way or the other on the position of
the IARU. Perhaps you can find an instance where I did so. It'll give
you something with which to fill your empty hours.

> >Why izzit that when you begin your rant of ancient morse tales, they
> >begin with landline telegraphy but when some mentions the age of SSB, it
> >has to be confined to amateur radio use? Can you say "double standard"?
> >You are soooooo transparent.
>
> The "age (era to be exact) of amateur SSB" began about 1950.
> It was in all the ham publications of the time and the decade
> following.

Irrelevant. No claim was made about "amateur SSB".

> Was Heil licensed then? Did he have an "interest" in radio
> then? If no to either, why is he prattling on like some whiny
> little opaque-to-light-of-newness poor baby who can't take
> opposition?

Irrelevant. Heil can read.

> How much SSB equipment did the US embassies in Africa
> use, Mr. FSO? Did you invent the use of CW as an order
> wire on State's SSB circuits too?!?

All U.S. embassies in Africa use both fixed and mobile HF SSB equipment. They also make extensive use of VHF FM base, mobile and hand-held transceivers and repeaters.

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr. Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

Dave K8MN

1163. Re: Why Dave has such a p*ss poor attitude

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-28 12:25:14 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E3676F7.7C44606B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60245

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3E3432E5.8266EB56@earthlink.net...
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3E32CCE6.D8842848@earthlink.net...
> > > > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > > >> > Yes ... assuming that you're refering to my behavior towards you,
> > > > > it's simple ... "Pompus, narrow-minded jerks irritate me>"
> > > >
> > > > I love it. Someone who can't spell "pompous" quotes himself. I
> assume
> > > > that your view assumes that anyone who doesn't buy into your grand
> > > > scheme is pompous and narrow-minded. You've not just used that method
> > > > with me.
> > >
> > > You have ADD, right Dave? I've mentioned several times that I have
> > > a bit of loss of feeling/coordination in my fingers due to a spinal
> injury.
> > >
> > I recall that. I don't see how your medical problem forced you to cut
> > and paste an old quote complete with its original spelling error.
>
> The original typo was simply propagated by error ... I didn't look
> closely enough at what I was reusing ... you want to hang me for that?
> (sounds pretty petty to me ...)

An error was propagated by error? Most of us would have said, "I made a
mistake". Hang you for it? Naw--just laugh over it.

> > My recollection is of how many countries you'd worked from home on 10m.
>
> OK ... so what if I mentioned something about working some DX? ... again,
> I'm not chasing it

Right. It is likely chasing you.

> > I didn't ask for a travelogue or justification. I just wondered how you
> > could be spared from what you call "important work".
>
> The CEO of my company gets to take vacations, too ... the fact that
> one's work is important doesn't mean they're required to work 24/7/365.

Nobody works 24/7, much less 24/7/365--not even Leonard H.

Dave K8MN

1164. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-28 12:44:09 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E367B14.3D42354F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60247

Len Over 21 wrote:

> Robeson continually states that discussion opponents have
> "really" said something even though what was written was
> obviously not so. Again, that is libelous.

I can't believe that you write some of the things you write and still manage to keep a straight face.

> Robeson seems enraged that others could have gathered
> experience in radio communication before him (including his
> birth) on HF...and then gone on to LF, VLF, VHF, UHF, and
> higher as a professional. It seems to be a greater rage
> because he had NO prior military radio experience and had
> NO working experience in radio engineering (purchasing
> agent order-filling does not count) in civilian life.

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr. Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

> Amateur radio is a fun hobby, a recreation.

How would you know?

> Roughly three years ago, Heil attempted a small snow job of
> amateur participants in here with the tale of "using CW for an
> RTTY circuit order-wire as a clever idea." The term "order-
> wire" is not used much in US amateur radio yet is a common
> term in commercial and military communications, both in
> landline and radio. Robeson has no experience in such
> communications thus increasing his displeasure at loss of
> control over subjects.

How time flies. If you want to get is right, that has been about five years ago. I was still working in Helsinki at the time. My statement was as correct then as it is now.

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr. Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic

slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

> Robeson cannot argue. On the issue of code testing necessity,
> he did not bother with rational arguments to support his side
> but indulged in a remarkable long-time constant barrage of lies,
> distortions, personal insults, "rewriting" of what was clearly
> written, attempts at character assassination, and general rage
> that was clearly libelous.

Whoa! You're treading on some pretty thin ice there, Leonard. What was that part about rewriting? How about that character assassination stuff?

>
> No, it is just Robeson indulging in another immature, uncontrolled
> spasm of rage at being opposed in anything. Robeson cannot
> tolerate opposition of any kind. His "solution" is to disregard
> civility for invective, seek "destruction" of his opposition by any
> means possible.

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr. Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."
> ---------------
>
> In a clinical sort of way, Robeson's output can be interesting to
> those interested in human psychology. It's a small melange of
> psychological disorders manifesting themselves in rather classic
> elementary syndromes. Sort of an on-line "Psych 101" workbook.

Anderson has no credentials in psychology nor is he a medical doctor. Isn't that what you stated about "Robeson" above?

Dave K8MN

1165. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-28 12:45:57 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E367B86.5F2FFB61@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60248

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <oliZ9.6698$d66.604847@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
> <kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
> >
> >:
> >: But since the WBFD is at least the size of a G5RV or trap dipole, and
> >: costs at least as much as a conventional dipole plus a tuner, it is a
> >: mystery why any ham would use a WBFD.
> >:
> >
> >Translation: N.I.H.
>
> Do you mean "Not Invented Here", Hans?
>
> If so, that's not the case. The WBFD has been around a long time - I learned
> about it from a 1948 QST article.

Brian is making great progress in his quest for knowledge about the
antenna. Just a few short months ago he didn't understand what it was.

Dave K8MN

1166. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-28 13:36:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030128083623.05048.00000263@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 60249

In article <OulZ9.1420$N5.819411@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030126215637.20835.00000270@mb-fy.aol.com...
>>>
>> Are there more than 3400 current NCI members?
>
>Yes ...

How many?

And since there are no dues nor membership expirations, how do you know if a
"current member" still exists?
>
>> >Nor, I might point out, does ARRL's membership constitute a majority
>> >of US hams ... more like a bit less than 25% IIRC the last numbers I
>> >noticed.
>>
>> Quite true. Nor does ARRL claim to constitute a majority, either.
>
>ARRL claims to be "THE National Society for Amateur Radio" ...

Is there another national society for amateur radio?

NCI cannot claim to be one, because

a) it is "international"
b) its sole stated purpose is to end stand-alone Morse code testing.

What other "national society for amateur radio" exists in the USA?

>they
>most certainly claim to speak for all when they file comments with the
>FCC etc.

How?

>Not directly in so many words, but it is CLEARLY implied.

Where? Where does ARRL claim to speak for all?

ARRL's membership number is clearly stated. Not a secret in any way.

What is NCI's current membership, give or take 1%? Why has that number been
such a closely guarded secret?

>Fortunately, the FCC understands the reality.

The FCC clearly does not interpret ARRL's words as claiming "to speak for all when they file comments with the FCC etc." Such an implication exists only in the minds of a few. Those few infer what is not implied.

Does FCC know NCI's current membership, give or take 1%? Why has that number been such a closely guarded secret?
>
Anyone who comments to the FCC is, by definition, telling the FCC that their ideas represent what is best. Of course "best for whom?" is a different question. Some comments, like one that demanded an age limit of 14 years for any class of amateur license, do not represent what is best for the ARS.

Is there another amateur radio society in the USA that provides even 1% of the services ARRl provides to the amateur radio community?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1167. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-28 14:55:09 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301280655.2e818836@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60250

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0301271519.4fe046a2@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0301261943.4df5faaf@posting.google.com>...
> > kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0301260719.4750d2df@posting.google.com>...
>
> > > That's right, the t2fd is an extremely inefficient antenna on most
> > > freqs because most of the power ya put to one is wasted heating the
> > > resistor in the thing. It's a terrible antenna for ham purposes,
> > > anybody with half a brain and the same space a t3fd needs can put up a
> > > far more efficient antenna for 1/10 the cost of a t2fd. That leaves
> > > you out.
> >
> > Empty Head, why must t2fd cost more than other antennas of its kind?
>
> What antenna or antennas is/are "like a t2fd"??

See the N2EY post.

> > Why must a discussion about such an antenna in military and government
> > use pass amateur "standards?"
>
> If you actually bothered studying even 1/4 of the innumerable threads
> in RRAA abt the t2fd you would know why t2fd's are not a very good
> idea in ham radio except under unusual circumstances. 'Course then agn
> a t2fd might be just the ticket for you, if there was ever an "unusual
> circumstance" it's YOU.

Don't be so close minded or empty headed.

Notice that the thread I referred to in rraa concerned DoD and other
government uses, where frequency and band hopping occurs frequently,
in possibly in an environment where you don't want to go out and
change the effective length of a dipole with jumper leads.

Yet there are even applications tor the T2FD in amateur use, but
you'll never see that, Empty Head.

> > What is the amateur standard, and where
> > is it codified?
>
> Ya buy the ARRL Antenna Book. Ya open it to page one. Even you can't
> possibly need the map from there.
>
> UhOh . . wrong.

Now the ARRL Antenna Handbook forbids the T2FD?

Hey Len, we've got another one that confuses the ARRL with the FCC.

> > Why must amateurs run their antenna preferences by you
> > and your cronies on rraa? Are you now saying that amateur radio
> > operators with half a brain lack freedom of choice in the kind of
> > antennas they choose to implement? Do full brained amateurs get to
> > choose their own antennas, or must they march lock step with you?
>
> Nobody out here gives a rat's patooie abt what antennas you use, knock
> yerself out, go work yer dummy load.

Ah! You called it a dummy load. Does your dummy load radiate as
well?

Some engineer you are.

I wonder if N2EY's dummy load radiates as well. Some school, right?

You're not "arguing" with me or
> anybody else in RRAP or RRAA, you're tripping out on some goofy
> tangent trying to "politicize" simple dipole physics.

Nope; dipoles are just about the perfect radiator for one band/one
frequency. You should know that.

Some engineer you are.

Or something
> only you could come off the wall with. Nobody gives a rat's patooie
> abt that either.

Then stop replying.

1168. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-28 15:03:56 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030128100356.02295.00000276@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 60251

>Subject: Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 1/27/03 6:13 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030127191336.08866.00000151@mb-mf.aol.com>

>We are all waiting for the claims of experience in military
> communications from the Putzman. Total so far: ZERO

[Glancing at title of newsgroup....a-m-a-t-e-u-r
r-a-d-i-o...Hmmmmm...Wonder why I am not discussing MILITARY radio,
Lennie..?!?!

IT'S NOT GERMANE.

>In order to "rule" on "compromising an on-going operation"
> the Putzman has to explain how SW listeners can decode
> the encryption used by the military.

No all military communications is encrypted. But you knew that.

>Even more interesting is that "modern" (since before the
> Gulf War) military communications...(SNIP)

A-M-A-T-E-U-R R-A-D-I-O

I know that your three years in the Army is ALL you can talk about, but
it's still not applicable in here.

>Whooo! All the "expertise in radio" floating around here, all
> from memorizing the advertisements in QST every month!

As opposed to the retelling of Korean era clerk stories or rehashing of
the development of SINCGARS, WHAT can you tell us abot CURRENT Amateur Radio,
Lennie?

1169. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-28 15:05:15 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030128100515.02295.00000277@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 60252

>Subject: Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 1/27/03 8:12 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0301271812.19d3713f@posting.google.com>

>You mean if the SW station had cryptological gear to monitor? Now who
>could that be?

Shadowing Lennie's rants, Brian...?!?! Pretty lame!

Steve, K4YZ

1170. Re: Hot Fun In The Summertime With Brian

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-28 15:06:10 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301280706.43230148@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60253

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030127212105.21366.00000695@mb-mu.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0301271755.74e30a07@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >> Not by you I haven't. Where are those T5 logs and permission to
> operate
> >> at...?!?!
> >>
> >> Steve, K4YZ
> >
> >What is wrong with my statements?
>
> You've not followed the Dill Sergeant's ORDERS to the troops
> on comportment in his mystical idea of amateur radio. If you
> sass the Dill Sergeant you wind up on company punishment
> :-)

Though loud, his orders are meaningless.

> That's in parallel with the "26-patent" kid in Pennsy who
> gave you implicit ORDERS on which antenna to use. :-)

He confuses ARRL Antenna Book with FCC Part 97. (Kelly doesn't
realize that the t2fd was not intended to be a one band/one frequency
antenna. Now he thinks it's a dummy load. What kind of an engineer
thinks that?)

> There is only ONE way...their way. That's the way is IS!
>
> What next, close-order drill? :-)

It can't be good, whatever it is.

He must be getting very frustrated at this point, which is a reason to
go back to the point of this thread.

Steve, what was wrong with my statements?

1171. Re: Hot Fun In The Summertime With Brian

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-28 15:07:46 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301280707.67674486@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60254

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030127191335.08866.00000150@mb-mf.aol.com>...
> In article <20030127102808.01441.00000231@mb-mk.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Sgt HAH
> Putz) writes:
>
> >>No, Steav, you tell me what is wrong with my statements. You cannot.
> >
> > I already did. You choose to ignore it. Do you treat red lights and
> >"Bridge Out" signs with the same disregard?
> >
> >>You've earned "cubed."
> >
> > Not by you I haven't. Where are those T5 logs and permission to operate
> >at...?!?!
>
> The rest of us are waiting for details, references, or other
> verification of those "seven hostile action" experiences.

Could have been self-abuse.

1172. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-28 15:48:01 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030128104801.02295.00000278@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 60255

>Subject: Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 1/27/03 6:13 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030127191330.08866.00000148@mb-mf.aol.com>

>> And both of you may and neither of you have been impeded by anyone that
>I
>>am aware of, least of all me.
>
> Oh? Robeson's output in this newsgroup is a constant, almost
> unremitting calumny of anyone who does not agree with his
> Dill Sergeant pronouncements.

Lennie, PLEASE produce some evidence that you have been prevented from
posting what you will to this (or any other) forum by me or anyone else.

>One of the classic attempts at intimidation was the home page
> on AOL, all because of his childish rage over a mistake.

The radioelectronics "professional" made a mistake? I don;t think so.
You're an opprotunist, Lennie, and you certainly took advantage of that one.

>Sorry, badass Dill Instructor, but LIBEL, however slight, is still
> LIBEL with or without capital letters. Robeson continually puts
> himself into a libelous position that he cannot extricate.

Pointing out YOUR lies, Oh Lame One? I don't think so.

>Robeson seems enraged that others could have gathered
> experience in radio communication before him (including his
> birth) on HF...and then gone on to LF, VLF, VHF, UHF, and
> higher as a professional.

I am sure you think so, Lennie. The truth is that you are the one that is
enraged...that AMATEURS can do daily what you had to go to school for.

>All that is Robeson's obvious problem. Personal rage is not
> justified nor an excuse for dishonorable behavior.

Salpping a punk like you around in this virtual boxing ring is no problem,
Lennie, nor is it dishonorable.

Dishonor is trying to embellish and impress others with your alleged
war-hero status at the expense of combat KIA's.

THAT is dishonorable.

>Once again, a LIE about "hating amateur radio." Disinformation
> certainly.

Not with the evidence you provide here, Lennie.

Show me ONE thing you have done FOR Amateur Radio lately, Lennie.
"Expressing (your) opinion" does not count.

How many radio clubs have you lectured at?...date/time/place, please.

WHO have you mentored in the licensing process? Who had obtained
licensure BECAUSE of you...not INSPITE of...

What operating events have you participated in?

What classes have you taught and in what media was it presented?

>The "AN/PRC-119 family" of military radios...(SNIP)

...lives in another community. Not rec.radio.AMATEUR.

>Robeson has a selfish little habit of modeling all of US amateur
> radio on what He believes, what He experiences, what He does.

You can provide specific quotes that substantiate this, of course...?!?!

>Robeson simply cannot tolerate an opposite opinion.

Sure I can. What I can't tolerate are pathological liars. (That would be
you, by the way...)

>Robeson has NOT "disproven" anything.

I don't have to, Lennie. You do it for me. You make assertions about
this-or-that, then are "called" on it. You are given ample opportunity to
provide the expected "evidence" to back up your assertions, and you never do.

Just more repetitions of your SINCGARS stories, more retellings of the
glory days at ADA, and how Dave Heil's interpretation of "order wires" negates
any/everything he has ever done in Amateur Radio.

>>However I refuse to allow it to go unchallenged.
>
> That's the pity of all this, the cause for a constant barrage of
> pejoratives, commands, disinformation, and general uncivil
> and dishonorable behavior of Robeson

The pity of it is that you keep lying in the face of evidence that you ARE
lying, or at least making up untruthful assertions that youa re unprepared to
validate.

I am not the one with something to prove here, Lennie.

>Robeson cannot stand opposition in anything.

Prove it.

>Robeson has no credentials in psychology nor is he a medical
> doctor. The use of "pathological liar" labeling is interesting, but
> it only reinforces his own petty personal demand that everyone
> Believe in what He Believes.

No one "has" to believe anything, Lennie. Least of all what you spit out
in here.

>No, it is just Robeson indulging in another immature, uncontrolled
> spasm of rage at being opposed in anything.

Call it what you will. It keeps your lies and rants in check.

>No, it is just Robeson indulging in another immature, uncontrolled
> spasm of rage at being opposed in anything.

Nope. Just opposed to what you represent...dishonesty and deceit.

>His "solution" is to disregard
> civility for invective, seek "destruction" of his opposition by any
> means possible.

If it WAS by "any means possible", theses exchanges would have stopped a
long time ago.

>It does waste nearly everyone's time in here and that's a pity for
> all the rest.

Then stop lying and stop providing so many opportunities to show you for
what you are.

Putz.

1173. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-28 15:50:04 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030128105004.19271.00000651@mb-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 60256

In article <b14ga0jjc1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>
>But you don't care enough about to allow the future of morse
>to be a free choice decision. You want code testing to be that
>recruiting effort. Well at least that's an honest statement.
>
>Cheers
>Bill K2UNK

Bill:

No, I don't. Like it or not, amateur radio is not a democracy, and doesn't have to be! It needs to be "democratic" only to the extent that all people are equally eligible to apply for a license, assuming they can meet the established licensing requirements. However, the Welfare State liberals saw the Morse code testing requirements as an inconvenience which forestalled their progress toward the goal of getting an HF microphone in front of their faces, so they whined long and hard enough to get them reduced to the point of insignificance.

It's amazing how our hobby's backward progress has tracked that of society as a whole.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1174. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-28 16:20:05 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030128112005.02295.00000279@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 60257

>Subject: Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 1/27/03 7:53 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0301271753.4119316e@posting.google.com>

>Not at all. I welcome not only free speech, but open debate. You on
>the other hand wish to silence Len in amateur radio matters as he does
>not have a license.

Not at all. I would like to see Lennie silenced becasue he has lied repeatedly and makes outrageous and unsupported claims against Amateur Radio as a whole.

You support no code, and I have no argument with that. So does Carl and several others. Do you see me responding to them like I do Lennie? No. It's because, like it or not, they express THIER opinions without lying or making easily disproved assertions about Amateur Radio, the ARRL in general or certain Hams in particular., and they show me the same courtesy.

>And what of your endless spamming?

So people should just let Lennie lie uncontested?

>They ought to be. This group is supposed to be about that.

That argument is over with, Brian. There are other IMMEDIATE issues that need to be and should be addressed, but they aren't. I ahve introduced and reintorduced them, but they fall on deaf ears, so it shall be...I am not another "Vipul" who will damn all Amateur Radio because it won't meet MY needs.

Here's some facts:

(1) The FCC has so far refused to revisit any further petitions on the Morse Code testing issue until it is addressed in WRC-03.

(2) Most major western powers and most of the rest of the world has already moved to a minimalist position on Code testing, dropping it to 5WPM or "code recognition" tests. Many of THOSE countries have stated that they will drop code testing when the ITU treaty is ammended to drop it.

(3) The only major Amateur Radio organization in the United States has dropped it's own long-standing support of Code testing. Therefore with the exception of the occassional anonymous "No Code=No Ham" hold outs, there is no organized support for continued code testing.

Do I like it? Not particularly. But I accept it and will try to encourage new Hams to learn the Code even after ITU deletes or ammends S25.5.

>Your zeal only exposes you for what you are.

Intolerant of the lying and deceitful?

>> Have you seen him provide one iota of "evidence" about ARRL
>> "dishonesty"...?!?!
>
>Ask him if he has one iota of evidence concerning Watergate,
>Iran-Contra, Savings and Loan scams, Monica-gate, or Dangling Chads.

None of those are in discussion here, now are they?

>He sure does pull your strings.

Liars always do.

>Like now?

If the shoe fits, Brian...

> Like it or not, you
>keep falling into the characature mold that Len has described. And I
>know you don't like it. Sorry.

Sorry for what? Lennie insists on some "lodge hall" mentality, insists
that Amateur Radio does NOT provide a public service,and has made countless
assertions that are untrue and proven false with ease.

So he has proved....what?

Steve, K4YZ

1175. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-28 16:27:28 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030128112728.02295.00000280@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 60258

>Subject: Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 1/27/03 6:13 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030127191332.08866.00000149@mb-mf.aol.com>

>A horse has "gait." Are you a veterinary nurse too used to
> four-footed creatures? Why do you treat others a mere
> animals?

Sorry, Lennie. Here's yet ANOTHER example of you spouting off on
something you know nothing of. One's ability to ambulate and the
characteristics of that ambulation is refered to as "gait".

>I made no claims of going for that, only that it COULD be
> done.

Uh huh.

>Why not? I got my First Class Radiotelephone (commercial)
> license in one examination session in 1956 at an FCC field
> office in Chicago. Without using any Q&A book.

Here you are in the fifties again, Lennie. >>WE<< are in the 21st
century. Care to come along? And your First Phone (GROL) grants NO privileges
in the Amateur Radio service. Sorry.

>I never said ARRL was "dishonest," just that their actions
> on "examining" two six-year-olds and "passing" them, then
> publicizing them on their website was SUSPICIOUS.

Not truthful.

You have blatantly called the ARRL dishonest on numerous occassions.

>But, never mind that...you expect everyone to Believe in
> ARRL, that they Never Do Wrong (for They are Holy).

Nope. Never said that. I HAVE, however, asked YOU to provide the
EVIDENCE of this dishonesty you allege.

You have not. You've had at least six months to do so.

>I was assigned to the....(SNIP)

Blah blah blah blah.....

We've heard it before. The best thing you could do is shut up about it
and let it pass, Lennie.

>The 71st Signal Service Battalion....(SNIP)

Has nothing to do with Amateur Radio nor your qualifications to serve as a licensee in an FCC radio service.

>I have the name, rank, Army Serial Number, of each one of
> the 19 signalmen who died in that July, 1950, crash.

Then you should find thier families and ask forgiveness for having used the memory of their loved ones deaths to promote yourself in this forum, you creep.

>The Putzman seems to think that NO ONE can possibly
> take pride in the service of their country unless his Royal
> Hindness "approves" of it. But, what does the Putzman
> say about his own service?

I don't need to, Lennie. It's not important in here. What I do TODAY is.

>"Seven times in hostile action!" No references, no details,
> no names, no verification, no nothing except a very general
> statement of standard braggadoccio

As opposed to your "I can't talk about recent electronics work because it's still confidential"...Un huh...Cute, Lennie.

>Putzman never did any military communications. He can't
> even name on of the standard radios of the USMC for
> small (or large) unit operations.

So? That you have memorized these radios make you a competent Amatuer Radio operator HOW, Lennie?

>Total BULLSHIT on the "classified" claim.

Back at ya, Lennie. What as that stuff day-before-yesterday about you couldn't discuss all you recent work because of confidentiality?

Guess that only goes one way, eh?

>Putzman wants to chastise others for not talking about
> amateur radio subjects...while he goes on and on...(SNIP)

Sorry, Lennie, I do NOT go "on and on" about any of the topics you mentioned. CERTAINLY not like we are innundated with war lies about the 8235th, the 71st, or any thing that happened with radio between 1953 and 1956, and the deployment of SINCGARS. None of which is pertinent to 21st century Amateur Radio.

>US amateur radio is NOT a branch of the US military.

Then WHY do you think anyone here is REMOTELY interested in your retelling of the story of the 8235th ad nauseum? Why are we bombarded with tales of the efficiently of SINCGARS?

It's NOT Amateur Radio, Lennie. YOU said it, now LIVE by it.

>US amateur radio is a hobby activity, recreation, and NOT
> vital to national defense....(SNIP)

In YOUR opinion.

>Putzman won't accept reality.

I accept it fine. You are a liar and a a creep. See...No problem.

>To be honest, prior military service does NOT have any
> direct bearing on amateur radio...but Robeson is obsessed
> with that, continuing to demean and insult veterans of the
> US military that won't agree with his writing in here.

I am not the one hiding behind the deaths of comrades who died in combat 3 years beore I joined a unit, Lennie.

> It may be greater than DISHONOR by Robeson to dismiss
> 19 casualties of a war that happened before he was born
> because of his little personal feud with another. Sad.

Nice dodge. Didn't work. Eveyone see's through it but YOU, Lennie.

Sheeesh.

1176. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-28 16:29:02 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030128112902.02295.00000281@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 60259

>Subject: Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 1/28/03 5:43 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3E366D23.DBC4D171@earthlink.net>

>I've believe he has you clocked, Leonard.

It wasn't hard. He makes it easy to do!

Steve, K4YZ

1177. Re: Why Hams feel they are superior to CBers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-28 18:31:33 UTC
From: a Red Hairy One <berniebignose@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3e36e1f7@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 60262
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Scott" <scott@scotti.sh!t> wrote in message
news:IPudnegSaMjRPKmjXTWcow@comcast.com...
>
> Why does the Liberty Net exist?

To keep a bunch of sorry-ass old geezers
occupied on Saturday night? (they have become
so utterly pathetic that even Harrison in Sarasota
King-of-the-Tape-Players has even abandoned them!)

1178. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-28 19:43:19 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301281143.2223e790@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60260

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030128105004.19271.00000651@mb-fp.aol.com>...
> In article <b14ga0jjc1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >
> >But you don't care enough about to allow the future of morse
> >to be a free choice decision. You want code testing to be that
> >recruiting effort. Well at least that's an honest statement.
> >
> >Cheers
> >Bill K2UNK
>
> Bill:
>
> No, I don't. Like it or not, amateur radio is not a democracy, and doesn't
> have to be! It needs to be "democratic" only to the extent that all people
> are equally eligible to apply for a license, assuming they can meet the
> established licensing requirements. However, the Welfare State liberals
> saw the Morse code testing requirements as an

an outdated, unnecessary, and arbitrary licensing requirement.

> It's amazing how our hobby's backward progress has tracked that of
> society as a whole.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Amazing. Up hill both ways.

1179. Re: 14.275 mhz Proves FCC's Ineffectiveness ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-28 19:47:55 UTC
From: a Red Hairy One <berniebignose@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3e36e1f8@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 60263
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Lloyd, N0VFP" <brother_lloyd_99@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:3e3603e9$1_7@server....

> Glenn Baxter is doing a world of good for Amauter Radio. He enjoys
helping
> others around the world. So what about making forgien policy? Big deal!
> Alot will be said of Baxter, when God takes him off the scene, what about
> you?

More people remember MUJ's drunken rantings on 14.313 ten years later.

More people remember Drunken Walter YEE's fantastic broadcast-grade
audio and playing of German Marches on 75 Meters. (it's a true shame all his
recordings and ham radio equipment are now residing in a landfill in
New Jersey someplace - word is his XYL cleaned the place out w/dumpster)

More people remember WB2OTK for being one of the freshest people
to key a ham radio microphone in a very long time. Rich was without doubt
the
Sam Kinnison of 20 and 75 meters. (boy do we miss him on HF! a true comic
so needed in the desert-dry world of humorless ham radio)

More people remember "Bernie the Bagleman" who was the *original*
20 meter "Dancing Chicken", WD4PZT with his infamous trailer
park chicken barbeques, "Raincoat Charlie" who would drive Mike
and Judy nuts. (...get out that six D-cell vibrator !)

And finally....the Red Panty Man who we need to come up on 14.275
and sing his diddy before k1man starts up his self-gratification broadcast.

need I continue?
> Glenn Baxter is role model for new hams........

Imagine RH pulls up to k1man
with Federal Marshals and a tow truck w/towmotor.
Down come antenna towers then toss those
out-of-alignment worn out Collins rigs into the back
seat of the car with Baxter in a straightjacket alongside...

1180. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-28 19:56:15 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301281156.62a32955@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60261

dennis@wawa.juniper.net (Dennis Ferguson) wrote in message
news:<b0ss3h$65k$1@heap.juniper.net>...
> Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote:
> >And, as noted above, sme countries won't likly ever have
> >a hardwired infrastructure. Several years ago
> >I worked on a proposal for a 3rd world
> >country that had as a requirement NO copper cable because
> >theft of cable for the copper was too prevalent.
>
> Not only in third world countries either. The phone company I
> worked for 9 years ago used to have a recurring problem with major
> circuit outages, in particular in the vicinity of their junction
> in West Orange, New Jersey, from people cutting chunks out of
> fiber optic cables where they came out of the ground at railway
> bridges. I think they got some relief by gluing labels which
> said "Fiber Optics" all over the exposed stuff, since people
> were mistaking the glass for copper.
>
> Dennis Ferguson

By December 1992, all power and telephone lines in Mogadishu had been
downed to pilfer. The former U.S. Embassy there had likewise been
stripped of all wire, fixtures, switches, and floor tiles.

Without power, there were no telephones and no running water, no radio
stations were on the air til later as Warlord Aideed needed to
consolidate support to fight the Americans.

1181. Re: How Long until K1MAN receives his revocation letter?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-28 20:00:35 UTC
From: Trebb@webtv.net
Message-ID: <20819-3E36E163-434@storefull-2277.public.lawson.webtv.net>
Source record: 60265

rfburns,

Well thought out, supported with facts, a likely scenario. Wonderful
piece of writing!

Bob Sherin, W4ASX

Get to know us; visit our Web Site
http://community.webtv.net/AllAmericn/BobW4ASXandMaryAnn/

1182. Re: Lets face it ... we're just communicators.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-28 20:04:08 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301281204.24ad4a3e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60264

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030125092232.05609.00000199@mb-df.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Lets face it ... we're just communicators.....
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 1/25/03 7:07 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0301250507.449359f@posting.google.com>
>
> >Steve, you probably know how to change a flat tire, too. I'll let you
> >know next time I have car trouble.
>
> Which, considering your incompetentcy with simple adminisitrative matters,
> will probably be soon. I'll get the truck warmed up.
>
> Steve

That would be "administrative matters," unless you had something else in mind.

1183. Re: The coders embarrass themselves on 14.275 MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-28 20:28:25 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93119D63D93EFelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 60266

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
news:20030128062208.12173.00000217@mb-mr.aol.com:

> In article <Xns9310674182842elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>
>>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
>>news:20030127083647.16889.00000237@mb-cc.aol.com:
>>
>>> In article <Xns930FEFFD5E116elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
>>> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>>>
>>>>Riley Hollingsworth recently visited our local club. One of the
>>>>things he said in his talk was that he had never heard of a complaint
>>>>of a CW op jamming.
>>>
>>> I think what he meant was CW ops jamming other CW/digital ops.
>>>
>>> In other words, jamming in the 'phone bands is much, much more common
>>> that in the CW/digital bands.
>>>
>>>> It occurred to me at the time, although I didn't get the chance to
>>>> tell him, that I had heard someone sending
>>>
>>> (expletive deleted)
>>>
>>>> repeatedly in CW on a repeater.
>>>
>>> I don't doubt it, even though I've never heard such on a ham
>>> repeater.
>>>
>>>>It's a myth that there's no jamming or swearing on CW.
>>>>
>>> Of curse it's a myth. The point is, however, that it's far less
>>> common on CW than on voice modes. Just read the FCC enforcement
>>> letters. Lots of enforcement actions against hams using voice in the
>>> voice bands, extremely few (if any) against hams using CW or digital
>>> in the CW/digital bands.
>>>
>>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>>
>>>
>>
>>So, let me see if I've got this right. You're saying that only us phone

>>ops are the victims, and just because they don't send obscene CW at the
>>CW end of the band that somehow makes CW better?
>
> Nope.
>
> I'm saying that jamming and obscenity are extremely rare in the
> CW/digital parts of the bands. So rare that enforcement actions against
> them are practically unknown. Much rarer than those sorts of violations
> in the 'phone bands. Since many if not most HF ham rigs manufactured in
> the past 20 years or so have built-in electronic keyers, and many have
> a memory feature, sending a word or two of Morse with them does not
> require a lot of skill.
>
> There are certain frequencies in the 'phone bands, (3950, 14313) and
> some VHF/UHF repeaters (W6NUT) that have become infamous for poor
> operator behavior. No such freqs exist in the CW/digital bands.
> Interesting.
>
> If the use of a certain mode results in far fewer violations by those
> using the mode, doesn't that make the mode somewhat better?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>
>

I think it's merely that it's harder to attract attention using CW.

1184. Re: The coders embarrass themselves on 14.275 MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-28 20:30:13 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93119DB1FCA30elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 60267

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in
news:f45722ac.0301271818.383f3557@posting.google.com:

> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> news:<20030127083647.16889.00000237@mb-cc.aol.com>...
>
>> Of curse it's a myth. The point is, however, that it's far less common
>> on CW than on voice modes. Just read the FCC enforcement letters. Lots
>> of enforcement actions against hams using voice in the voice bands,
>> extremely few (if any) against hams using CW or digital in the
>> CW/digital bands.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Could it be that the FCC no longer has a pool of trained CW operators
> to monitor amateur CW communications?
>
> Don't forget that Dick Carrol sends code so attrociously that machine
> copy is not possible.
>

You may be onto something.

1185. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-28 20:44:38 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0301281244.2abd08dc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60268

Welcome back, Jeff.

>jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu (Jeffrey Herman) wrote in message
news:<b12la4$8u1$1@news.hawaii.edu>...
> Kï¿½HB <Kï¿½HB@ARRL.ORG> wrote:
> > NCI 4304
>
> How many of those 4304 are current members?

NCI membership numbers started with either 1000 or 1001, not 0001, so
a member number of 4304 indicates a maximum of 3305 members, not 4304.

Membership is free and does not expire. Only way a member becomes a
nonmember is to request removal. Which has been done in at least two
cases that I know of.

> Were/are they all licensed
> hams? How many were/are coded hams?

Unknown - neither is a requirement of membership.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1186. MARS opinions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-28 20:50:51 UTC
From: gadget@easypath.com
Message-ID: <7a475dae.0301281250.4cda6845@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60269

Hello all,

I'm thinking of joining one of the MARS groups in the NY area, and I'd like to hear anyone's opinion as to which group may be the best. I'm interested in helping with military functions and/or being available "just in case".
I'm new to ham radio, but I learn very quick. I have experience as a Police/Fire/EMS dispatcher and have worked some local disasters. I'd probably be most comfortable in a progressive and active group.
From listening in my area it seems the Air Force MARS is most active in voice, but I've heard little other than reads of old regulations and check-ins for time logging.
I'm very experienced in computer technology, and would be most interested in digital radio/modem work.

Any thoughts guys?

Appreciate you comments,
Jim/KC2KIW

1187. Re: 14.275 mhz Proves FCC's Ineffectiveness ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-28 21:39:42 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b16ta8afm1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 60270
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

This guy KNOWS his 20 meter history. Pay attention.

Dan/W4NTI

"a Red Hairy One" <berniebignose@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:3e36e1f8@snipnews.snip.net...
>
> "Lloyd, N0VFP" <brother_lloyd_99@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:3e3603e9$1_7@server....
>
> > Glenn Baxter is doing a world of good for Amauter Radio. He enjoys
> helping
> > others around the world. So what about making forgien policy? Big
deal!
> > Alot will be said of Baxter, when God takes him off the scene, what
about
> > you?
>
> More people remember MUJ's drunken rantings on 14.313 ten years later.
>
> More people remember Drunken Walter YEE's fantastic broadcast-grade
> audio and playing of German Marches on 75 Meters. (it's a true shame all
his
> recordings and ham radio equipment are now residing in a landfill in
> New Jersey someplace - word is his XYL cleaned the place out w/dumpster)
>
> More people remember WB2OTK for being one of the freshest people
> to key a ham radio microphone in a very long time. Rich was without doubt
> the
> Sam Kinnison of 20 and 75 meters. (boy do we miss him on HF! a true comic
> so needed in the desert-dry world of humorless ham radio)
>
> More people remember "Bernie the Bagleman" who was the *original*
> 20 meter "Dancing Chicken", WD4PZT with his infamous trailer
> park chicken barbeques, "Raincoat Charlie" who would drive Mike
> and Judy nuts. (...get out that six D-cell vibrator !)
>
> And finally....the Red Panty Man who we need to come up on 14.275
> and sing his diddy before k1man starts up his self-gratification
broadcast.
>
> need I continue?
> > Glenn Baxter is role model for new hams........
>

> Imagine RH pulls up to k1man
> with Federal Marshals and a tow truck w/towmotor.
> Down come antenna towers then toss those
> out-of-alignment worn out Collins rigs into the back
> seat of the car with Baxter in a straightjacket alongside...
>
>
>
>

1188. Re: MARS opinions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-28 21:42:54 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b16tg8$a98$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 60271

AF MARS is the better choice at the moment. All MARS programs are being intgergrated so we can/and do check into each others nets.

Big changes are in the works. Activity will certainly pick up. Thats all I can say at the moment.

I recently re-joined AF Mars . I have been in All of them at one time or another.

Dan/W4NTI

"Jim" <gadget@easypath.com> wrote in message news:7a475dae.0301281250.4cda6845@posting.google.com...
> Hello all,
>
> I'm thinking of joining one of the MARS groups in the NY area, and
> I'd like to hear anyone's opinion as to which group may be the best.
> I'm interested in helping with military functions and/or being
> available "just in case".
> I'm new to ham radio, but I learn very quick. I have experience as a
> Police/Fire/EMS dispatcher and have worked some local disasters. I'd
> probably be most comfortable in a progressive and active group.
> From listening in my area it seems the Air Force MARS is most active
> in voice, but I've heard little other than reads of old regulations
> and check-ins for time logging.
> I'm very experienced in computer technology, and would be most
> interested in digital radio/modem work.
>
> Any thoughts guys?
>
> Appreciate you comments,
> Jim/KC2KIW

1189. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-28 21:43:58 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E36F9E9.42FD8459@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60272

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E367B86.5F2FFB61@earthlink.net>...
> > N2EY wrote:
> > >
> > > In article <oliZ9.6698$d66.604847@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
> > > <kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG> writes:
> > >
> > > >"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
> > > >
> > > >:
> > > >: But since the WBFD is at least the size of a G5RV or trap dipole, and
> > > >: costs at least as much as a conventional dipole plus a tuner, it is a
> > > >: mystery why any ham would use a WBFD.
> > > >:
> > > >
> > > >Translation: N.I.H.
> > >
> > > Do you mean "Not Invented Here", Hans?
> > >
> > > If so, that's not the case. The WBFD has been around a long time - I learned
> > > about it from a 1948 QST article.
> >
> > Brian is making great progress in his quest for knowledge about the
> > antenna. Just a few short months ago he didn't understand what it was.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Dave, you couldn't be more wrong. I was using that type of antenna
> more than a decade ago.
>
> Better luck next time.

I prefer my luck THIS time. Remember the following stuff?

From: Brian P Burke (bpburke@prodigy.net)
Subject: Re: Sixty Meter Band Planning
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2002-06-22 08:44:09 PST

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3D1401E6.37D682@earthlink.net...

> Brian P Burke wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3D0FFDC5.9241EE3E@earthlink.net...
> > > Brian P Burke wrote:
> > >
> > > > Do you want to be the guy up on the American Embassy wall changing the
> > > > length of an antenna, or doing the same in a chemical environment? Many
> > > > embassy's I've seen have two T2FD's, at 90deg angles.
> > >
> > > Not American embassies, Brian. U.S. embassies use basically five
> > > varieties of HF antenna: RX only broadband dipoles (resistive network,
> > > works poorly), B&W broadband folded dipole (resistive network, works
> > > poorly),
> >
> > A T2FD "clone." Shorter, less spacing in the folded portion.
>
> Not really. A T2FD is erected with a 20 to 40 degree tilt and is fed
> with open wire line. To quote Gilbert Countryman the W3HH of the day,
> "Basically , the antenna is the hyptoenuse of a right triangle, one leg
> of which is along the ground."
>
> Dave K8MN

Then the manuals that I've seen illustrating the "T2FD" are incorrect.

You can thank the folks at Google.

Dave K8MN

1190. Leonard's Tall Tales - Volume I

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-28 22:17:19 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E3701BA.5D4EE245@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60273

In the interest of putting Len's repeated claim that I claimed originality for use of CW on an order wire circuit (he claims it took place three years ago but it was five years back), I thought I'd test Google's "memory" on the subject. Look what I came up with:

"From: Dave Heil (k8mn@clinet.fi)
Subject: Re: Can't we all just get along?
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 1998/01/01

Len, you tried to give me a lesson in the history of radio and you also twisted some dates and events but, to what end? What was that all about? FYI: I was handling the QSYs, openings and closings for a government 75 baud circuit via CW from late '87 through late '89 from Guinea-Bissau. Guess we didn't know CW was obsolete, huh?

Dave Heil OH2/K8MN"

Brian Burke introduced a comment shortly thereafter. I responded thusly:

"From: Dave Heil (k8mn@clinet.fi)
Subject: Re: Can't we all just get along?
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 1998/01/03

Brian wrote:

> Dave, as a professional communicator, you should have already known that
> your CW circuit was obsolete. At least you should have had the
> initiative to ask if there was a better way to move your message traffic
> than through a CW circuit.
> Doing something the same old way just because "thats the way we always
> did it," is no longer the right answer. When one of my younger troops
> asked why we were doing something the way we were doing it (or why we
> were doing it at all), I had to have a better answer than that. When I
> didn't, change was imminent.
> By the way, I was using SATCOM voice way back then. Worked great.
> 73, Brian/N0iMD

Brian,

Do you really think I was doing something the hard way because of my personal choice? Asking for a better way and getting a better way are two different things. I didn't have access to satellite equipment and certainly wouldn't consider SATCOM voice an alternative for maintaining

a 24 hour per day circuit which handled high volumes of traffic.

The point I made was that the government was using such circuits.
Nobody was interested in whether I had a better way or not--I was there
to run the existing circuit. Multipath propagation and the slow 75 baud
RTTY circuit were the unpleasant parts--the CW was fun.

Dave OH2/K8MN"

It looks as if Len has been propagating an untruth for a number of
years.
He's as far off base on the order wire yarn as he was on the Key
Officers listings.

Dave K8MN

1191. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-29 00:41:46 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0301281641.566bb178@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60274

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message news:<20030128062207.12173.00000216@mb-mr.aol.com>...
> In article <oliZ9.6698$d66.604847@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
> <kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
> >
> >:
> >: But since the WBFD is at least the size of a G5RV or trap dipole, and
> >: costs at least as much as a conventional dipole plus a tuner, it is a
> >: mystery why any ham would use a WBFD.
> >:
> >
> >Translation: N.I.H.
>
> Do you mean "Not Invented Here", Hans?
>
> If so, that's not the case. The WBFD has been around a long time - I learned
> about it from a 1948 QST article.
>
> What the WBFD offers is convenience at the price of efficiency. As both an EE
> and amateur radio operator, I say the tradeoff is not worthwhile for most
> amateur radio applications.
>
> Tell us, Hans - would YOU use a WBFD at your ham station instead of a
> conventional dipole of equivalent size?

Not hardly. Without fear of contradiction I'll state that Our Chief
sure as hell was not running a goofyass t2fd on 7.037 that mememorable
nite a piece back when he boomed the whole frigging NA continent and
cleaned house at 30 over.

Did I get that right Chief? Momback Good Buddy.

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

1192. Claims Of Dishonesty

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-29 00:48:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030128194823.12173.00000227@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 60276

In article <20030128112728.02295.00000280@mb-bk.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>
>>I never said ARRL was "dishonest," just that their actions
>> on "examining" two six-year-olds and "passing" them, then
>> publicizing them on their website was SUSPICIOUS.
>
> Not truthful.
>
> You have blatantly called the ARRL dishonest on numerous occassions.
>
>>But, never mind that...you expect everyone to Believe in
>> ARRL, that they Never Do Wrong (for They are Holy).
>
> Nope. Never said that. I HAVE, however, asked YOU to provide the
>EVIDENCE of this dishonesty you allege.
>
> You have not.

Steve,

Let's put aside various claims and interpretations and take a look at what Mr. Anderson actually wrote back on December 2, 2002. Surely no reasonable person would object to shining the light of Logic and Truth upon the actual post in question.

It can be found easily by searching google with the words "lenover21 accuse ARRL fraud"

So here's a paragraph-by-paragraph analysis of the post which caused all the fuss. Let's see what the actual accusations are. The phrases "BEGIN QUOTE", "PAUSE QUOTE", "RESUME QUOTE" and "END QUOTE" are used to avoid any confusion as who wrote what.

BEGIN QUOTE:

Lines: 54
X-Admin: news@aol.com
From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 02 Dec 2002 18:07:01 GMT
References: <20021201183714.00112.00000794@mb-fz.aol.com>
Organization: AOL http://www.aol.com
X-Newsreader: Session Scheduler (Queue Name: gng-fa)
Subject: Re: Would have been Extra sooner

Message-ID: <20021202130701.22850.00000806@mb-fa.aol.com>

In article <20021201183714.00112.00000794@mb-fz.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <20021201133916.21441.00000449@mb-mc.aol.com>, j1aguiar@aol.com
>(J1aguiar) writes:

>Accusing the VECs of falsifying test results is pretty serious stuff, btw. Do
>you have any solid evidence?

VEC test sessions are NOT monitored by anyone else DURING
testing. All that is monitored is the FCC scanning over test
RESULTS sent to them by the VEC teams.

PAUSE QUOTE

Despite the unnecessary shouting, this first paragraph is just a restatement of the obvious. Note that FCC has not had any reservations about the testing of young children for amateur radio exams, nor of the VE session in question.

RESUME QUOTE:

Now go back to the famous/infamous ARRL news page that
showed two darling six-year-olds who were reported to have
"passed" written tests for Novice and Technician, respectively.
Now let any, repeat ANY, first-grade teacher look at the
written exam questions and decide for themselves whether
SIX YEAR OLDS can read those questions well enough to
answer even 70 percent of them. Just to READ them and
be able to choose any answer.

PAUSE QUOTE

The first sentence uses a scornful tone to question the legitimacy of the test results of the two children. Quite typical of the author.

The rest of the paragraph sets up a hypothetical person ("any, repeat ANY, first grade teacher") as a Final Authority on whether the children could read the test.

However, the proposed test is invalid. The question is not whether all six-year-olds could read the test, or whether typical six-year-olds could read the test, but whether the two particular six-year-olds who actually passed the test could read it. Without actually evaluating the two children in question, it's impossible to say whether they could read the test or not.

Also, not all six-year-olds are in first grade. Enrollment cutoff dates vary widely across the country. Here in Radnor Township, a child must be at least six years old before October 1 of the year that child is in first grade. Other school districts have much later cutoff dates, while some have earlier ones.

Most of all, many children today learn to read long before even entering the first grade.

RESUME QUOTE

If you say "yes they can, because...[for any reason]" then
you MUST acknowledge that (1) You don't have slightest
familiarity with six-year-olds' reading/writing comprehension;
or (2) You think anything labeled/stamped/categorized as
"ham radio material" is somehow "special" over and above
any other subject matter; or (3) Any child who is "involved" in
any way with amateur radio is somehow a "gifted child" or a
"child prodigy." All of them are nonsense, ridiculous because
of a way-too-strong identification (beyond rationality) with
amateur radio.

PAUSE QUOTE

Here, Mr. Anderson makes the classical logical error of assuming the conclusion. He presents the idea that no six-year-old could possibly read the test as an indisputable fact, without any proof whatsoever. He claims that anyone who disagrees with his assertion is simply wrong, but presents absolutely no proof of the assertion. The hypothetical first-grade teacher who is supposed to be the Final Authority on the reading skills of six-year-olds is never mentioned again. After all, someone might produce a first grade teacher who would say "Yes, some exceptional first graders could read that".

Also never mentioned is the fact that most people taking the test would probably have seen the questions and answers before, with plenty of time to learn unfamiliar words and phrases.

There DO exist six-year-olds with reading skills quite advanced for their biological age. I have known several who would have little trouble reading the Novice and Technician written exams, particularly if the content of the tests had been available to them ahead of time.

Reading comprehension is another matter. But the tests require only that the examinee select the correct answer, not an understanding of the question and/or answer. This is true regardless of the age or educational level of the examinee.

Again, the reading skills and comprehension levels of the children who actually took the tests are unknown to Mr. Anderson.

RESUME QUOTE

ARRL was being over-indulgent in that bit of "news" fluff and
the VEC group who did the alleged testing thought it all
cutesy-poo from a kindly grandfatherly feeling to kiddies
(picture included one of the VEC proctors, smiling and no
doubt feeling "proud" over the kiddies' "accomplishments."

PAUSE QUOTE

This paragraph is similar to the beginning of the second paragraph, using a scornful tone to question the legitimacy of the test results of the two children in question, the ARRL, and the VEC group who conducted the test. Yet no proof of any wrongdoing is presented by Mr. Anderson. He implies that the

tests could not have been legitimately passed by the children in question.

RESUME QUOTE

I accuse ARRL of very mild fraud on the part of condoning such
such things and hypocrisy on the implication of passing a ham
written exam as a sort of academic certificate. In the latter, if
barely-able-to-read-and-write six-year-olds can read and mark
with even reasonable comprehension, then the written exam is
a SHAM...even under pre-restructuring standards.

PAUSE QUOTE

Here's where Mr. Anderson accuses ARRL of "very mild fraud" and "hypocrisy" – again, without any proof whatsoever. Note also the baseless claim that ARRL presents the amateur written exam as some sort of academic certificate.

The "such such" mistake in the first sentence is how it appears in google.

And again he assumes that the six-year-olds in question are "barely-able-to-read-and-write" without any direct knowledge of their abilities.

Now, does an accusation of "very mild fraud" constitute an accusation of dishonesty? To anyone with comprehension of the meanings of the words "fraud" and "dishonesty", it is clear that an accusation of fraud, even "very mild" fraud, is, by definition, an accusation of dishonesty.

In the case of VE-administered license tests, either the tests were administered and passed in accordance with FCC rules, or they were not. If the tests in question were administered and passed in accordance with FCC rules, there is no fraud, deliberate falsification or dishonesty of any kind. If not, then the fraud is not "very mild". Mr. Riley Hollingsworth has made it clear, through enforcement actions, that VE-administered license tests must be in accordance with FCC rules. Accusing VEs and/or VECs of deliberate falsification without any evidence borders on libel.

In the last sentence, Mr. Anderson allows the possibility that the written tests may be a "SHAM" – but again offers no proof. Nor does he qualify or limit his earlier accusation of fraud. If such tests are a "SHAM" then they are so for all new amateurs, not just young ones.

RESUME QUOTE

No MORE evidence is needed...the evidence has already been
presented although sugar-coated with parental pride and the
usual propaganda of ARRL being all good things to US amateur
radio and never making mistakes or illegalities.

PAUSE QUOTE

Yet again, Mr. Anderson assumes his conclusion, with no proof. His whole argument is that no six-year-old could possibly read and pass the written tests for any amateur radio exam. He does not consider:

1) That six-year-olds with reading skills and other academic skills quite above the average for their age do exist, and often have accomplished quite amazing things for their age

2) That the written tests do not require comprehension of the material, just the selection of the correct answers.

3) That 2) has been true in the USA for more than 43 years, and that FCC has seen no problem with the system

4) That he has absolutely no information about the children or VEs in question, other than their age and license tests passed.

RESUME QUOTE

On the charge of deliberate FALSIFICATION for whatever reason,
ARRL VEC is GUILTY.

END QUOTE

Does an accusation of "deliberate FALSIFICATION" constitute an accusation of dishonesty? To anyone with comprehension of the meanings of the words "deliberate falsification" and "dishonesty", it is clear that an accusation of "deliberate falsification", is, by definition, an accusation of dishonesty.

So we have at least two claims of "dishonesty" by Mr. Anderson, supported by nothing but prejudice and faulty logic.

Note that Mr. Anderson acts as prosecutor, judge and jury, yet presents absolutely no proof whatsoever to support his claims. Note also that he does not add a signature to the post.

Why should anyone take Mr. Anderson or his comments seriously, given his proven track record of faulty logic, unsubstantiated claims of fraud and deliberate falsification against strangers, and general prejudice against ARRL and most radio amateurs?

But rather than responding to Mr. Anderson using pejoratives such as "liar" and "putz", let us give him the benefit of the doubt - even though he does not do so to the ARRL, those who oppose his views, nor to the young hams or VEs in question.

Perhaps Mr. Anderson simply does not remember what he wrote. Perhaps he does not comprehend the meaning of words like "fraud" and "dishonesty". Perhaps all of these claims and denials are just simple mistakes on his part. After all, his posts here are full of similar mistakes.

It is also clear that Mr. Anderson was not "joking" about any of his accusations. Although he routinely uses many "emoticons" or "smileys" in his posts, not a single one is used in the above post by him.

Of course no evidence will be forthcoming, Steve. He obviously has none to substantiate his claims.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1193. Out Of The Box?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-29 00:48:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030128194825.12173.00000228@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 60277

In article <20030128112728.02295.00000280@mb-bk.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>
>>I made no claims of going for that, only that it COULD be
>> done.
>
> Uh huh.

Steve, there seems to be some confusion as to what Mr. Anderson has claimed in the past about getting an amateur radio license.

Let's put aside various claims and interpretations and take a look at what Mr. Anderson actually wrote back on January 19, 2000. Surely no reasonable person would object to shining the light of Logic and Truth upon the actual post in question.

It can be found easily by searching google with the words "lenof21 Extra" and the phrase "out of the box". Note that Mr. Anderson was using a different screen name back then. He has used "Nocwtest", "Averyfine", "Lenof21", "Lenover21", and "Averyfineman" (all AOL names) in the past 5 years for some reason. Of those, at least the last three are still in use.

So here's a paragraph-by-paragraph analysis of the post which caused all the fuss. Let's see what the actual accusations are. The phrases "BEGIN QUOTE", "PAUSE QUOTE", "RESUME QUOTE" and "END QUOTE" are used to avoid any confusion as who wrote what.

BEGIN QUOTE:

From: lenof21@aol.com (Lenof21)
Subject: Re: Petition for partial reconsideration Filed!!!
Date: 2000/01/19
Message-ID: <20000119020558.02619.00000208@nso-fk.aol.com>#1/1
References: <27EF731ED4A6C251.37C0D81516E4FD68.9695A23CAD7F622A@lp.airnews.net>
Organization: AOL http://www.aol.com
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
X-Admin: news@aol.com

In article <27EF731ED4A6C251.37C0D81516E4FD68.9695A23CAD7F622A@lp.airnews.net>, "W5TIT, Kim Walker" <kw5tit@hotmail.com> writes:

>Brian Kelly wrote:
>>
>> >
>> >Zzzzz. ALL the radio licenses of the old, bygone days were like
>> >that, grandpa, even the commercial licenses. BFD.

>> >
>> Yeah, I had one of those, Second TELEGRAPH.

[Kelly didn't get is FIRST...tsk, tsk :-)]

>> >Cut yer crap and count yer blessings
>> >that the inventive license system gave you bragging rights
>> >about your license class...
>> >
Just can't stand that can ya? Heee!
>> >
>> >LA
>> >
>> w3rv Amateur Extra CP35
>
>Yeah? Bragging rights, huh? Well, if that's what it's called nowadays,
>then that's when ham radio died.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Bragging rights were codified in law with the so-called Incentive License plan and firmly cemented with the Vanity Call sub-parts of Part 97. US amateur radio didn't die then...but it CHANGED to make the bragging LEGAL. :-)

Kelly is having a fun time trying to make fun of others less skilled at morse code and a long time-in-grade as an extra. That's a form of bragging, a form of showing "superiority" over others...for the braggist's personal pleasure.

Such bragging does irritate me, yes, but only to a minor degree. What does and has bothered me for years, on and off, is the continual insistence that such qualities ("ham radio is all about CW on HF," and other Morse Myths) somehow "define" amateur radio's "experts." What really happened is that these old-timers managed to get into a position of influence at the ARRL and had the ARRL lobby the FCC to keep those "standards." They did that for years but the newer access to the government via the Internet, the dissemination of rule-change notices through the Internet has bypassed the ARRL. US radio amateurs no longer have to get information second-hand nor do they have to go through (by the League's insistence) their Section Director to "communicate their desires." Everyone, ham or non-ham, can go DIRECT to the FCC. The control of influence/lobbying of the FCC by the ARRL has eroded. This disturbs many who Believe in Big Brother to do the lobbying for them. Tough. The PUBLIC spoke and the FCC listened. 99-412 happened.

PAUSE QUOTE

The above is so full of factual errors which have been addressed elsewhere. Here's a quick summary:

- There were "incentive licensing" type systems in US amateur radio long before the changes of 1968-69. Among them were the old "ABC" system, and the six-class system enacted by the 1951 restructuring.

- The ARRL was not the only group proposing changes to the FCC. There were at least ten incentive licensing proposals submitted to the FCC that were given RM numbers

- The original ARRL proposal of 1963 did not involve any additional code testing for full priviliges.

- ARRL and others successfully opposed FCC's proposal to institute a fourth code test speed (16 wpm) in 1965.

- There was much debate and communication about the proposed incentive licensing changes. It was no surprise to anyone interested in amateur radio at the time.

- The changes put in place by incentive licensing included much more additional writen testing (2 tests, totalling 90-100 questions) than code testing (1 test, 20 wpm)

- FCC received over 6000 comments in regard to incentive licensing, most of them from individuals. This is almost triple the number of comments to 98-143, even though the US amateur radio community today is far larger than in the 1960s (~685,000 today, ~240,000 then). 1960s hams had no internet, no email, no ECFS system, yet they let their voices be heard at FCC.

These are just the high points. Mr. Anderson simply has his facts wrong.

--

Now for the most relevant quote:

RESUME QUOTE:

I'm going for Amateur Extra "out of the box." Maybe I'll
make it, maybe not. The personal point is irrelevant.

PAUSE QUOTE

Well, there you have it. Nothing ambiguous or qualified about it at all. Not a claim of what could be done, or might be done, but of what he was going to do.

Of course there is no time frame mentioned, and it is always possible he changed his mind in the three years since he wrote those words. But it is clear he DID say he was going to get the Extra class license.

RESUME QUOTE

What 99-412 really means is that there is no longer any
time-in-grade "seniority" nor any morsemanship that
indicates "superiority" of those bragextras. That applies
to EVERYONE who wants to try...without all the

artificialities of adhering to standards and practices of
the 1930s held in place by old men trying to relive
their youth by bravado and braggadoccio.

I'm another "old man," a retired professional in
radio-electronics engineering. Some of those tenured
old men of US ham radio don't seem to want anyone
with practical, professional and academic skill in radio
and electronics technology. They seem to fear those
who have industry-proven capabilities because that
doesn't fit into their standards...or because they are
insecure in not really knowing what goes on behind
the front-panel of their factory-built equipment. They
have difficulty in trying to put down those who know
practical theory so they try to make fun of them
instead...using their license paper as a "diploma"
and their HF CW tenure as some kind of "PhD" or
"professorship" of radio. Radio theory is somehow
imbued by spending hours working rare DX at high
rates, therefore some of those old men are "expert."
:-)

When 99-412 goes into real restructuring in April, it
won't change some of those tenured old men of US
ham radio. They will be bitter, boastful, and express
contempt of newcomers, some of which will have the
exact same government-granted rank/status/privilege
as all those old men who claimed they "worked" for
theirs. Human nature doesn't change. Neither have
they.

Len

END QUOTE

Basically a diatribe against nameless persons whom Mr. Anderson obviously has some sort of grudge against. He does not consider, however, that many of those he rails against are "radio electronics professionals". Note that none of the predictions made by him 3 years ago have come to pass. Amateur radio is not much different today than before restructuring.

I included the entire post simply to demonstrate that there was nothing in any of it to change the interpretation of the sentence

"I'm going for Amateur Extra "out of the box.""

It's clear to any reasonable person what that sentence means.

But rather than responding to Mr. Anderson using pejoratives such as "liar" and "putz", let us give him the benefit of the doubt - even though he does not do so to others. Perhaps Mr. Anderson simply does not remember what he wrote. Perhaps all of his denials are just simple mistakes on his part. After all, his posts here are full of similar mistakes, as shown in the above analysis.

So the question I would ask of you, Steve, is this: Why let Mr. Anderson's mistakes, errors, and insults bother you so much? Why should anyone take him or his comments seriously?

And why would anyone interested in the good of the ARS want him to make good on his intention?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1194. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-29 00:49:03 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0301281649.66b732a6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60275

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E367B86.5F2FFB61@earthlink.net>...
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > In article <oliZ9.6698$d66.604847@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
> > <kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG> writes:
> >
> > >"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
> > >
> > >:
> > >: But since the WBFD is at least the size of a G5RV or trap dipole, and
> > >: costs at least as much as a conventional dipole plus a tuner, it is a
> > >: mystery why any ham would use a WBFD.
> > >:
> > >
> > >Translation: N.I.H.
> >
> > Do you mean "Not Invented Here", Hans?
> >
> > If so, that's not the case. The WBFD has been around a long time - I learned
> > about it from a 1948 QST article.
>
> Brian is making great progress in his quest for knowledge about the
> antenna. Just a few short months ago he didn't understand what it was.

He obviously still don't and he never will.

>
> Dave K8MN

Romeo Victor

1195. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-29 04:36:35 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E375A24.5030108@adelphia.net>
Source record: 60278

Brian wrote:

> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0301270942.1cbde93d@posting.google.com>...
>
>
>>But since the WBFD is at least the size of a G5RV or trap dipole, and
>>costs at least as much as a conventional dipole plus a tuner, it is a
>>mystery why any ham would use a WBFD.
>>
>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>
> Jim, mystery solved. Imagine an amateur that is also a MARS or CAP
> affiliate, or a maritime station. Imagine the convenience of one
> antenna for all or nearly all amateur bands, MARS frequency
> assignments, and maritime frequencies.

I got one too! It's a general dipole with a tuner. Not as convenient. I take about ten seconds to change the tuner when I change bands. I don't understand why anyone would use one either. But some do.

> You, unlike the experts on rraa, did not describe the above antenna as
> a "dummy load." Bully for you.

You forgot to add "air cooled" to the dummy load Brian. 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

1196. Re: Leonard's Tall Tales - Volume I

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-29 05:26:01 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301282126.16d629f6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60279

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E3701BA.5D4EE245@earthlink.net>...
> Brian,
>
> Do you really think I was doing something the hard way because of my
> personal choice?

Don't know, but if rrap is any indication...

1197. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-29 05:34:47 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301282134.6b58bd50@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60280

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030128100515.02295.00000277@mb-bk.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 1/27/03 8:12 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0301271812.19d3713f@posting.google.com>
>
> >You mean if the SW station had cryptological gear to monitor? Now who
> >could that be?
>
> Shadowing Lennie's rants, Brian...?!?! Pretty lame!
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Steve, I really don't know where you're comment is coming from.

Have you ever used HF comms in the service? Were they not encrypred?

1198. Re: Why Dave has such a p*ss poor attitude

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-29 05:50:53 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030129005053.06242.00000355@mb-fh.aol.com>
Source record: 60283

In article <3E3676F7.7C44606B@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>>
>> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>> news:3E3432E5.8266EB56@earthlink.net...
>> > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>> > >
>> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>> > > news:3E32CCE6.D8842848@earthlink.net...
>> > > > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>> > > >> > Yes ... assuming that you're refering to my behavior towards you,
>> > > > > it's simple ... "Pompus, narrow-minded jerks irritate me>"
>> > > > >
>> > > > I love it. Someone who can't spell "pompous" quotes himself. I
>> assume
>> > > > that your view assumes that anyone who doesn't buy into your grand
>> > > > scheme is pompous and narrow-minded. You've not just used that
>method
>> > > > with me.
>> > >
>> > > You have ADD, right Dave? I've mentioned several times that I have
>> > > a bit of loss of feeling/coordination in my fingers due to a spinal
>> injury.
>> >
>> > I recall that. I don't see how your medical problem forced you to cut
>> > and paste an old quote complete with its original spelling error.
>>
>> The original typo was simply propagated by error ... I didn't look
>> closely enough at what I was reusing ... you want to hang me for that?
>> (sounds pretty petty to me ...)
>
>An error was propagated by error? Most of us would have said, "I made a
>mistake". Hang you for it? Naw--just laugh over it.
>
>
>> > My recollection is of how many countries you'd worked from home on 10m.
>>
>> OK ... so what if I mentioned something about working some DX? ... again,
>> I'm not chasing it
>
>Right. It is likely chasing you.
>

>
>> > I didn't ask for a travelogue or justification. I just wondered how you
>> > could be spared from what you call "important work".
>>
>> The CEO of my company gets to take vacations, too ... the fact that
>> one's work is important doesn't mean they're required to work 24/7/365.
>
>Nobody works 24/7, much less 24/7/365--not even Leonard H.

Well, "there you have it, Carl..." :-)

"Nobody" is on call or works as long as they are ordered, not
military members, not police or sheriff's deputies, not firemen
or paramedics (of professional fire departments), or Real MDs
on ER duty in hospitals or those on-call after office hours. Not
utility workers, either, like those who repaired the damage to
electric power or gas and water lines after the Loma Prieta or
Northridge earthquakes out here.

"NOBODY works 24/7" according to Heil. None. Zip. Nada.

Sigh...must have been cushy duty in some State Deptartment
postings or in USAF units "that worked with NASA." :-)

1199. Re: Hot Fun In The Summertime With Brian

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-29 05:50:54 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030129005054.06242.00000356@mb-fh.aol.com>
Source record: 60281

In article <f45722ac.0301280707.67674486@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20030127191335.08866.00000150@mb-mf.aol.com>...
>> In article <20030127102808.01441.00000231@mb-mk.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Sgt
>HAH
>> Putz) writes:
>>
>> >>No, Steav, you tell me what is wrong with my statements. You cannot.
>> >
>> > I already did. You choose to ignore it. Do you treat red lights and
>> >"Bridge Out" signs with the same disregard?
>> >
>> >>You've earned "cubed."
>> >
>> > Not by you I haven't. Where are those T5 logs and permission to
>operate
>> >at...?!?!
>>
>> The rest of us are waiting for details, references, or other
>> verification of those "seven hostile action" experiences.
>
>Could have been self-abuse.

That's a thought! Guess I'll have to go to the library and check
out the Kraft-Ebbing tome again ("Psychopathia Sexualis").

My own bet is on some RPG (Role Playing Game) on the 'Net.

He could have "blood pinned" hisself by slamming his mouse
down on the mousepad too hard...

Accidents happen. :-)

1200. Re: Hot Fun In The Summertime With Brian

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-29 05:50:55 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030129005055.06242.00000357@mb-fh.aol.com>
Source record: 60282

In article <f45722ac.0301280706.43230148@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20030127212105.21366.00000695@mb-mu.aol.com>...
>> In article <f45722ac.0301271755.74e30a07@posting.google.com>,
>> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>>
>> >> Not by you I haven't. Where are those T5 logs and permission to
>> operate
>> >> at...?!?!
>> >>
>> >> Steve, K4YZ
>> >
>> >What is wrong with my statements?
>>
>> You've not followed the Dill Sergeant's ORDERS to the troops
>> on comportment in his mystical idea of amateur radio. If you
>> sass the Dill Sergeant you wind up on company punishment
>> :-)
>
>Though loud, his orders are meaningless.

True enough, but his output makes for a high noise level in
this newsgroup. :-)

>> That's in parallel with the "26-patent" kid in Pennsy who
>> gave you implicit ORDERS on which antenna to use. :-)
>
>He confuses ARRL Antenna Book with FCC Part 97. (Kelly doesn't
>realize that the t2fd was not intended to be a one band/one frequency
>antenna. Now he thinks it's a dummy load. What kind of an engineer
>thinks that?)

Mechanical engineers who've never really gone after EM
fields and waves...dyed in the wool Believers in ARRL as
the "official" holy books, the ONLY holy books.

The Method of Moments is rather hard to absorb and
arcane...plus unforgiving of human emotions and opinions.
I think that reduces Kellie's "antenna expertise" to the
moment and the method being the waving of "official"
league mention. :-)

>> There is only ONE way...their way. That's the way is IS!
>>

>> What next, close-order drill? :-)
>
>It can't be good, whatever it is.
>
>He must be getting very frustrated at this point, which is a reason to
>go back to the point of this thread.

Sigh...too bad...it would have been fun to see him bluster and
shout some more! :-)

>Steve, what was wrong with my statements?

I think it's all because you didn't salute him and call him
"sir" while humming something about the Halls of
Montezuma... :-)

1201. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-29 05:50:57 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030129005057.06242.00000358@mb-fh.aol.com>
Source record: 60284

In article <3E367B14.3D42354F@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>> Robeson continually states that discussion opponents have
>> "really" said something even though what was written was
>> obviously not so. Again, that is libelous.
>
>I can't believe that you write some of the things you write and still
>manage to keep a straight face.

It's difficult but it can be done. :-) :-) :-)

All one has to do is "work hard at it" every day...practice,
practice, practice...

>> Amateur radio is a fun hobby, a recreation.
>
>How would you know?

I've read the "official" ARRL output on amateur radio. :-)

Of course, according to Heil, Robeson, Miccolis, and all
the PCTAs, it must be done in an "official" manner,
always working HF, CW whenever possible, and observing
all DX within sight and hearing.
- US amateur service general order #1

>How time flies. If you want to get is right, that has been about five
>years ago. I was still working in Helsinki at the time. My statement
>was as correct then as it is now.

Tell us more about Guinea-Bisseau and how it compares to
a Scandinavian country. Does the US State Department radio
in Finland use CW as an order-wire on RTTY circuits too?

>Whoa! You're treading on some pretty thin ice there, Leonard. What was
>that part about rewriting? How about that character assassination
>stuff?

Yeah, how about it? You missed that wonderful AOL home
page of Robeson's, didn't you? Poor baby.

Was there thin ice in Guinea-Bisseau?

>Anderson has no credentials in psychology nor is he a medical doctor.

I don't pretend to be one...but it doesn't take any degree except about 98.6 of them on the Fahrenheit scale to see Obsession and Hate-Rage in Robeson's actions in here for all the readers to see.

For "credentials" in psychology, I can call on my own consultant, my wife, who has two Masters degrees (both from University of Illinois) with one of those being in Social Work. She was a licensed private counselor in the states of Illinois and Washington for a number of years. She has Robeson...and you as well...tagged, labeled, pickled, and put on the shelf as classic examples of dysfunction.

No problem. Both "Steam's" and your own behavior can be seen with passing grades from two semesters of psychology. [a requirement in California undergraduate studies in the 1960s]

Steam Robeson likes to put on like he was "almost" an MD, "expert" in nearly everything medical. Some nurses get like that away from the hospital. Once at work the are submissive and follow orders of Real MDs meekly. That might be one of Robeson's frustrations to explain his behavior in here.

Yourself, on the other hand, imply you are the "expert" in radio...not just amateur radio, but in ALL radio. You "took credit" for the clever innovation of using CW as the order-wire of a State Department RTTY circuit (later changing that to "official State Department Procedure"). Now that sort of "innovation" is neither clever nor good practice, hasn't been done by any of the other government or commercial HF communications folks. QED...you tried a snow-job on the others and got caught at it, now you can't forget it or "lose face" in public due to your own personal whatevers.

Not my problem, colonel. I'm not your therapist. Doesn't take any credential to see what you're doing in here. :-)

1202. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-29 05:50:57 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030129005057.06242.00000359@mb-fh.aol.com>
Source record: 60286

In article <3E366D23.DBC4D171@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>I've believe he has you clocked, Leonard.

That "clock" is broken, doesn't tell time, chimes only when the
key winder is upset at time lookers not viewing with the
proper Heilian attitude. :-)

Why not tell us more about Heil's Adventures in Guinea-Bisseau,
that important center of communications innovation and trial?

1203. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-29 05:50:58 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030129005058.06242.00000360@mb-fh.aol.com>
Source record: 60285

In article <f45722ac.0301280655.2e818836@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
>news:<d22b54c3.0301271519.4fe046a2@posting.google.com>...
>> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
>news:<f45722ac.0301261943.4df5faaf@posting.google.com>...
>> > kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
>news:<d22b54c3.0301260719.4750d2df@posting.google.com>...

>> Ya buy the ARRL Antenna Book. Ya open it to page one. Even you can't
>> possibly need the map from there.
>>
>> UhOh . . wrong.
>
>Now the ARRL Antenna Handbook forbids the T2FD?
>
>Hey Len, we've got another one that confuses the ARRL with the FCC.

It happens all the time for the Believers.

If it's not in "official" publications, it can't be true. :-)

>> > Why must amateurs run their antenna preferences by you
>> > and your cronies on rraa? Are you now saying that amateur radio
>> > operators with half a brain lack freedom of choice in the kind of
>> > antennas they choose to implement? Do full brained amateurs get to
>> > choose their own antennas, or must they march lock step with you?
>>
>> Nobody out here gives a rat's patooie abt what antennas you use, knock
>> yerself out, go work yer dummy load.
>
>Ah! You called it a dummy load. Does your dummy load radiate as
>well?
>
>Some engineer you are.

Kellie is a credentialled MECHANICAL engineer.

I'm sure that Kellie could design a sound mechanical
support for an antenna that might withstand the forces
of nature...such as corrosion from hoagie drippings. :-)

From thereon though, the EM fields and waves in the
conductors of antennas...or the influence of conducting
portions of the antenna support on antenna patterns...
is NOT a topic. The antenna TYPE, that is, the NAME

must be "officially" sanctioned, approved, and published
in the "official" ARRL antenna book. Without that, no
strange, unknown antenna can possibly work. :-)

>I wonder if N2EY's dummy load radiates as well. Some school, right?
>
>You're not "arguing" with me or
>> anybody else in RRAP or RRAA, you're tripping out on some goofy
>> tangent trying to "politicize" simple dipole physics.
>
>Nope; dipoles are just about the perfect radiator for one band/one
>frequency. You should know that.
>
>Some engineer you are.

QED. What I mentioned above. :-)

>Or something
>> only you could come off the wall with. Nobody gives a rat's patooie
>> abt that either.
>
>Then stop replying.

Good advice, but odds are in favor of his replying anyway.

1204. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-29 05:56:45 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301282156.22316415@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60287

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030128112005.02295.00000279@mb-bk.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 1/27/03 7:53 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0301271753.4119316e@posting.google.com>
>
> >Not at all. I welcome not only free speech, but open debate. You on
> >the other hand wish to silence Len in amateur radio matters as he does
> >not have a license.
>
> Not at all. I would like to see Lennie silenced becasue he has lied
> repeatedly and makes outrageous and unsupported claims against Amateur Radio as
> a whole.

You have lied repeatedly.

Len's opinion of the cult of amateur radio isn't far off the mark.

> You support no code, and I have no argument with that. So does Carl and
> several others. Do you see me responding to them like I do Lennie? No.

YES!

I've given a long list of the people that you incessantly badger
whenever they might come on to the group.

It's
> because, like it or not, they express THIER opinions without lying or making
> easily disproved assertions about Amateur Radio, the ARRL in general or certain
> Hams in particular., and they show me the same courtesy.

Uphill both ways.

> >And what of your endless spamming?
>
> So people should just let Lennie lie uncontested?

We're not talking about "people." We're talking about your
unreasoned, eyes rolled back, rantings.

Get over it.

> >They ought to be. This group is supposed to be about that.
>
> That argument is over with, Brian. There are other IMMEDIATE issues that
> need to be and should be addressed, but they aren't. I ahve introduced and
> reintorduced them, but they fall on deaf ears, so it shall be...I am not

> another "Vipul" who will damn all Amateur Radio because it won't meet MY needs.

Do you believe that the FCC, through a body of rules titled "Part 97"
governs amateur radio?

> Here's some facts:
>
> (1) The FCC has so far refused to revisit any further petitions on the
> Morse Code testing issue until it is addressed in WRC-03.

Is this one of your "immediate" issues?

I wish they would revisit it.

If it is unnecessary to obey START treaty with Russia...
If it is unnecessary to form a coalition to bomb Iraq...

We ought to be able to eliminate the code exam for free American
amateurs.

> (2) Most major western powers and most of the rest of the world has
> already moved to a minimalist position on Code testing, dropping it to 5WPM or
> "code recognition" tests. Many of THOSE countries have stated that they will
> drop code testing when the ITU treaty is ammended to drop it.

Wow. Forward thinkers. (30 years late)

> (3) The only major Amateur Radio organization in the United States has
> dropped it's own long-standing support of Code testing. Therefore with the
> exception of the occassional anonymous "No Code=No Ham" hold outs, there is no
> organized support for continued code testing.

I disagree, but does there need to be organized support to maintain an
unnecessary and arbitrary requirement?

> Do I like it? Not particularly. But I accept it and will try to
> encourage new Hams to learn the Code even after ITU deletes or ammends S25.5.

Our government may take years to eliminate the code exam. Unless they
allow the VEC to misinterpret Part 97 and just stop testing.

> >Your zeal only exposes you for what you are.
>
> Intolerant of the lying and deceitful?

M-o-v-e On!

> >> Have you seen him provide one iota of "evidence" about ARRL
> >> "dishonesty"...?!?!
> >
> >Ask him if he has one iota of evidence concerning Watergate,
> >Iran-Contra, Savings and Loan scams, Monica-gate, or Dangling Chads.
>
> None of those are in discussion here, now are they?

I have no factual evidence about how many times a day brakes stop
cars, either.

None!

> >He sure does pull your strings.
>
> Liars always do.
>
> >Like now?
>
> If the shoe fits, Brian...
>
> > Like it or not, you
> >keep falling into the characature mold that Len has described. And I
> >know you don't like it. Sorry.
>
> Sorry for what? Lennie insists on some "lodge hall" mentality,

Yup.

insists
> that Amateur Radio does NOT provide a public service,

So, he's wrong.

and has made countless
> assertions that are untrue and proven false with ease.

So do you.

> So he has proved....what?

He's said that we're full of OF's that cling to the past. If you
can't see that, then you're part of the problem.

Brian

1205. ARNewsline 1328 - Jan 24 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-29 08:47:48 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030129034748.16097.00000430@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 60288

Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1328 - January 24, 2003

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1328 with a release date of Friday, January 24, 2003 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T. Wildfires rage in Australia, an FCC official says the agency is excited about P-L-C and the past becomes today at Cape Cod. These stories and more follow on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1328 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

RESCUE RADIO: HAMS HELP IN FIRE COMMUNICATIONS IN VK3 WIKLDFIRE

Hams in down-under are hard at work assisting in emergency communications as widfire rage in several Australian states. Q-News Graham Kemp, VK4BB, is in Brisbane with the latest:

--
Audio report only. No text. Hear it at www.arnewsline.org
--

(Q-News)

**

RESCUE RADIO: REPEATER APPEARS LOST IN VK1 WILDFIRE

Meantime there is some good news regarding hams living in and around the city of Canberra. They are all reportedly O-K, but one of their local repeaters may have been lost in a widlfire thats has been sweeping the area. Phil Longworth VK1ZPL who is the WICEN Coordinator Canberra:

--

Longworth: "We have a couple of repeaters around town. One which is actually located at the NASA site down at Cape Mc Villa. We haven't heard it since Saturday. The scouts cannot get close to there because they have lost a lot of infrastructure. So we are assuming that we have probably suffered some damage."

--

The repeater being referred to is VK1RAC. So far radio operators have not been called in the Canberra area because there have be no major failures in the nations telecommunications system. But hams are standing by even though they may have to do without one major repeater.

(Q-News)

**

RESCUE RADIO: US HAMS NOT NEEDED IN MEXICAN QUAKE

Mexico's telecommunications system is working properly following a major earthquake and communications assistance from the United States is not needed. The quake hit in Nortth-West Mexicio. It registered 7.6 on the Richter scale, toppled dozens of homes, killed at least 24 people and injuring at about 175. And while telephone service in several remote areas was knocked out for a time, the Mexican government got it quickly restored. Also, Mexico's own ham radio community has decasdes of experience making outside aid not necessary in many cases.

Here in the United States, Gordon West, WB6NOA, has been monitoring the situation from his home in Costa Mesa Claifornia. Thats about 150 miles North of where the quake hit. And hes been taklking to hams in the area and confirms that United States hams going to assist are just not needed:

--

West: "In communiocating with the maritime mobile operators near Manzinello Mexico, many ofd the mariners rowed ashore and asked whether or not their ham radio gear on 40 meters might help relay messages back to the U.S.A. The villagers on shore evidently indicated that their communications were still up, and, that while they apreciated the boaters going ashore to ask for relays, none were needed.

The mariners did indicate that they felt a slight tidal movement. That was reported the following morning on many of the Baja maritime mobile nets."

--

West says that immediately after the quake hit he began monitoring the various frequencies known to be usaed by Mexican hams for emergencies on 40 and 75 meters. West says that not a signal on the air indicated any apparent need for mutual communications aid from the United States. Don. (ARNewsline™)

**

SPECTRUM ALLOCATIONS: FCC ON WRC-03 PROPOSALS

Back here in the U-S, an ARRL Bulletin says that the FCC is seeking comments on draft recommendations the World Radiocommunication Conference Advisory Committee adopted January 8th. Amateur Radio Newsline's Ken Locke, N8PJN, has more details:

--

The FCC's International Bureau says that based on its initial review of the recommendations, it tentatively concludes that it can generally

support the proposals recommended by the W-R-C 03 Advisory Committee. And if adopted, United States delegations will use the proposals at bilateral, regional and international meetings.

One agenda item of interest to hams involves examining the adequacy of the frequency allocations for High Frequency broadcasting in the vicinity of 4 to 10 MHz. The FCC also has draft proposals developed by Executive Branch agencies, and the agency is requesting comments on those as well.

The Public Notice was released January 15th. The deadline for comments is January 31st. Complete texts of draft proposals are available via the FCC's WRC 03 Web site. You reach it from a link at www.fcc.gov.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Ken Locke, N8PJN.

--

Comments may be filed via e-mail to wrc03@fcc.gov. You can also submit them by mail the Office of the Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th Street, SW, Washington, DC 20554. (ARRL)

**

Break 1

From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including the Superstition Amateur Radio Club repeater serving Mesa Arizona.

(5 sec pause here)

**

EMERGING TECHNOLOGY: PLC MAY BE COMING TO THE USA

P-L-C could be coming to the United States -- but not right away. This according to a top official at the FCC. Amateur Radio Newsline's Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, is here with the details:

--

P-L-C stands for Powerline Communications and the idea is to use the same wires that bring electricity to your home as a pathway for high-speed Internet access. And as previously reported, in nations where P-L-C has been evaluated or approved it has caused moderate to severe degradation to a good portion of the electromagnetic spectrum. In fact,. several nations have decided against implementing P-L-C even though it holds the promise of becoming a less expensive alternative to cable modems and D-S-L telephone lines as a way to get broadband service.

And the FCC appears to be optimistic about P-L-C. On Wednesday January 15th, Edmond Thomas, chief of the Federal Communications Commission's Office of Engineering and Technology said companies developing the

technology have overcome many hurdles in the past year.

The FCC has been studying P-L-C technology for several months and Thomas says that the agency will pay more attention to it this year. He notes that there are no regulations that prohibit the technology, but the agency is concerned that Internet data transmissions carried over power lines could radiate signals inside and outside the home that could cause interference.

And Thomas indicates that the widespread introduction of Powerline Communications wont happen very soon. He says that the FCC wants to be certain P-L-C is not going to cause problems to your TV. And that's certainly good news for all communications services including Amateur Radio.

Reporting from Los Angeles, I'm Bruce Tennant, K6PZW.

--

Obviously this is an emerging technology that can impact negatively on ham radio and will have to be watched. (Published reports)

**

ENFORCEMENT: FCC CANCELS EXPERIMENTAL LICENSE WC2XZV

The FCC has cancelled an experimental license to California company because the agency says its being used for other purposes. According to the CGC Communicator, the FCC cancelled experimental authorization of WC2XZV after Enforcement Bureau monitoring confirmed the operation.

In a short letter dated January 17th, the Commission stated that the California station's emissions were not in compliance with the terms of its experimental radio license. But a story on recnet.com says a lot more. It says that that there were published reports of an alleged pirate station operating in the Antelope Valley area prior to the experimental license grant. The station was operating on 104.7 MHz and identifying as Frequency Radio with its website at www.1047.fm A check of the website makes no mention of the experimental license or the FCC action to cancel it. Acopy of the FCC's letter is posted in cyberspace at www.recnet.com/fcc/wc2xzv_cancel.pdf (CGC Communicator)

**
NAMES IN THE NEWS: MITNICK FREE TO REJOIN THE WWW

Former computer hacker Kevin David Mitnick, N6NHG, has completed his probation and is now free to once again use a computer and surf the web. After being released from prison three years ago on probation, the Mitnick had been barred from contact with computers until last year. He was not allowed to access the Internet until this his probation ended Monday January 20th.

But simply roaming the web may not what Mitnick has in mind. Since his release he has turned his efforts to becoming a consultant on computer

and Internet security issues. He hosted a radio program on Los Angeles talk station KFI, has written a book and has even testified before a congressional committee on ways to make computing more secure.

Only a few weeks ago the FCC agreed to permit him to renew his Amateur Radio license. The Administrative Law Judge hearing the case said that Mitnick was rehabilitated and would likely adhere to all of the agency's rules. And in a recent interview with the Los Angeles Times newspaper, Mitnick said - quote : "The truth is, I learned my lesson."

Kevin Mitnick, N6NHG, also learned a lot about computers and the world-wide-web from his days of hacking. Now he appears to want to use this knowledge for the benefit of all in society. (ARNewline™ from published news stories)

**

PROMOTING THE HOBBY: "AMATEUR RADIO TODAY" - THE VIDEO

The most trusted man in America has lent his name and callsign in support of the hobby. This as retired CBS newsman Walter Cronkite, KB2GSD, tells the story of hobby's public service efforts to the non-ham public in a new ARRL produced video titled Amateur Radio Today.

Cronkite narrates the program from his office in New York City from a script developed by Alan Kaul, W6RCL. Kaul is the West Coast Producer of NBC Nightly News and a former anchor here on Amateur Radio Newsline.

Amateur Radio Today was directed by Dave Bell, W6AQ, who is responsible for many ham radio films including the all-time classic "The Hams Wide World." Bell, Kaul, Bill Baker, W1BKR, of PBS and Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF served the co-producers. The show was edited at Suite Sixteen Post in Burbank California with Keith Glispie, WA6TFD, at the controls of the all digital Quantel Edit Box. But its really Walter Cronkite that takes you on a fast-paced six minute trip into the very soul of ham radio.

The only legitimate authorized source of Amateur Radio Today is the American Radio Relay League which holds the copyright. It will be available on video CD in the very near future and -- eventually -- VHS tape. Visit www.arrl.org/catalog and order item number 8861 (ARRL, ARNewsline™)

**

HAM RADIO VIDEO: WRTC 2002 VIDEO NOW AVAILABLE

Another video is aleady being called the best ham radio sports show ever to hit the street. This with the announcement that the official video of the Amateur Radio Olympics 2002 is now available on DVD and VHS.

The world premier was held in Helsinki Finland on January 18th before an overflow crowd at the Contest Club Finland meeting. Unlike previous

ham radio videos, this one is produced from a 100% "pro-sports" perspective.

In order to capture as much of the action as possible, three camera crews taped as many teams and events as they could during the actual 24 hour competition. Supporting all this great footage are high-end 3D graphics, scoreboards, top-ten boxes, team profiles, and everything else that you might expect when watching a professional sports event on television. And the production is even narrated by one of ESPN's top sportscasters

The program's total running time is 60 minutes. The DVD version contains lots of extra features like full score breakdowns for each team, continental line-ups, competitor rulebook, and even all the past W-R-T-C scores dating back to 1990.

If you've ever wanted to watch the worlds top radiosports teams in action, now is your chance. Copies are available for a nominal fee from the website: http://home1.pacific.net.sg/~jamesb (WRTC)

**

RESCUE RADIO: FISHING BOAT CREW DISAPPEARS BUT CELL PHONE TURNS UP IN INDONESIA

A strange story from Taipei. A mobile telephone belonging to the missing chief engineer of a ship found abandoned off Australia has been used to make more than 80 calls from Indonesia. Australian police said they are baffled by the discovery of a fishing boat full of rotting fish and its lifeboats in tact, but no crew. News reports say that the boat was found drifting off the remote northwest Australian coast. The phone calls from Indonesia add to the mystery of what happened to the missing crew. (PacificRimOnline)

**

COMMUNICATIONS MAGAZINES: POPTRONICS CEASES PUBLIC ATION

Popular Electronics -- better known as Poptronics Magazine is the latest hobby electronics publication to fail. This with the announcement that its publisher Gernsback Publications is no longer in operation.

Gernsback was in the publishing business for 94 years. The January 2003 issue was the last. Negotiations are reportedly under way to provide an alternative publication to Popular Electronics current subscribers. (W8HDU)

**

HAM LICENSING HELP: OH-KY-IN OFFERING HAM CLASSES

If you live in Ohio, Kentucky or Indiana and have a friend wanting to become a ham, this is for you. The OH-KY-IN Amateur Radio Society will offer ham radio license classes in the Cincinnati, Ohio area. Training

is scheduled to begin on Thursday evening, February 20th.. Training will cover Technician through Extra grades along with Morse instruction to 5 words per minute. At the conclusion of the ten week course, Amateur exams will be offered. More information is in cyberspace at www.ohkyin.com. (OK-KY-IN release)

**

WITH THE HANDI HAMS: THE CALIFORNIA CAMP

The Handi Hams California Radio Camp is the week of March 2 through 9th. This years special guest speakers include Bob Zeida N1BLF, Gordon West WB6NOA and Bill Pasternak WA6ITF.

Also, those of you contacting camp special event station W0EQO will be eligable for a special QSL. More information about the camp and the station is on the web at www.handiham.org (HandiHams)

**

BREAK 2

This is ham radio news for today's radio amateur. From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org and being relayed by the volunteer services of the following radio amateur:

(5 sec pause here)

**

CONVENTIONS AMD HAMFESTS: THE MIAMI TROPICAL HAMBOREE

The 2003 convention seasons gets off to a bang the 1st weekend in February. Thats when the 43rd annual Tropical Hamboree and ARRL Florida State Convention will be held in at the Fair Expo Center in Miami Florida.

The Tropical Hamboree is truly a fun filled convention with loads of new and used radio gear for sale along with a host of terrific programs and top notch speakers.

The hours of operation are 9 am to 5 pm Saturday February 1st and 9 am to 4 pm on Sunday the 2nd. For everything you might want to know about this years Tropical Hamboree take your web browswer over to www.hamboree.org (Tropical Hamboree)

**

HAM RADIO ASSISTS: THE MIAMI MARATHON

Another activity scheduled for the same weekend in the same place is the 2003 Miami Marathon. Sponsored by Toyota and The National Diabeties Association, the Miami Marathon is a 26 mile foot race starting at the famed Coconut Grove, across Biscayne Bay, to Miami Beach and back again

to Miami.

The date for this event is Sunday February 2nd. Ben Nemser WA4DZS, owner of Nemal International Electronics is coordinating the amateur radio communications. His assistant, all the way from New York City is none other than that well-known 'marathon man', and former ARRL 1st Vice President Steve Mendelsohn, W2ML.

With two major events involving ham radio the same weekend, its going to be a major challenge for the South Florida ham community. Its also looks to be a very memorable weekend in Miami as well. (Tropical Hamboree)

**

TECHNOLOGY: EIGHTY ONE MILLION PEOPLE WATCH FREE TV

According to the National Association of Broadcasters, approximately eighty-one million television sets in the U.S. receive programming exclusively from free, over-the-air TV stations. In comments filed with the Federal Communications Commission, the NAB noted that while the total number of television sets in the U.S. is 267 million that more than three out of every ten TV sets relies exclusively on "free TV" for programming. This means that the TV set is not hooked up to cable, satellite or any other subscription TV service.

Other figures noted by the NAB say that twenty-five percent of all cable and satellite homes have at least one TV set in the household that receives signals solely from free TV. Also, 24 percent of African-American and 32 percent of Hispanic households rely exclusively on free TV for their television viewing.

The National Association of Broadcasters analysis was provided to the FCC as part of the Commission's "Annual Assessment of the Status of Competition in the Market for the Delivery of Video Programming." The N-A-B says that its comments demonstrate the considerable extent to which consumers still depend on over-the-air broadcast television signals. (NAB)

**

INTERNATIONAL - IARU

On the international scene, the Radio Society of Great Britain passes along word that the national amateur radio societies of Cameroon and Macau have been admitted to the International Amateur Radio Union. A-R-T-J in Cameroon was formed in 1998 and has 14 members, seven of whom are licensed. Macau's ARM was founded in 1992 and now has 85 members. Both societies were inducted as of last December the 9th. (RSGB)

**

ON THE AIR: AO-40 QSO PARTY

The operating period for the first AO-40 QSO Party has been extended to 4 days in order to give more operating windows to Amateur stations world wide. The QSO Party will begin at 0000 UTC on the 24th of January and conclude at 2400 UTC on January 27th. Currently stations from over 30 countries have indicated their intention to participate in this years event. (ANS)

**

DX

In DX, a team of operators that includes SM0BSO, SM0LQB and SM1TDE will operate from the QTH of JW5E on Spetsbergen between February 24th and March 1st. Look for them on 160 through 2 meters running CW, SSB, RTTY as well as SSTV and other soundcard modes. QSL to each operators home call direct or via the bureau. (GB2RS)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: SPANNING THE ATLANTIC

And finally this week, the story of history being celebrated. Of the earliest days of radio being commemorated by the people of the 21st century. And those who were there said it was like the past catching up with the future on a cold day at Cape Cod Massachusetts.

The event was the 100th celebration of the first ever radio transmission from the United States being received in Europe. It was made by radio pioneer Guglielmo Marconi in 1903. And it was his daughter, Princess Elettra Marconi, who lent her voice to begin the 100th anniversary celebration of the first trans-atlantic radio message. A message that probably sounded something like this:

--
Audio Here
--

That sound was supplied by Bob Doherty, K1VV. He along with members of the Marconi Radio Club and Marconi Cape Cod Memorial Radio Club were the people behind KM1CC. That was the on-the-air celebration of the two club's namesake making the first wireless transmission to Europe. And quite an affair it was.

Princess Elettera Marconi began the festivities in a brief contact with Ken Bowersox, KD5KBP. That's Commander Ken Bowersox on board the International Space Station. A bit later, Bowersox spoke with Cape Cod area school children who asked questions about life on-orbit. Both contacts were made possible by ARISS -- Amateur Radio on board the International Space Station.

The January 18, 1903 contact by Guglielmo Marconi used an early form of hand sent code to span the Atlantic. A short time later Marconi predicted that mans voice would eventually span the globe using wireless. Now, precisely a hundred years later on a frigid January 18, 2003. Marconi's daughter returned to near the scene of that first

contact and got to speak to a man in space. If he were alive today, Guglielmo Marconi would justly be proud. (K1VV)

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, Amateur News Weekly, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline @arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I'm Don Wilbanks, AE5DW, saying 73 and we thank you for listening." Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2002. All rights reserved.

--
Terminal Break
--

RAIN PROMO

1206. Re: Why Dave has such a p*ss poor attitude

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-29 12:48:39 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E37CDF7.3663EABD@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60289

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E3676F7.7C44606B@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> >>
> >> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >> news:3E3432E5.8266EB56@earthlink.net...
> >> > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> >> > >
> >> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >> > > news:3E32CCE6.D8842848@earthlink.net...
> >> > > > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> >> > > >> > Yes ... assuming that you're refering to my behavior towards you,
> >> > > > > it's simple ... "Pompus, narrow-minded jerks irritate me>"
> >> > > > >
> >> > > > I love it. Someone who can't spell "pompous" quotes himself. I
> >> assume
> >> > > > that your view assumes that anyone who doesn't buy into your grand
> >> > > > scheme is pompous and narrow-minded. You've not just used that
> >method
> >> > > > with me.
> >> > > >
> >> > > You have ADD, right Dave? I've mentioned several times that I have
> >> > > a bit of loss of feeling/coordination in my fingers due to a spinal
> >> injury.
> >> >
> >> > I recall that. I don't see how your medical problem forced you to cut
> >> > and paste an old quote complete with its original spelling error.
> >>
> >> The original typo was simply propagated by error ... I didn't look
> >> closely enough at what I was reusing ... you want to hang me for that?
> >> (sounds pretty petty to me ...)
> >
> >An error was propagated by error? Most of us would have said, "I made a
> >mistake". Hang you for it? Naw--just laugh over it.
> >
> >
> > My recollection is of how many countries you'd worked from home on 10m.
> >>
> >> OK ... so what if I mentioned something about working some DX? ... again,
> >> I'm not chasing it
> >

> >Right. It is likely chasing you.
> >
> >
> >> > I didn't ask for a travelogue or justification. I just wondered how you
> >> > could be spared from what you call "important work".
> >>
> >> The CEO of my company gets to take vacations, too ... the fact that
> >> one's work is important doesn't mean they're required to work 24/7/365.
> >
> >Nobody works 24/7, much less 24/7/365--not even Leonard H.
>
> Well, "there you have it, Carl..." :-)
>
> "Nobody" is on call or works as long as they are ordered, not
> military members, not police or sheriff's deputies, not firemen
> or paramedics (of professional fire departments), or Real MDs
> on ER duty in hospitals or those on-call after office hours. Not
> utility workers, either, like those who repaired the damage to
> electric power or gas and water lines after the Loma Prieta or
> Northridge earthquakes out here.

Being on call is not working 24/7. Military members are given opportunities to sleep. None of the people described work round the clock for a week--none of them.

> "NOBODY works 24/7" according to Heil. None. Zip. Nada.
>
> Sigh...must have been cushy duty in some State Deptartment
> postings or in USAF units "that worked with NASA." :-)

Don't you have enough egg on your face for a single week? I'll settle for a single example of someone who is actually working 24 hours per day, seven days per week. This excludes someone who works the occasional long stretch. Come up with someone who has actually put in 148 continuous hours.

Dave K8MN

1207. Re: ARNewsline 1328 - Jan 24 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-29 13:00:18 UTC
From: Lloyd <Lloyd@LloydChief14313.net>
Message-ID: <b18j8c$am6$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 60290

Pasternak continues to SPAM Usenet with his worthless
drivel.

Lloyd

"Radionews" <radionews@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030129034748.16097.00000430@mb-mo.aol.com...
> Amateur Radio NewslineT Report 1328 - January 24, 2003
>
> Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1328 with a release date of Friday,
> January 24, 2003 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.
>
> The following is a Q-S-T. Wildfires rage in Australia, an FCC official
> says the agency is excited about P-L-C and the past becomes today at
> Cape Cod. These stories and more follow on Amateur Radio Newsline
> report number 1328 coming your way right now.
>
>
> (Billboard Cart Here)
>
> **
>
> RESCUE RADIO: HAMS HELP IN FIRE COMMUNICATIONS IN VK3 WIKLDFIRE
>
> Hams in down-under are hard at work assisting in emergency
> communications as widfire rage in several Australian states. Q-News
> Graham Kemp, VK4BB, is in Brisbane with the latest:
>
> --
> Audio report only. No text. Hear it at www.arnewsline.org
> --
>
> (Q-News)
>
> **
>
> RESCUE RADIO: REPEATER APPEARS LOST IN VK1 WILDFIRE
>
> Meantime there is some good news regarding hams living in and around the
> city of Canberra. They are all reportedly O-K, but one of their local
> repeaters may have been lost in a widlfire thats has been sweeping the
> area. Phil Longworth VK1ZPL who is the WICEN Coordinator Canberra:
>
> --
>

> Longworth: "We have a couple of repeaters around town. One which is
> actually located at the NASA site down at Cape Mc Villa. We haven't
> heard it since Saturday. The scouts cannot get close to there because
> they have lost a lot of infrastructure. So we are assuming that we have
> probably suffered some damage."
>
> --
>
> The repeater being referred to is VK1RAC. So far radio operators have
> not been called in the Canberra area because there have be no major
> failures in the nations telecommunications system. But hams are
> standing by even though they may have to do without one major repeater.
> (Q-News)
>
>
> **
>
> RESCUE RADIO: US HAMS NOT NEEDED IN MEXICAN QUAKE
>
> Mexico's telecommunications system is working properly following a major
> earthquake and communications assistance from the United States is not
> needed. The quake hit in Nortth-West Mexicio. It registered 7.6 on the
> Richter scale, toppled dozens of homes, killed at least 24 people and
> injuring at about 175. And while telephone service in several remote
> areas was knocked out for a time, the Mexican government got it quickly
> restored. Also, Mexico's own ham radio community has decasdes of
> experience making outside aid not necessary in many cases.
>
> Here in the United States, Gordon West, WB6NOA, has been monitoring the
> situation from his home in Costa Mesa Claifornia. Thats about 150 miles
> North of where the quake hit. And hes been taklking to hams in the area
> and confirms that United States hams going to assist are just not
> needed:
>
> --
>
> West: "In communiocating with the maritime mobile operators near
> Manzinello Mexico, many ofd the mariners rowed ashore and asked whether
> or not their ham radio gear on 40 meters might help relay messages back
> to the U.S.A. The villagers on shore evidently indicated that their
> communications were still up, and, that while they apreciated the
> boaters going ashore to ask for relays, none were needed.
>
> The mariners did indicate that they felt a slight tidal movement. That
> was reported the following morning on many of the Baja maritime mobile
> nets."
>
> --
>
> West says that immediately after the quake hit he began monitoring the

> various frequencies known to be usaed by Mexican hams for emergencies on
> 40 and 75 meters. West says that not a signal on the air indicated any
> apparent need for mutual communications aid from the United States.
> Don. (ARNewslineT)
>
> **
>
> SPECTRUM ALLOCATIONS: FCC ON WRC-03 PROPOSALS
>
> Back here in the U-S, an ARRL Bulletin says that the FCC is seeking
> comments on draft recommendations the World Radiocommunication
> Conference Advisory Committee adopted January 8th. Amateur Radio
> Newsline's Ken Locke, N8PJN, has more details:
>
> --
>
> The FCC's International Bureau says that based on its initial review of
> the recommendations, it tentatively concludes that it can generally
> support the proposals recommended by the W-R-C 03 Advisory Committee.
> And if adopted, United States delegations will use the proposals at
> bilateral, regional and international meetings.
>
> One agenda item of interest to hams involves examining the adequacy of
> the frequency allocations for High Frequency broadcasting in the
> vicinity of 4 to 10 MHz. The FCC also has draft proposals developed by
> Executive Branch agencies, and the agency is requesting comments on
> those as well.
>
> The Public Notice was released January 15th. The deadline for comments
> is January 31st. Complete texts of draft proposals are available via
> the FCC's WRC 03 Web site. You reach it from a link at www.fcc.gov.
>
> For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Ken Locke, N8PJN.
>
> --
>
> Comments may be filed via e-mail to wrc03@fcc.gov. You can also submit
> them by mail the Office of the Secretary, Federal Communications
> Commission, 445 12th Street, SW, Washington, DC 20554. (ARRL)
>
> **
>
>
> Break 1
>
> From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline,
> heard on bulletin stations around the world including the Superstition
> Amateur Radio Club repeater serving Mesa Arizona.
>
> (5 sec pause here)

>
>
> **
>
> EMERGING TECHNOLOGY: PLC MAY BE COMING TO THE USA
>
> P-L-C could be coming to the United States -- but not right away. This
> according to a top official at the FCC. Amateur Radio Newsline's Bruce
> Tennant, K6PZW, is here with the details:
>
> --
>
> P-L-C stands for Powerline Communications and the idea is to use the
> same wires that bring electricity to your home as a pathway for high-
> speed Internet access. And as previously reported, in nations where P-
> L-C has been evaluated or approved it has caused moderate to severe
> degradation to a good portion of the electromagnetic spectrum. In
> fact,. several nations have decided against implementing P-L-C even
> though it holds the promise of becoming a less expensive alternative to
> cable modems and D-S-L telephone lines as a way to get broadband
> service.
>
> And the FCC appears to be optimistic about P-L-C. On Wednesday January
> 15th, Edmond Thomas, chief of the Federal Communications Commission's
> Office of Engineering and Technology said companies developing the
> technology have overcome many hurdles in the past year.
>
> The FCC has been studying P-L-C technology for several months and Thomas
> says that the agency will pay more attention to it this year. He notes
> that there are no regulations that prohibit the technology, but the
> agency is concerned that Internet data transmissions carried over power
> lines could radiate signals inside and outside the home that could cause
> interference.
>
> And Thomas indicates that the widespread introduction of Powerline
> Communications wont happen very soon. He says that the FCC wants to be
> certain P-L-C is not going to cause problems to your TV. And that's
> certainly good news for all communications services including Amateur
> Radio.
>
> Reporting from Los Angeles, I'm Bruce Tennant, K6PZW.
>
> --
>
> Obviously this is an emerging technology that can impact negatively on
> ham radio and will have to be watched. (Published reports)
>
>
> **
>

> ENFORCEMENT: FCC CANCELS EXPERIMENTAL LICENSE WC2XZV
>
> The FCC has cancelled an experimental license to California company
> because the agency says its being used for other purposes. According to
> the CGC Communicator, the FCC cancelled experimental authorization of
> WC2XZV after Enforcement Bureau monitoring confirmed the operation.
>
> In a short letter dated January 17th, the Commission stated that the
> California station's emissions were not in compliance with the terms of
> its experimental radio license. But a story on recnet.com says a lot
> more. It says that that there were published reports of an alleged
> pirate station operating in the Antelope Valley area prior to the
> experimental license grant. The station was operating on 104.7 MHz and
> identifying as Frequency Radio with its website at www.1047.fm A check
> of the website makes no mention of the experimental license or the FCC
> action to cancel it. Acopy of the FCC's letter is posted in cyberspace
> at www.recnet.com/fcc/wc2xzv_cancel.pdf (CGC Communicator)
>
> **
> NAMES IN THE NEWS: MITNICK FREE TO REJOIN THE WWW
>
> Former computer hacker Kevin David Mitnick, N6NHG, has completed his
> probation and is now free to once again use a computer and surf the web.
> After being released from prison three years ago on probation, the
> Mitnick had been barred from contact with computers until last year. He
> was not allowed to access the Internet until this his probation ended
> Monday January 20th.
>
> But simply roaming the web may not what Mitnick has in mind. Since his
> release he has turned his efforts to becoming a consultant on computer
> and Internet security issues. He hosted a radio program on Los Angeles
> talk station KFI, has written a book and has even testified before a
> congressional committee on ways to make computing more secure.
>
> Only a few weeks ago the FCC agreed to permit him to renew his Amateur
> Radio license. The Administrative Law Judge hearing the case said that
> Mitnick was rehabilitated and would likely adhere to all of the agency's
> rules. And in a recent interview with the Los Angeles Times newspaper,
> Mitnick said - quote : "The truth is, I learned my lesson."
>
> Kevin Mitnick, N6NHG, also learned a lot about computers and the world-
> wide-web from his days of hacking. Now he appears to want to use this
> knowledge for the benefit of all in society. (ARNewlineT from published
> news stories)
>
> **
>
> PROMOTING THE HOBBY: "AMATEUR RADIO TODAY" - THE VIDEO
>
> The most trusted man in America has lent his name and callsign in

> support of the hobby. This as retired CBS newsman Walter Cronkite,
> KB2GSD, tells the story of hobby's public service efforts to the non-ham
> public in a new ARRL produced video titled Amateur Radio Today.
>
> Cronkite narrates the program from his office in New York City from a
> script developed by Alan Kaul, W6RCL. Kaul is the West Coast Producer
> of NBC Nightly News and a former anchor here on Amateur Radio Newsline.
>
> Amateur Radio Today was directed by Dave Bell, W6AQ, who is responsible
> for many ham radio films including the all-time classic "The Hams Wide
> World." Bell, Kaul, Bill Baker, W1BKR, of PBS and Bill Pasternak,
> WA6ITF served the co-producers. The show was edited at Suite Sixteen
> Post in Burbank California with Keith Glispie, WA6TFD, at the controls
> of the all digital Quantel Edit Box. But its really Walter Cronkite
> that takes you on a fast-paced six minute trip into the very soul of ham
> radio.
>
> The only legitimate authorized source of Amateur Radio Today is the
> American Radio Relay League which holds the copyright. It will be
> available on video CD in the very near future and -- eventually -- VHS
> tape. Visit www.arrl.org/catalog and order item number 8861 (ARRL,
> ARNewslineT)
>
> **
>
> HAM RADIO VIDEO: WRTC 2002 VIDEO NOW AVAILABLE
>
> Another video is aleady being called the best ham radio sports show
> ever to hit the street. This with the announcement that the official
> video of the Amateur Radio Olympics 2002 is now available on DVD and
> VHS.
>
> The world premier was held in Helsinki Finland on January 18th before
> an overflow crowd at the Contest Club Finland meeting. Unlike previous
> ham radio videos, this one is produced from a 100% "pro-sports"
> perspective.
>
> In order to capture as much of the action as possible, three camera
> crews taped as many teams and events as they could during the actual 24
> hour competition. Supporting all this great footage are high-end 3D
> graphics, scoreboards, top-ten boxes, team profiles, and everything else
> that you might expect when watching a professional sports event on
> television. And the production is even narrated by one of ESPN's top
> sportscasters
>
> The program's total running time is 60 minutes. The DVD version
> contains lots of extra features like full score breakdowns for each
> team, continental line-ups, competitor rulebook, and even all the past
> W-R-T-C scores dating back to 1990.
>

> If you've ever wanted to watch the worlds top radiosports teams in
> action, now is your chance. Copies are available for a nominal fee from
> the website: http://home1.pacific.net.sg/~jamesb (WRTC)
>
> **
>
> RESCUE RADIO: FISHING BOAT CREW DISAPPEARS BUT CELL PHONE TURNS UP IN
> INDONESIA
>
> A strange story from Taipei. A mobile telephone belonging to the
> missing chief engineer of a ship found abandoned off Australia has been
> used to make more than 80 calls from Indonesia. Australian police said
> they are baffled by the discovery of a fishing boat full of rotting fish
> and its lifeboats in tact, but no crew. News reports say that the boat
> was found drifting off the remote northwest Australian coast. The phone
> calls from Indonesia add to the mystery of what happened to the missing
> crew. (PacificRimOnline)
>
> **
>
> COMMUNICATIONS MAGAZINES: POPTRONICS CEASES PUBLIC ATION
>
> Popular Electronics -- better known as Poptronics Magazine is the latest
> hobby electronics publication to fail. This with the announcement that
> its publisher Gernsback Publications is no longer in operation.
>
> Gernsback was in the publishing business for 94 years. The January 2003
> issue was the last. Negotiations are reportedly under way to provide an
> alternative publication to Popular Electronics current subscribers.
> (W8HDU)
>
> **
>
> HAM LICENSING HELP: OH-KY-IN OFFERING HAM CLASSES
>
> If you live in Ohio, Kentucky or Indiana and have a friend wanting to
> become a ham, this is for you. The OH-KY-IN Amateur Radio Society will
> offer ham radio license classes in the Cincinnati, Ohio area. Training
> is scheduled to begin on Thursday evening, February 20th.. Training will
> cover Technician through Extra grades along with Morse instruction to 5
> words per minute. At the conclusion of the ten week course, Amateur
> exams will be offered. More information is in cyberspace at
> www.ohkyin.com. (OK-KY-IN release)
>
> **
>
> WITH THE HANDI HAMS: THE CALIFORNIA CAMP
>
> The Handi Hams California Radio Camp is the week of March 2 through 9th.
> This years special guest speakers include Bob Zeida N1BLF, Gordon West

> WB6NOA and Bill Pasternak WA6ITF.
>
> Also, those of you contacting camp special event station W0EQO will be
> eligable for a special QSL. More information about the camp and the
> station is on the web at www.handiham.org (HandiHams)
>
> **
>
>
> BREAK 2
>
> This is ham radio news for today's radio amateur. From the United
> States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the
> world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org and being
> relayed by the volunteer services of the following radio amateur:
>
> (5 sec pause here)
>
>
> **
>
> CONVENTIONS AMD HAMFESTS: THE MIAMI TROPICAL HAMBOREE
>
> The 2003 convention seasons gets off to a bang the 1st weekend in
> February. Thats when the 43rd annual Tropical Hamboree and ARRL Florida
> State Convention will be held in at the Fair Expo Center in Miami
> Florida.
>
> The Tropical Hamboree is truly a fun filled convention with loads of new
> and used radio gear for sale along with a host of terrific programs and
> top notch speakers.
>
> The hours of operation are 9 am to 5 pm Saturday February 1st and 9 am
> to 4 pm on Sunday the 2nd. For everything you might want to know about
> this years Tropical Hamboree take your web browswer over to
> www.hamboree.org (Tropical Hamboree)
>
> **
>
> HAM RADIO ASSISTS: THE MIAMI MARATHON
>
> Another activity scheduled for the same weekend in the same place is the
> 2003 Miami Marathon. Sponsored by Toyota and The National Diabeties
> Association, the Miami Marathon is a 26 mile foot race starting at the
> famed Coconut Grove, across Biscayne Bay, to Miami Beach and back again
> to Miami.
>
> The date for this event is Sunday February 2nd. Ben Nemser WA4DZS,
> owner of Nemal International Electronics is coordinating the amateur
> radio communications. His assistant, all the way from New York City is

> none other than that well-known 'marathon man', and former ARRL 1st Vice
> President Steve Mendelsohn, W2ML.
>
> With two major events involving ham radio the same weekend, its going to
> be a major challenge for the South Florida ham community. Its also
> looks to be a very memorable weekend in Miami as well. (Tropical
> Hamboree)
>
> **
>
> TECHNOLOGY: EIGHTY ONE MILLION PEOPLE WATCH FREE TV
>
> According to the National Association of Broadcasters, approximately
> eighty-one million television sets in the U.S. receive programming
> exclusively from free, over-the-air TV stations. In comments filed with
> the Federal Communications Commission, the NAB noted that while the
> total number of television sets in the U.S. is 267 million that more
> than three out of every ten TV sets relies exclusively on "free TV" for
> programming. This means that the TV set is not hooked up to cable,
> satellite or any other subscription TV service.
>
> Other figures noted by the NAB say that twenty-five percent of all cable
> and satellite homes have at least one TV set in the household that
> receives signals solely from free TV. Also, 24 percent of African-
> American and 32 percent of Hispanic households rely exclusively on free
> TV for their television viewing.
>
> The National Association of Broadcasters analysis was provided to the
> FCC as part of the Commission's "Annual Assessment of the Status of
> Competition in the Market for the Delivery of Video Programming." The N-
> A-B says that its comments demonstrate the considerable extent to which
> consumers still depend on over-the-air broadcast television signals.
> (NAB)
>
> **
>
> INTERNATIONAL - IARU
>
> On the international scene, the Radio Society of Great Britain passes
> along word that the national amateur radio societies of Cameroon and
> Macau have been admitted to the International Amateur Radio Union. A-R-
> T-J in Cameroon was formed in 1998 and has 14 members, seven of whom are
> licensed. Macau's ARM was founded in 1992 and now has 85 members. Both
> societies were inducted as of last December the 9th. (RSGB)
>
> **
>
> ON THE AIR: AO-40 QSO PARTY
>
> The operating period for the first AO-40 QSO Party has been extended to

> 4 days in order to give more operating windows to Amateur stations world
> wide. The QSO Party will begin at 0000 UTC on the 24th of January and
> conclude at 2400 UTC on January 27th. Currently stations from over 30
> countries have indicated their intention to participate in this years
> event. (ANS)
>
> **
>
> DX
>
> In DX, a team of operators that includes SM0BSO, SM0LQB and SM1TDE will
> operate from the QTH of JW5E on Spetsbergen between February 24th and
> March 1st. Look for them on 160 through 2 meters running CW, SSB, RTTY
> as well as SSTV and other soundcard modes. QSL to each operators home
> call direct or via the bureau. (GB2RS)
>
> **
>
> THAT FINAL ITEM: SPANNING THE ATLANTIC
>
> And finally this week, the story of history being celebrated. Of the
> earliest days of radio being commemorated by the people of the 21st
> century. And those who were there said it was like the past catching up
> with the future on a cold day at Cape Cod Massachusetts.
>
> The event was the 100th celebration of the first ever radio transmission
> from the United States being received in Europe. It was made by radio
> pioneer Guglielmo Marconi in 1903. And it was his daughter, Princess
> Elettra Marconi, who lent her voice to begin the 100th anniversary
> celebration of the first trans-atlantic radio message. A message that
> probably sounded something like this:
>
> --
> Audio Here
> --
>
> That sound was supplied by Bob Doherty, K1VV. He along with members of
> the Marconi Radio Club and Marconi Cape Cod Memorial Radio Club were the
> people behind KM1CC. That was the on-the-air celebration of the two
> club's namesake making the first wireless transmission to Europe. And
> quite an affair it was.
>
> Princess Elettera Marconi began the festivities in a brief contact with
> Ken Bowersox, KD5KBP. That's Commander Ken Bowersox on board the
> International Space Station. A bit later, Bowersox spoke with Cape Cod
> area school children who asked questions about life on-orbit. Both
> contacts were made possible by ARISS -- Amateur Radio on board the
> International Space Station.
>
> The January 18, 1903 contact by Guglielmo Marconi used an early form of

> hand sent code to span the Atlantic. A short time later Marconi
> predicted that mans voice would eventually span the globe using
> wireless. Now, precisely a hundred years later on a frigid January 18,
> 2003. Marconi's daughter returned to near the scene of that first
> contact and got to speak to a man in space. If he were alive today,
> Guglielmo Marconi would justly be proud. (K1VV)
>
> **
>
> NEWSCAST CLOSE
>
> With thanks to Alan Labs, Amateur News Weekly, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC
> Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio
> Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the
> Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline
> @arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio
> Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You
> can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O.
> Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.
>
> For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I'm Don
> Wilbanks, AE5DW, saying 73 and we thank you for listening." Amateur
> Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2002. All rights reserved.
>
> --
> Terminal Break
> --
>
> RAIN PROMO
>
>
>

1208. Re: Out Of The Box?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-29 13:14:52 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301290514.4e06c350@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60291

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message news:<20030128194825.12173.00000228@mb-mr.aol.com>...

> So the question I would ask of you, Steve, is this: Why let Mr. Anderson's
> mistakes, errors, and insults bother you so much? Why should anyone take him or
> his comments seriously?

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Fair enough.

1209. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-29 13:20:00 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E37D4FE.B4856451@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60294

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E367B14.3D42354F@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> >> Robeson continually states that discussion opponents have
> >> "really" said something even though what was written was
> >> obviously not so. Again, that is libelous.
> >
> >I can't believe that you write some of the things you write and still
> >manage to keep a straight face.
>
> It's difficult but it can be done. :-) :-) :-)
>
> All one has to do is "work hard at it" every day...practice,
> practice, practice...
>
> >> Amateur radio is a fun hobby, a recreation.
> >
> >How would you know?
>
> I've read the "official" ARRL output on amateur radio. :-)

C'mon, Len. How would you know that amateur radio is a "fun hobby",
having never been a participant?

> Of course, according to Heil, Robeson, Miccolis, and all
> the PCTAs, it must be done in an "official" manner,
> always working HF, CW whenever possible, and observing
> all DX within sight and hearing.
> - US amateur service general order #1

This is more of you as described by N2EY. I don't only work HF and
don't only chase DX. I certainly spend no more than half my air time
using CW.

> >How time flies. If you want to get is right, that has been about five
> >years ago. I was still working in Helsinki at the time. My statement
> >was as correct then as it is now.
>
> Tell us more about Guinea-Bisseau and how it compares to
> a Scandinavian country. Does the US State Department radio
> in Finland use CW as an order-wire on RTTY circuits too?

What U.S. State Department radio in Finland?

> >Whoa! You're treading on some pretty thin ice there, Leonard. What was
> >that part about rewriting? How about that character assassination
> >stuff?
>
> Yeah, how about it? You missed that wonderful AOL home
> page of Robeson's, didn't you? Poor baby.

No, I didn't miss it. How was it any different than the kind of stuff
you write here?

> Was there thin ice in Guinea-Bisseau?

Club Galleon.

> >Anderson has no credentials in psychology nor is he a medical doctor.
>
> I don't pretend to be one...but it doesn't take any degree
> except about 98.6 of them on the Fahrenheit scale to see
> Obsession and Hate-Rage in Robeson's actions in here for
> all the readers to see.

I could have sworn you were just pretending to be one, despite your
present claim to the contrary. What temperature do your Obsession and
Hate-Rage posts generate?

> For "credentials" in psychology, I can call on my own
> consultant, my wife, who has two Masters degrees (both
> from University of Illinois) with one of those being in Social
> Work. She was a licensed private counselor in the states
> of Illinois and Washington for a number of years. She has
> Robeson...and you as well...tagged, labeled, pickled, and
> put on the shelf as classic examples of dysfunction.

What does she have to say about your antics?

> No problem. Both "Steam's" and your own behavior can
> be seen with passing grades from two semesters of
> psychology. [a requirement in California undergraduate
> studies in the 1960s]

But you aren't a licensed psychologist any more than you are a licensed
radio amateur. You can't practice either without a license.

> Steam Robeson likes to put on like he was "almost" an MD,
> "expert" in nearly everything medical. Some nurses get like
> that away from the hospital. Once at work the are submissive
> and follow orders of Real MDs meekly. That might be one of
> Robeson's frustrations to explain his behavior in here.

Show your wife the above paragraph and ask her professional opinion of
someone who would continue posting such unsubstantiated stuff. Explain
to her that you and not some adolescent wrote it.

> Yourself, on the other hand, imply you are the "expert" in
> radio...not just amateur radio, but in ALL radio.

Such a claim has never been made by me.

> You "took
> credit" for the clever innovation of using CW as the order-
> wire of a State Department RTTY circuit (later changing that
> to "official State Department Procedure"). Now that sort of
> "innovation" is neither clever nor good practice, hasn't been
> done by any of the other government or commercial HF
> communications folks. QED...you tried a snow-job on the
> others and got caught at it, now you can't forget it or "lose
> face" in public due to your own personal whatevers.

All of your untruthful claims have been repeatedly and strongly refuted.
In fact, my original statements from five years back have just been
quoted here to show you for what you are.

> Not my problem, colonel.

No, your current problems are explaining how you've made the untruthful
statements about things like use of CW as an order wire and the absence
of my name in State's "Key Officers" lists in the face of irrefutable
proof to the contrary.

> I'm not your therapist.

No kidding. You aren't anyone's therapist.

> Doesn't take
> any credential to see what you're doing in here. :-)

No, it takes no credentials to see that I'm revealing you to be a teller
of untruths. You are just as described by N2EY.

Dave K8MN

1210. Re: Claims Of Dishonesty

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-29 13:22:05 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301290522.a0dee0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60292

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message news:<20030128194823.12173.00000227@mb-mr.aol.com>...
>
> In article <20021201183714.00112.00000794@mb-fz.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:
>
> >In article <20021201133916.21441.00000449@mb-mc.aol.com>, j1aguiar@aol.com
> >(J1aguiar) writes:
>
> >Accusing the VECs of falsifying test results is pretty serious stuff, btw. Do
> >you have any solid evidence?
>
> VEC test sessions are NOT monitored by anyone else DURING
> testing. All that is monitored is the FCC scanning over test
> RESULTS sent to them by the VEC teams.
>
> PAUSE QUOTE
>
> Despite the unnecessary shouting, this first paragraph is just a restatement of
> the obvious. Note that FCC has not had any reservations about the testing of
> young children for amateur radio exams, nor of the VE session in question.

Now it is obvious that exams are NOT monitored? Unfrigginbelievable;
what unpalatable concessions are made in the effort to hang Len.

You might want to clue in buddy Dick Carrol/W0EX. He thinks otherwise
and you had -ample- opportunity to correct him at the time.

I'll spell it out very clearly: PCTA Double Standard.

Brian

1211. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-29 13:24:00 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E37D5EF.8D05931D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60295

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E366D23.DBC4D171@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >I've believe he has you clocked, Leonard.
>
> That "clock" is broken, doesn't tell time, chimes only when the
> key winder is upset at time lookers not viewing with the
> proper Heilian attitude. :-)

As stated, I believe he has you clocked.

> Why not tell us more about Heil's Adventures in Guinea-Bisseau,
> that important center of communications innovation and trial?

So you can begin a new series of bald faced lies?

Dave K8MN

1212. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-29 13:24:56 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301290524.1154ddf9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60293

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0301281244.2abd08dc@posting.google.com>...
> Welcome back, Jeff.
>
> >jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu (Jeffrey Herman) wrote in message
news:<b12la4$8u1$1@news.hawaii.edu>...
> > Kï¿½HB <Kï¿½HB@ARRL.ORG> wrote:
> > > NCI 4304
> >
> > How many of those 4304 are current members?
>
> NCI membership numbers started with either 1000 or 1001, not 0001, so
> a member number of 4304 indicates a maximum of 3305 members, not 4304.
>
> Membership is free and does not expire. Only way a member becomes a
> nonmember is to request removal. Which has been done in at least two
> cases that I know of.

I'm one and I'm current. Donations are accepted to help cover costs.

> > Were/are they all licensed
> > hams? How many were/are coded hams?
>
> Unknown - neither is a requirement of membership.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

I was an unlicensed ARRL member. No problems. The local library is
apparently an unlicensed member also.

1213. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-29 14:12:27 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030129091227.24796.00000278@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 60296

>Subject: Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 1/28/03 11:34 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0301282134.6b58bd50@posting.google.com>

>Have you ever used HF comms in the service? Were they not encrypred?

Yes. Some were, some were not.

Extended response sent to Brian via e mail.

Steve, K4YZ

1214. Re: The coders embarrass themselves on 14.275 MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-29 14:36:47 UTC
From: William <w341x@releyviaserver341x.com>
Message-ID: <b18ot4smk0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 60297

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message

> Could it be that the FCC no longer has a pool of trained CW operators
> to monitor amateur CW communications?

I am beginning to wonder exactly what expertise they have left
anymore. I work in a component of DOD, and they called our office,
requesting assistance with a signal they were tracking. I denied the
request, whereupon the FCC official flew into a rage. sure nuff,
they had one of their higher ups call one of my higher ups, and got the
same answer I gave them, "no."

William

1215. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-29 14:43:21 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030129094321.24796.00000280@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 60298

>Subject: Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 1/29/03 7:24 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3E37D5EF.8D05931D@earthlink.net>
>
>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <3E366D23.DBC4D171@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >I've believe he has you clocked, Leonard.
>>
>> That "clock" is broken, doesn't tell time, chimes only when the
>> key winder is upset at time lookers not viewing with the
>> proper Heilian attitude. :-)
>
>As stated, I believe he has you clocked.
>
>> Why not tell us more about Heil's Adventures in Guinea-Bisseau,
>> that important center of communications innovation and trial?
>
>So you can begin a new series of bald faced lies?

I think Jim, N2EY's post's in another thread that exactly quoted
(including headers) Lennie saying what Lennie DISclaims saying pretty well
defeats any claims Lennie may have hoped to hold on to of "character
assassination".

And I think in light of those posts (and reams of others) pretty well
quells any claims Lennie may make of allegedly being libelled.

Whew!

73

Steve, K4YZ

1216. Re: Why Dave has such a p*ss poor attitude

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-29 14:52:20 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030129095220.24796.00000281@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 60299

>Subject: Re: Why Dave has such a p*ss poor attitude
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 1/29/03 6:48 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3E37CDF7.3663EABD@earthlink.net>

>> "NOBODY works 24/7" according to Heil. None. Zip. Nada.
>>
>> Sigh...must have been cushy duty in some State Deptartment
>> postings or in USAF units "that worked with NASA." :-)
>
>Don't you have enough egg on your face for a single week? I'll settle
>for a single example of someone who is actually working 24 hours per
>day, seven days per week. This excludes someone who works the
>occasional long stretch. Come up with someone who has actually put in
>148 continuous hours.

It was so obvious a faux pas that one has to wonder how an allegedly
educated person could be so idiotic as to make the assertion, Dave.

I can understand the first one passing...assuming, that is, that one
refers to "24/7" as a combination of work and on-call. But to turn right
around and REPEAT the same stupid comments...well, I just don't know.

73

Steve, K4YZ

1217. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-29 15:09:29 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030129100929.24796.00000282@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 60300

>Subject: Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 1/28/03 11:50 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030129005057.06242.00000358@mb-fh.aol.com>

>I don't pretend to be one...but it doesn't take any degree
> except about 98.6 of them on the Fahrenheit scale to see
> Obsession and Hate-Rage in Robeson's actions in here for
> all the readers to see.

I can deal with the "hate-rage", as you call it. But you're busted as a liar...

>For "credentials" in psychology, I can call on my own
> consultant, my wife, who has two Masters degrees (both
> from University of Illinois) with one of those being in Social
> Work

She still with you? She's either very compassionate, or has a high tolerance for liars and creeps.

She must use industrial strength "Janitor in a Drum" to get the stench off.

>She has
> Robeson...and you as well...tagged, labeled, pickled, and
> put on the shelf as classic examples of dysfunction.

Perhaps you'd not mind then if we run off copies of the posts where you make allegations agains Amateur Radio, say you're going to do something and then not do it, and use your OWN adjectives like "jack-booted thug", "Nazi", elitist", etc.

But then...I have to ask myself...What kind of person WOULD be married to a creep like you and I find the answers are not very flattering.

And I can only imagine what kind of "psych" professional your spouse must be that she can't make an objective observation of your OWN "dysfunction".

Your wife thinks it's "acceptable" for her husband to make tens-of-thousands of posts to an online newsgroup for a radio service in which he has no vested interest? She doesn't find THAT "obsessive" or "dysfunctional"...?!?!

If not, she's as incompetent in HER alleged profesion as you are in yours.

>Steam Robeson likes to put on like he was "almost" an MD,
> "expert" in nearly everything medical. Some nurses get like

> that away from the hospital. Once at work the are submissive
> and follow orders of Real MDs meekly. That might be one of
> Robeson's frustrations to explain his behavior in here
BBBBWWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA
HAHAHA ! ! ! ! ! ! !

Lennie, You DO have SUCH a sense of humor ! ! !

I'd ask you to back THAT up with SOME sort of evidence, but I know there's
ABSOLUTELY NONE ! ! !

BBBBWBWBWBWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! ! ! !

>Not my problem, colonel. I'm not your therapist. Doesn't take
> any credential to see what you're doing in here

Nor you, Lying Creep...Nor you....

1218. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-29 15:45:31 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030129104531.24796.00000283@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 60301

>Subject: Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 1/28/03 11:56 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0301282156.22316415@posting.google.com>

>> Not at all. I would like to see Lennie silenced becasue he has lied
>> repeatedly and makes outrageous and unsupported claims against Amateur
>Radio as
>> a whole.
>
>You have lied repeatedly.

Then you are free to post the quotes where I lied, Brian. As a matter of fact, I DARE you to do it.

>Len's opinion of the cult of amateur radio isn't far off the mark.

It's so far off the mark as to be laughable. That you think it isn't makes me rethink the "concilliatory" language I've been trying to take with you.

My bust.

>I've given a long list of the people that you incessantly badger
>whenever they might come on to the group.

Your list, as I responded to earlier, was in error.

>>That argument is over with, Brian. There are other IMMEDIATE issues
>that
>> need to be and should be addressed, but they aren't. I ahve introduced and
>> reintorduced them, but they fall on deaf ears, so it shall be...I am not
>> another "Vipul" who will damn all Amateur Radio because it won't meet MY
>needs.
>
>Do you believe that the FCC, through a body of rules titled "Part 97"
>governs amateur radio?

Where in the blue blazes did you get a questuion like that in response to the quoted paragraph, Brian?

The FCC's jurisdiction over Amateur Radio has NEVER been in contest. This is some dodge that your buddy like to try and trun from time to time.

No one in this forum has ever "denied", "disclaimed", alluded to" or otherwise attempted to suggest that the FCC is NOT the governing agency for civil radio in the United States.

I DARE you to provide ONE quote where ANYONE in this forum has stated otherwise.

>We ought to be able to eliminate the code exam for free American
>amateurs.

There are Amateurs imprisoned over Morse Code? I know Flippo and Burton are in jail for QRMing and unlicensed operation, but WHO is in jail over Code?

>I disagree, but does there need to be organized support to maintain an
>unnecessary and arbitrary requirement?

Please cite for me some known law that is enforced WITHOUT "organized support", Brain.

I can't think of a single law that gets enacted and enforced WITHOUT "organized support", and I certainly can't think of any law that ever got revoked or deleted without "organized support". The Bill of Rights bears witness to same, espeicially the 18th and 21st amendments.

>Our government may take years to eliminate the code exam.

Brian...copy this post, including headers, and save it.

I am willing to wager $100.00 US Dollars (one hundred), that the Federal Communications Commission shall, either on thier own volition or acting on a duly submitted petition, within 180 days of the ratification of any changes to ITU S25.5, delete Morse Code testing as a requirement for ANY class of Amateur Radio license in the United States.

>Unless they
>allow the VEC to misinterpret Part 97 and just stop testing.

How can they "misinterpret" Part 97?

What part of Part 97 as it presently exists lends itself to "misinterpret(ation)" such that VE's could even remotely consider NOT complying with examinations for Element 1?

>> >Your zeal only exposes you for what you are.
>>
>> Intolerant of the lying and deceitful?
>
>M-o-v-e On!

You condone liars and the deceitful?

>>Sorry for what? Lennie insists on some "lodge hall" mentality,
>
>Yup.

He's wrong.

> insists
>> that Amateur Radio does NOT provide a public service,
>

>So, he's wrong.

That's what I've been TRYING to tell you!

>and has made countless
>> assertions that are untrue and proven false with ease.
>
>So do you.

Quotes, please...

>> So he has proved....what?
>
>He's said that we're full of OF's that cling to the past. If you
>can't see that, then you're part of the problem.

Let's see...."clings to the past"...

Hmmmm....I certainly AM active on CW on HF...But Wait! There's More!

EME...(building a station)...airborne telemetery for DASH surveillence,
mentoring, ATV...

Whew...Could go on, but why...??? I've helped dozens of NEW hams get on
the air, almost all of which have been Post 1991 and post "Restructuring"
licensees.

No one in any club I belong to (three) even remotely supports "clinging to
the past". Nothing I read in ANY periodical suggests that Amateur Radio
"cling to the past" other than the usual historical interest expressed by ANY
group in it's development. Every major periodical is ripe with new technology
and techniques articles.

Nothing, Brian...

Now, Please provide the requested verifications of YOUR assertions of lies
on my part.

We'll wait right here.

Steve, K4YZ

1219. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-29 16:26:15 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0301290826.44224c2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60302

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0301281641.566bb178@posting.google.com>...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030128062207.12173.00000216@mb-mr.aol.com>...
> > In article <oliZ9.6698$d66.604847@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
> > <kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG> writes:
> >
> > >"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
> > >
> > >:
> > >: But since the WBFD is at least the size of a G5RV or trap dipole, and
> > >: costs at least as much as a conventional dipole plus a tuner, it is a
> > >: mystery why any ham would use a WBFD.

Rewrite that to to read "a mystery why any knowledgeable ham would use
a WBFD in preference to an dipole of equal size".
> >
> > >Translation: N.I.H.
> >
> > Do you mean "Not Invented Here", Hans?
> >
> > If so, that's not the case. The WBFD has been around a long time - I learned
> > about it from a 1948 QST article.
> >
> > What the WBFD offers is convenience at the price of efficiency. As both an EE
> > and amateur radio operator, I say the tradeoff is not worthwhile for most
> > amateur radio applications.
> >
> > Tell us, Hans - would YOU use a WBFD at your ham station instead of a
> > conventional dipole of equivalent size?
>
> Not hardly. Without fear of contradiction I'll state that Our Chief
> sure as hell was not running a goofyass t2fd on 7.037 that mememorable
> nite a piece back when he boomed the whole frigging NA continent and
> cleaned house at 30 over.

Who knows what he was running? A "3-30 MHz" WBFD in the clear 100+
feet above the prairie will prolly do a half-decent job on 40 meters,
'specially if fed enough suds. If the thing is only 10% efficient, it
just brings the 1500 W boys down to barefoot-and-a-dipole level.
>
> Did I get that right Chief? Momback Good Buddy.

Remember, it was 40 on a good evening, and Hans is in the midwest.
Heck, I work the West Coast with my low inverted V and 100 homebrew

watts under those conditions - on 80 meters.

--

"T2FD" stands for "tilted, terminated, folded dipole". Originally meant to be a nondirectional, frequency-insensitive RECEIVING antenna, fed with balanced line. Really cutting-edge stuff a half-century ago - hook one to yer R-390 and there's no need to fool with the antenna trimmer. Or run the T2FD into a multichannel "antenna coupler" (which most hams would call an "active splitter" and feed a bank of HF RXs tuned to different freqs. No adjustment required.

The interesting thing is that some folks are of the mindset that "if the govt. and military use it, it MUST be the best". They disregard the differences between the govt's needs and resources vs. hams. (You see that sort of thinking all the time here on rrap). Manufacturer's advertising hype doesn't help, either.

If some ham with more bucks than brains gives me a hard time about the T2FD/WBFD, I don't argue anymore.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1220. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-29 17:07:48 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E380A64.308@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 60305

Bill Sohl wrote:

>
> Turns out the FCC listens to ARRL, NCI and anyone else that has anything
> credible to say...

Which leaves out Baxter.

1221. Re: ARNewsline 1328 - Jan 24 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-29 17:09:38 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E380AD2.7090801@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 60306

Lloyd wrote:
> Pasternak continues to SPAM Usenet with his worthless
> drivel.

Like k1man spams the ham bands with his useless worthless drivel.

1222. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-29 17:16:39 UTC
From: jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu
Message-ID: <b1929n$6ad$1@news.hawaii.edu>
Source record: 60303

Brian <brianburke@juno.com> wrote:
>N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote

>> Membership is free and does not expire. Only way a member becomes a
>> nonmember is to request removal. Which has been done in at least two
>> cases that I know of.

Membership in NCI sounds more like signing a petition than anything
else.

>I'm one and I'm current. Donations are accepted to help cover costs.

I asked:
>>> Were/are they all licensed hams? How many were/are coded hams?

>> Unknown - neither is a requirement of membership.

Now I'm really convinced that NCI membership = signing a petition.

>I was an unlicensed ARRL member. No problems. The local library is
>apparently an unlicensed member also.

You mean the librarian? Someone (a person) had to sign the NCI
"petition."

73, Jeff KH6O

--
Operations Specialist Mathematics Lecturer
U.S. Coast Guard Kapiolani College
Dept. of Homeland Security University of Hawaii System

1223. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-29 17:30:39 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b1937m$645$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 60304

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030128083623.05048.00000263@mb-cs.aol.com...
> In article <OulZ9.1420$N5.819411@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20030126215637.20835.00000270@mb-fy.aol.com...
> >>>
> >> Are there more than 3400 current NCI members?
> >
> >Yes ...
>
> How many?

What difference does it make?

> And since there are no dues nor membership expirations, how do you know if
a
> "current member" still exists?

What difference does it make?

> >> >Nor, I might point out, does ARRL's membership constitute a majority
> >> >of US hams ... more like a bit less than 25% IIRC the last numbers I
> >> >noticed.
> >>
> >> Quite true. Nor does ARRL claim to constitute a majority, either.
> >
> >ARRL claims to be "THE National Society for Amateur Radio" ...
>
> Is there another national society for amateur radio?
>
> NCI cannot claim to be one, because
>
> a) it is "international"
> b) its sole stated purpose is to end stand-alone Morse code testing.
>
> What other "national society for amateur radio" exists in the USA?

As before...what difference does all this make?

> >they
> >most certainly claim to speak for all when they file comments with the
> >FCC etc.
>
> How?

>
> >Not directly in so many words, but it is CLEARLY implied.
>
> Where? Where does ARRL claim to speak for all?
>
> ARRL's membership number is clearly stated. Not a secret in any way.
>
> What is NCI's current membership, give or take 1%? Why has that number
been
> such a closely guarded secret?
>
> >Fortunately, the FCC understands the reality.
>
> The FCC clearly does not interpret ARRL's words as claiming "to speak for
all
> when they file comments with the FCC etc." Such an implication exists only
in
> the minds of a few. Those few infer what is not implied.
>
> Does FCC know NCI's current membership, give or take 1%? Why has that
number
> been such a closely guarded secret?
> >
> Anyone who comments to the FCC is, by definition, telling the FCC that
their
> ideas represent what is best. Of course "best for whom?" is a different
> question. Some comments, like one that demanded an age limit of 14 years
for
> any class of amateur license, do not represent what is best for the ARS.
>
> Is there another amateur radio society in the USA that provides even 1% of
the
> services ARRl provides to the amateur radio community?

I am both an ARRL member and a volunteer in ARRL field activities (LGL).
I am also a director of NCI. Frankly, I don't see any value to this
discussion
since it is meaningless in the ongoing policy discussions and has been for
some time.

Turns out the FCC listens to ARRL, NCI and anyone else that has anything
credible to say...and in the end the FCC decides what to do.
Hell, it works for me...not to mention that NCI's track record
with seeing NCI viewpoints taken by the FCC has been pretty
darn good.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1224. Re: Claims Of Dishonesty

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-29 18:29:19 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030129132919.27196.00000019@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 60307

In article <20030128194823.12173.00000227@mb-mr.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <20030128112728.02295.00000280@mb-bk.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
>Robeson K4YZ) writes:
>
>>>I never said ARRL was "dishonest," just that their actions
>>> on "examining" two six-year-olds and "passing" them, then
>>> publicizing them on their website was SUSPICIOUS.
>>
>> Not truthful.
>>
>> You have blatantly called the ARRL dishonest on numerous occassions.
>>
>>>But, never mind that...you expect everyone to Believe in
>>> ARRL, that they Never Do Wrong (for They are Holy).
>>
>> Nope. Never said that. I HAVE, however, asked YOU to provide the
>>EVIDENCE of this dishonesty you allege.
>>
>> You have not.
>
>Steve,
>
>Let's put aside various claims and interpretations and take a look at what Mr.
>Anderson actually wrote back on December 2, 2002. Surely no reasonable person
>would object to shining the light of Logic and Truth upon the actual post in
>question.

Ooooo! Here we go again, gang.

The Man Who Lives In Google's Past has another long one...

>>Accusing the VECs of falsifying test results is pretty serious stuff, btw. Do
>>you have any solid evidence?
>
> VEC test sessions are NOT monitored by anyone else DURING
> testing. All that is monitored is the FCC scanning over test
> RESULTS sent to them by the VEC teams.
>
>PAUSE QUOTE
>
>Despite the unnecessary shouting, this first paragraph is just a restatement
of
>the obvious. Note that FCC has not had any reservations about the testing of

>young children for amateur radio exams, nor of the VE session in question.

Obvious NON-criticsm. The FCC does NOT have any age
limit on US amateur licensee applicants.

Is pointing out SUSPICIOUS action "charges?" Oh, my!

>RESUME QUOTE:
>
> Now go back to the famous/infamous ARRL news page that
> showed two darling six-year-olds who were reported to have
> "passed" written tests for Novice and Technician, respectively.
> Now let any, repeat ANY, first-grade teacher look at the
> written exam questions and decide for themselves whether
> SIX YEAR OLDS can read those questions well enough to
> answer even 70 percent of them. Just to READ them and
> be able to choose any answer.
>
>PAUSE QUOTE
>
>The first sentence uses a scornful tone to question the legitimacy of the test
>results of the two children. Quite typical of the author.

Oh! Oh! The CRIME!

Mr. Anderson "uses a scornful tone!" Oh! Oh!

>The rest of the paragraph sets up a hypothetical person ("any, repeat ANY,
>first grade teacher") as a Final Authority on whether the children could read
>the test.

Jimmie has scorn on the cob...

>However, the proposed test is invalid. The question is not whether all
>six-year-olds could read the test, or whether typical six-year-olds could read
>the test, but whether the two particular six-year-olds who actually passed the
>test could read it. Without actually evaluating the two children in question,
>it's impossible to say whether they could read the test or not.

Counselor! I hear "scorn" in the critique! Quick, to Google!

Wanna-be pediatrics expert Jimmie Miccolis seems to think
that ALL six-year-olds have full comprehension of reading
along with full judgement of responsibility at that age.

I would assume that nearly all parents of THEIR children
would claim that...it is the norm in our society...but the
newsgroup doesn't know if Miccolis is a parent of any kind
or a pediatrician or where he works or what he does in any
detail. He DOES feel free to "hear scorn" on a screen
(must have a remarkable computer transducer in there)
and critique others who don't Have The Right Attitude On
Ham Radio. <shrug>

>Also, not all six-year-olds are in first grade. Enrollment cutoff dates vary
>widely across the country. Here in Radnor Township, a child must be at least
>six years old before October 1 of the year that child is in first grade.
Other
>school districts have much later cutoff dates, while some have earlier ones.

Radnor is The Land Of Gifted Children. Ok, we've established
that. "Other places have different things..." Echh, statement
of the obvious, something which Jimmie abhored elsewhere. :-)

>Most of all, many children today learn to read long before even entering the
>first grade.

Of course. I read and critiqued "War And Peace." In the original
Russian. Didn't Jimmie?

Jimmie didn't get his Ham license until 14. Was he retarded?
Living in another county? Excuse me, TOWNSHIP...

>RESUME QUOTE
>
> If you say "yes they can, because...[for any reason]" then
> you MUST acknowledge that (1) You don't have slightest
> familiarity with six-year-olds' reading/writing comprehension;
> or (2) You think anything labeled/stamped/categorized as
> "ham radio material" is somehow "special" over and above
> any other subject matter; or (3) Any child who is "involved" in
> any way with amateur radio is somehow a "gifted child" or a
> "child prodigy." All of them are nonsense, ridiculous because
> of a way-too-strong identification (beyond rationality) with
> amateur radio.
>
>PAUSE QUOTE
>
>Here, Mr. Anderson makes the classical logical error of assuming the
>conclusion. He presents the idea that no six-year-old could possibly read the
>test as an indisputable fact, without any proof whatsoever. He claims that
>anyone who disagrees with his assertion is simply wrong, but presents
>absolutely no proof of the assertion.

You are wanting maybe a Masters Thesis or a PhD Dissertation
already? Oh gevalt!

[Moishe, ya made da pants too tight...!]

I still don't "present any proof" because any trip to a large
market with kids in tow of mamas or any visit to a first-grade
classroom will demonstrate to ANY observer that first-graders
do NOT have adult or even teen-age reading ability OR
comprehension of difficult subjects involving science and law.

>The hypothetical first-grade teacher who
>is supposed to be the Final Authority on the reading skills of six-year-olds
is

>never mentioned again. After all, someone might produce a first grade teacher
>who would say "Yes, some exceptional first graders could read that".

Oh, my, Jimmie is loaded with hypo! He might as well have
said "every exception 'proves' that exceptions are in
universal application (when they are in ham radio)!"

>Also never mentioned is the fact that most people taking the test would
>probably have seen the questions and answers before, with plenty of time to
>learn unfamiliar words and phrases.

Ah, Jimmie setting the stage for a production of Dumbed-Down
Ham Testing! [now opening in your neighborhood ham news-
group, performances daily...]

"Most people!" Jimmie KNOWS "most people."

He also KNOWS the motivations within the FCC according to
his public statements in here. Terrible side-effect of too much
morse...delusions of telepathic ability. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

>There DO exist six-year-olds with reading skills quite advanced for their
>biological age.

All of them take ham tests. Yes, of course.

>I have known several who would have little trouble reading the
>Novice and Technician written exams, particularly if the content of the tests
>had been available to them ahead of time.

Jimmie KNOWS all these things! Amazing.

Pity he was 8 years late getting his first license...missed all the
"fun and activity" of late-night beeping, saving the Titanic, etc.

>Reading comprehension is another matter. But the tests require only that the
>examinee select the correct answer, not an understanding of the question
>and/or answer. This is true regardless of the age or educational level of the
>examinee.

...unless it has been written up on ARRL news pages which then
makes exceptions a "regular rule" and an everyday thing if it
involves Ham Radio!

>Again, the reading skills and comprehension levels of the children who
actually
>took the tests are unknown to Mr. Anderson.

Absolutely. I don't KNOW every human being on earth involved
with amateur radio (even in the slightest). Jimmie do.

Perhaps the kindly, grandfatherly-appearing VE or VEs at the
test read the questions to the kinds...sort of like reading them
the Sunday funnies? :-)

>This paragraph is similar to the beginning of the second paragraph, using a
>scornful tone to question the legitimacy of the test results of the two
>children in question, the ARRL, and the VEC group who conducted the test.

Hot darn! Another "ear of scorn!" :-)

>Yet
>no proof of any wrongdoing is presented by Mr. Anderson. He implies that the
>tests could not have been legitimately passed by the children in question.

What?!? Me accuse ARRL of any DISHONESTY?!?

ARRL is PERFECT in every regard, they NEVER do wrong!
They are the Bedrock of US amateur radio! The Final Word.
All BELIEVE in them for they are the savior of the ham!

>Here's where Mr. Anderson accuses ARRL of "very mild fraud" and "hypocrisy"
–
>again, without any proof whatsoever.

Tsk, tsk, Jimmie left out Tone of Scorn...

[hum a few bars and the rest will pick up on it...]

>And again he assumes that the six-year-olds in question are
>"barely-able-to-read-and-write" without any direct knowledge of their
>abilities.

"...and a little child shall lead them..."

>In the case of VE-administered license tests, either the tests were
>administered and passed in accordance with FCC rules, or they were not. If the
>tests in question were administered and passed in accordance with FCC rules,
>there is no fraud, deliberate falsification or dishonesty of any kind. If not,
>then the fraud is not "very mild". Mr. Riley Hollingsworth has made it clear,
>through enforcement actions, that VE-administered license tests must be in
>accordance with FCC rules. Accusing VEs and/or VECs of deliberate
>falsification without any evidence borders on libel.

Oooo...see you in court, Judge.

Hello? ARRL is NOT the god of Ham. They are a Political Special
Interest Group. They admit to that on their IRS tax statements.

Special Interest Groups are entities ripe for criticsm in the grand
old American Way Of Life. Been that way for years. Jimmie
thinks ARRL is a religious institution? Must be...

>In the last sentence, Mr. Anderson allows the possibility that the written
>tests may be a "SHAM" – but again offers no proof. Nor does he qualify or
>limit his earlier accusation of fraud. If such tests are a "SHAM" then they
>are so for all new amateurs, not just young ones.

Yup. Jimmie thinks ARRL is the god of Ham...and he wants to
play the part of the Spanish Inquisitor...or an amateur Taliban...
it gets confusing at times with all the Religious Fervor of the

Faithful and the Zealots hawking the Hue and Cry Against The
Infidels.

>RESUME QUOTE
>
> No MORE evidence is needed...the evidence has already been
> presented although sugar-coated with parental pride and the
> usual propaganda of ARRL being all good things to US amateur
> radio and never making mistakes or illegalities.
>
>PAUSE QUOTE
>
>Yet again, Mr. Anderson assumes his conclusion, with no proof. His whole
>argument is that no six-year-old could possibly read and pass the written
>tests for any amateur radio exam.

Jimmie ain't presented any PROOF that ANY six-year-old CAN
LEGITIMATELY PASS ANY HAM TEST except what the god of
Ham pronounced on its web page. ARRL makes no errors, they
are inviolate (even if red in the face that we cannot see).

>He does not consider:
>
>1) That six-year-olds with reading skills and other academic skills quite
>above the average for their age do exist, and often have accomplished quite
>amazing things for their age

Jimmie Motto: Every exception is The Rule.

Jimmie was 8 years late accomplishing Amazing Things.

>2) That the written tests do not require comprehension of the material,
>just the selection of the correct answers.

...especially when kindly, grandfatherly VEs read the funnies
to the kiddies.

>3) That 2) has been true in the USA for more than 43 years, and that FCC
>has seen no problem with the system

This Important Matter never even got to an Appellate Court
level, let alone the Supremes, yes..... :-)

>4) That he has absolutely no information about the children or VEs in
>question, other than their age and license tests passed.

Yes, unlike Jimmie, I don't KNOW everybody involved in
amateur radio. He is telepathically omniscient for He is a
PCTA and a 1x2.

>Does an accusation of "deliberate FALSIFICATION" constitute an accusation of
>dishonesty? To anyone with comprehension of the meanings of the words
>"deliberate falsification" and "dishonesty", it is clear that an accusation
>of "deliberate falsification", is, by definition, an accusation of dishonesty.

"Heah come de judge...heah come de judge...!"
- Sammy Davis Jr. on "Laugh In."

>So we have at least two claims of "dishonesty" by Mr. Anderson, supported by
>nothing but prejudice and faulty logic.

And here we've had another Epistle To The Corinthians given
by the Right Reverend Jimmie Miccolis, Judge of the Superior
Court and Administrative Prosecutor of the Church of Hiram,
the god of Ham.

>Note that Mr. Anderson acts as prosecutor, judge and jury, yet presents
>absolutely no proof whatsoever to support his claims.

Oooo! A Supreme Judge has Spoken!

"Look upon my words, ye mighty, and despair..."
[paraphrase of Shelley]

>Note also that he does not add a signature to the post.

God forbid such transgressions! Shame! No SIGNATURE
to a newsgroup post!!!

>Why should anyone take Mr. Anderson or his comments seriously, given his
proven
>track record of faulty logic, unsubstantiated claims of fraud and deliberate
>falsification against strangers, and general prejudice against ARRL and most
>radio amateurs?

Ooooo! "Most amateurs" being Miccolis, Heil, Robeson, and Kellie Of The
26 Patents. The "backfield four" of the PCTA team and Mighty Morsemen
all (Roll didn't make the line-up because his bus broke down...).

>But rather than responding to Mr. Anderson using pejoratives such as "liar"
and
>"putz", let us give him the benefit of the doubt - even though he does not do
>so to the ARRL, those who oppose his views, nor to the young hams or VEs in
>question.

Yes..."benefit of the doubt." A Spanish Inquistor could sum it up in far
fewer words...and save the eyes of the other readers...

>Perhaps Mr. Anderson simply does not remember what he wrote. Perhaps he does
>not comprehend the meaning of words like "fraud" and "dishonesty". Perhaps all
>of these claims and denials are just simple mistakes on his part. After all,
>his posts here are full of similar mistakes.

"Mistakes" again. Sigh. The Right Reverend has wound up his
Sermon on the Antenna Mount...hopefully.

ARRL can do no wrong for they are the god of Ham. Oy, veh...

>It is also clear that Mr. Anderson was not "joking" about any of his
>accusations. Although he routinely uses many "emoticons" or "smileys" in his
>posts, not a single one is used in the above post by him.

Reverend Jimmie must have rented a video of an old black and white film starring Robert Mitchum...playing a self-righteous preacher riding into a small town with LOVE tatooed on knuckles of one hand, HATE tatooed on the other hand. Tsk, tsk, he wants to BE the "Night of The Hunter."

Yah...I don't have the Right Attitude nor do I adore and cherish Mighty Morsemen of the Past. Burn the Infidel at the Stake!

Reverend Jimmie KNOWS everyone's motivations and is preaching the Gospel according to the Church of Hiram. All fear Him for He is So Serious and Righteous!

Beep, beep.

<signature here>

1225. Re: Out Of The Box?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-29 18:29:22 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030129132922.27196.00000020@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 60310

In article <20030128194825.12173.00000228@mb-mr.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <20030128112728.02295.00000280@mb-bk.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
>Robeson K4YZ) writes:
>
>>
>>>I made no claims of going for that, only that it COULD be
>>> done.
>>
>> Uh huh.
>
>Steve, there seems to be some confusion as to what Mr. Anderson has claimed
>in the past about getting an amateur radio license.
>
>Let's put aside various claims and interpretations and take a look at what Mr.
>Anderson actually wrote back on January 19, 2000. Surely no reasonable person
>would object to shining the light of Logic and Truth upon the actual post in
>question.

By all means, if it means so much to you because you think
someone is mean to you, poor baby.

Let's all Live In The Past Archives of Google and memories of
DejaNews! Your Sensibilities are hurt and you need Revenge!
:-)

>It can be found easily by searching google with the words "lenof21 Extra" and
>the phrase "out of the box". Note that Mr. Anderson was using a different
>screen name back then. He has used "Nocwtest", "Averyfine", "Lenof21",
>"Lenover21", and "Averyfineman" (all AOL names) in the past 5 years for some
>reason. Of those, at least the last three are still in use.

Oh! Oh! A Capital Offense! Someone using more than One
"official" screen name!!!

Oh, wow, someone throw out the dragnet!

In the case of Jane Ace, someone drag out the thrownet...

>So here's a paragraph-by-paragraph analysis of the post which caused all the
>fuss. Let's see what the actual accusations are. The phrases "BEGIN QUOTE",
>"PAUSE QUOTE", "RESUME QUOTE" and "END QUOTE" are used to avoid any >confusion
as who wrote what.

Oooo! A Book Of Instruction on How To Read A Message!

==========
>Such bragging does irritate me, yes, but only to a minor
>degree. What does and has bothered me for years, on and
>off, is the continual insistence that such qualities ("ham
>radio is all about CW on HF," and other Morse Myths)
>somehow "define" amateur radio's "experts." What really
>happened is that these old-timers managed to get into a
>position of influence at the ARRL and had the ARRL
>lobby the FCC to keep those "standards." They did that
>for years but the newer access to the government via the
>Internet, the dissemination of rule-change notices through
>the Internet has bypassed the ARRL. US radio amateurs
>no longer have to get information second-hand nor do they
>have to go through (by the League's insistence) their
>Section Director to "communicate their desires." Everyone,
>ham or non-ham, can go DIRECT to the FCC. The
>control of influence/lobbying of the FCC by the ARRL has
>eroded. This disturbs many who Believe in Big Brother
>to do the lobbying for them. Tough. The PUBLIC spoke
>and the FCC listened. 99-412 happened.
>
>PAUSE QUOTE
>
>The above is so full of factual errors which have been addressed elsewhere.
>Here's a quick summary:

Pizza off, Jimmie. Don't hand us all that guff about "so full of
factual errors." You're still so browned off about Not Having
The Proper Attitude About the Glory and Majesty of your idea
of amateur radio to be objective.

Opinions are opinions, boy, and you haven't understood that
yet.

Let's continue, skipping to other "juicy" stuff to satisfy Mighty
Morseman Miccolis' Need For Revenge In Newsgroups.

>Now for the most relevant quote:
>
>RESUME QUOTE:
>
>I'm going for Amateur Extra "out of the box." Maybe I'll
>make it, maybe not. The personal point is irrelevant.
>
>PAUSE QUOTE
>
>Well, there you have it. Nothing ambiguous or qualified about it at all. Not a
>claim of what could be done, or might be done, but of what he was going to do.

Bullshit, boy. Take that into the entire context of the
message...and then go "interpret" your buddie Kellie's
message text the same way you "interpreted" mine.

You can't do it, boy. You're a PCTA and so is Kellie.

>Of course there is no time frame mentioned, and it is always possible he
>changed his mind in the three years since he wrote those words. But it is
>clear he DID say he was going to get the Extra class license.

Extra WHAT? :-)

I also said around that time, elsewhere, that I would invent
antigravity and win the Nobel Prize, writing my own speech
of acceptance in Swedish! :-)

Jimmie-boy, DO NOT GET SO PEDANTIC. Do NOT go
that way, for such things can misfire on YOU!

>RESUME QUOTE
>
>What 99-412 really means is that there is no longer any
>time-in-grade "seniority" nor any morsemanship that
>indicates "superiority" of those bragextras. That applies
>to EVERYONE who wants to try...without all the
>artificialities of adhering to standards and practices of
>the 1930s held in place by old men trying to relive
>their youth by bravado and braggadoccio.

>When 99-412 goes into real restructuring in April, it
>won't change some of those tenured old men of US
>ham radio. They will be bitter, boastful, and express
>contempt of newcomers, some of which will have the
>exact same government-granted rank/status/privilege
>as all those old men who claimed they "worked" for
>theirs. Human nature doesn't change. Neither have
>they.
>
>Len
>
>END QUOTE
>
>Basically a diatribe against nameless persons whom Mr. Anderson obviously has
>some sort of grudge against. He does not consider, however, that many of those
>he rails against are "radio electronics professionals". Note that none of the
>predictions made by him 3 years ago have come to pass. Amateur radio is not
>much different today than before restructuring.

In Jimmie's world of ham radio, little changes...he works CW
for DX on HF, lives in Google, constantly talks about the
past. R&O 99-412 must have HURT his attitude-set about
US ham radio something awful!

I just love his "interpretation!" "PREDICTIONS" of three years ago!

What does Mighty Morseman Miccolis think content of a
newsgroup IS? Edicts? Papal encyclicals? Good grief...

>I included the entire post simply to demonstrate that there was nothing in any
>of it to change the interpretation of the sentence

Oooooo! Jimmie is REALLY Out For Revenge!

The OBJECTIVE "interpreter!" :-) :-) :-) :-) :-)

>"I'm going for Amateur Extra "out of the box.""
>
>It's clear to any reasonable person what that sentence means.

Jimmie, Jimmie, Jimmie...it is "clear" that you are NO
"reasonable person!" You're a PCTA...that says it all.

Okay, I'll give you another thing to let you Live in Google:

I'M GOING FOR EXTRA-OUT-OF-THE-BOX. SOME TIME.

Some time...after I've been brainwashed into thinking that
morse code will "always get through when ALL other modes
fail," that US amateur radio is not a hobby but a vital
service to this country, that amateur radio is a Way Of
Life that requires some kind of Right Attitude just like
Jimmie's, Kellie's, Steamy's (Sgt HAH Putz, that is),
the Colonel's (when he isn't innovating order-wires).

>Perhaps all of his denials are just simple mistakes on his part. After all,
his
>posts here are full of similar mistakes, as shown in the above analysis.

Absolutely on the money...to the mind of any PCTA who
Lives, Breathes, and Upholds the Amateur Radio Way of
The Olde-Timers.

I don't have the Right Attitude to fit Jimmie's little mold (or
is that 'mould'?), ergo, it is FAULTY! Error!

"Danger, Will Robinson!" :-)

>So the question I would ask of you, Steve, is this: Why let Mr. Anderson's
>mistakes, errors, and insults bother you so much?

Only his pshrink knows... :-)

>Why should anyone take him or his comments seriously?

Or YOURS...

Jimmie-boy, you just can't take negative criticsm of the
US ARS...you can't take negative criticsm of yourself.

>And why would anyone interested in the good of the ARS want him to make good
>on his intention?

Why would anyone take Jimmie Miccolis' words seriously?

That poor guy has got skin thickness measured in virtual microns, is an avowed morseman, lives in the PAST on amateur radio regulation minutae of long ago, and constantly wants everyone to Go To Google to Avenge His Wrongs.

Get with the program, boy. At least try to live for the PRESENT if you can't envision the FUTURE.

I'M GOING FOR EXTRA-OUT-OF-THE-BOX. SOME DAY.

There, have a QUOTE in caps, repeated. Make what you want from that...it will be fun to see just how innovative and "interpretive" you will be... :-)

1226. Re: Leonard's Tall Tales - Volume I

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-29 18:29:23 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030129132923.27196.00000021@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 60309

In article <3E3701BA.5D4EE245@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>It looks as if Len has been propagating an untruth for a number of
>years.
>He's as far off base on the order wire yarn as he was on the Key
>Officers listings.

Bravo on SELECTIVE QUOTING for whatever suits your
weird little outraged mind!

Now tell us more about Adventures in Guinea-Bisseau using
CW as an order-wire on an RTTY circuit. Gotta love those
tales of innovation and dering-do in a "sensitive posting!"

Now contact Sgt HAH Putz on the Admissability of Material
in this newsgroup. K4YZ has definitely said that NON-HAM
discussion in here is NOT ALLOWED!!!!

State Department postings, transmissions, modes, tall tales,
etc. are Verboten in the Official Notices posted by K4YZ
because they are NOT about amateur radio! You read it,
Obey it. K4YZ held a commission in the TN state guard
as a Communications Officer!

By the way, have you read any of W4RNL's columns at
Antennex or on his website? Ham antennas. For radio
amateurs. Can you understand anything there or do you
think it is a Greek posting? [just wondered]

Ever meet Biot or Savart? Cool pair. They made a law.
How about Maxwell? That's not just an old car, ya know.

Here, have a cashew nut...it'll remind you of old times...

1227. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-29 18:29:24 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030129132924.27196.00000022@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 60308

In article <f45722ac.0301282134.6b58bd50@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>Steve, I really don't know where you're comment is coming from.
>
>Have you ever used HF comms in the service? Were they not encrypred?

Ol' "Steam" never did any HF comms in any service.

He was the "communications officer" of a whole TN state
"brigade." That means he probably answered the telephone
once a month at their meetings. :-)

Someone (probably Hall Monitor Heil) will make lots of hay
about your typo of substituting an r for a t in encrypted,
but you've gone beyond "Steam's" communication-outside-
of-ARRL-documents knowledge. Steamy probably thinks
encryption = morse code.

Or...Steamy will make Much Ado About Nothing by screaming
that you can't mention anything Outside of Ham Radio!!!!!! :-)

US amateur radio expressly forbids any method or modulation
or mode or whatever "that obscures the meaning of the
transmission." That makes it very obscure how he could
possibly pass any conventional amateur radio license
examination...he obscures his own reading attitude by some
weird emotion filter...a built-in very low S/N ratio... :-)

1228. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-29 19:10:00 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301291109.65cc63c8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60311

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030129104531.24796.00000283@mb-bh.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 1/28/03 11:56 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0301282156.22316415@posting.google.com>
>
> >Len's opinion of the cult of amateur radio isn't far off the mark.
>
> It's so far off the mark as to be laughable. That you think it isn't
> makes me rethink the "concilliatory" language I've been trying to take with
> you.
>
> My bust.

Concilliatory? Thanks for going easy on me, Steve.

1229. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-29 19:18:47 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301291118.3a0b694c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60312

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030129104531.24796.00000283@mb-bh.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 1/28/03 11:56 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0301282156.22316415@posting.google.com>
>
> >We ought to be able to eliminate the code exam for free American
> >amateurs.
>
> There are Amateurs imprisoned over Morse Code? I know Flippo and Burton
> are in jail for QRMing and unlicensed operation, but WHO is in jail over Code?

Steve, I don't know who is in jail over Code. Why do you ask?

1230. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-29 19:37:39 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301291137.3c41634@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60313

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030129104531.24796.00000283@mb-bh.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 1/28/03 11:56 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0301282156.22316415@posting.google.com>
> >He's said that we're full of OF's that cling to the past. If you
> >can't see that, then you're part of the problem.
>
> Let's see...."clings to the past"...
>
> Hmmmm....I certainly AM active on CW on HF...But Wait! There's More!
>
> EME...(building a station)...airborne telemetery for DASH surveillence,
> mentoring, ATV...
>
> Whew...Could go on, but why...??? I've helped dozens of NEW hams get on
> the air, almost all of which have been Post 1991 and post "Restructuring"
> licensees.
>
> No one in any club I belong to (three) even remotely supports "clinging to
> the past". Nothing I read in ANY periodical suggests that Amateur Radio
> "cling to the past" other than the usual historical interest expressed by ANY
> group in it's development. Every major periodical is ripe with new technology
> and techniques articles.
>
> Nothing, Brian...

Code Testing.

1231. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-29 19:42:13 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301291142.46cd677e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60314

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030129091227.24796.00000278@mb-bh.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 1/28/03 11:34 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0301282134.6b58bd50@posting.google.com>
>
> >Have you ever used HF comms in the service? Were they not encrypred?
>
> Yes. Some were, some were not.
>
> Extended response sent to Brian via e mail.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Read it. You proved yourself invaluable and saved face for the US Forces.

Was that butter bar your "Commander?"

1232. Re: ARNewsline 1328 - Jan 24 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-29 21:11:59 UTC
From: K<unk>HB <k<unk>hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <zsXZ9.3076$wd2.241787@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 60315

Why is it drivel?

Because it puts the lie to K1MAN's pseudo heroic declaration of a Level III emergency or some such lame self aggrandizement?

Sunuvagun! So sue me!

<unk><unk><unk> 73, de Hans, K0HB
--
Help support youth involved in Amateur Radio.
http://www.mnyarc.org
http://www.k0bsa.org

"Lloyd" <Lloyd@LloydChief14313.net> wrote in message
news:b18j8c$am6$0@pita.alt.net...
: Pasternak continues to SPAM Usenet with his worthless
: drivel.

: >
: > RESCUE RADIO: US HAMS NOT NEEDED IN MEXICAN QUAKE
: >
: > Mexico's telecommunications system is working properly following a major
: > earthquake and communications assistance from the United States is not
: > needed. The quake hit in Nortth-West Mexicio. It registered 7.6 on the
: > Richter scale, toppled dozens of homes, killed at least 24 people and
: > injuring at about 175. And while telephone service in several remote
: > areas was knocked out for a time, the Mexican government got it quickly
: > restored. Also, Mexico's own ham radio community has decasdes of
: > experience making outside aid not necessary in many cases.

1233. Re: Out Of The Box?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-29 21:50:06 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E384C8C.5860DFAC@att.net>
Source record: 60316

N2EY wrote:

>
> So the question I would ask of you, Steve, is this: Why let Mr. Anderson's
> mistakes, errors, and insults bother you so much? Why should anyone take him or
> his comments seriously?
>

Ya got it, James OM. Why waste time even paying attention to a pair of gasbags such as he and his
minor clone T5-Slim Burke? Such a pair of gasbags of proportions such as to make the Hindenberg
look like a party baloon does make one wonder when they'll fire off in similar fashion.

Defintely a collosal waste of time and talent. For such drivel is clearly the extent of their talent.

> And why would anyone interested in the good of the ARS want him to make good on
> his intention?

I can't imagine that'll ever be much of a problem, can you?

Dick

1234. Re: Claims Of Dishonesty

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-29 22:11:07 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030129171107.08900.00000264@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 60317

>Subject: Re: Claims Of Dishonesty
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 1/29/03 12:29 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030129132919.27196.00000019@mb-ba.aol.com>

>Wanna-be pediatrics expert Jimmie Miccolis seems to think
> that ALL six-year-olds have full comprehension of reading
> along with full judgement of responsibility at that age.

It's not about wether or not these kids did or did not have comprehension
of the material.

It's wether or not you said what you said.

You have not answered why you made an accusation you ahve not backed up
with evidence.

>I would assume that nearly all parents of THEIR children
> would claim that...(SNIP)

Quick, Lennie...remind us how many children YOU have sired and raised?

>I still don't "present any proof" because any trip to a large
> market with kids in tow of mamas or any visit to a first-grade
> classroom will demonstrate to ANY observer that first-graders
> do NOT have adult or even teen-age reading ability OR
> comprehension of difficult subjects involving science and law.

The "proof" is you delivering the hard evidence of YOUR allegations of
dishonesty.

I for one have no doubt the kids did not use a "cheat sheet" or other
unethical aid, and I have no doubt the examiners made no effort to "prompt"
them or "fudge" the grading process.

Does this mean the kids "knew" the material? That's irrelevent. If an
adult can read and re-read a "study guide" to the point of recognizing the
questions, so what if a 6 year old does it? A 60 year old?

>>Also never mentioned is the fact that most people taking the test would
>>probably have seen the questions and answers before, with plenty of time to
>>learn unfamiliar words and phrases.

> "Most people!" Jimmie KNOWS "most people."

Complete the sentence, Your Lameness. "Most people taking the test". In
that specific contest, he is right. This is a known fact. One need but stand
at the door of any VE session and watch the last minute cramming.

>Pity he was 8 years late getting his first license...missed all the
> "fun and activity" of late-night beeping, saving the Titanic, etc.

And you've been....70 plus years late...?!?!

>Yup. Jimmie thinks ARRL is the god of Ham.

As opposed to you who IS "god of Ham"...?!?!

(...see me choking back the laughter!)

>And here we've had another...(SNIP)

...example of Lennie the Lame doing one of his tent revival sermons
against the person asking the questions...but NOT answering the questions.

>>Note that Mr. Anderson acts as prosecutor, judge and jury, yet presents
>>absolutely no proof whatsoever to support his claims.
>
> Oooo! A Supreme Judge has Spoken!

Nope. Absolue fact. You made accusations you cannot or will not
substantiate.

You got caught lying...

Again.

>"Mistakes" again. Sigh. The Right Reverend has wound up his
> Sermon on the Antenna Mount...hopefully.

I am sure you ARE hopeful...Hopeful that you successfully obfuscated the
context of Jim's post and hopeful that you can blow enough smoke as to avoid
the truth that you are caught lying again.

>Reverend Jimmie KNOWS everyone's motivations and is
> preaching the Gospel according to the Church of Hiram. All
> fear Him for He is So Serious and Righteous!

We don't have to know "everyone's", Lennie...Just you.

Lying creep.

Steve, K4YZ

1235. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-29 22:14:13 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E385232.1ABB9D56@att.net>
Source record: 60318

N2EY wrote:

>
> > > >: But since the WBFD is at least the size of a G5RV or trap dipole, and
> > > >: costs at least as much as a conventional dipole plus a tuner, it is a
> > > >: mystery why any ham would use a WBFD.
>
> Rewrite that to to read "a mystery why any knowledgeable ham would use
> a WBFD in preference to an dipole of equal size".

No one I know would. But make no mistake, they are a useful solution to some HF antenna problems, and are
in useful service at some ham stations where multiple antennas of better efficiency are simply not
possible. My only experiences with the B&W WBFD (at work) surprised me very much. They performed much
better than I ever expected, having previously viewed them as aircooled dummy loads. Clearly their
efficiency is variable and beyond the fact that maximum efficiency must be limited by the resistive
loading, is just as clearly is largely dependent on the operating frequency in use. On higher frequencies
they certainly work acceptably well while on lower bands the term "aircooled dummy load" is no misnomer.

Although I picked up a "bargain" used B&W unit when I ran accross one, I did so mainly for the wideband
balun and large terminating resistor, worth more than what I paid. Under some circumstances I might indeed
string it up intact, or modify it to my own requirements of the moment. But so far I've been quite happy
with individual dipoles, even when operating in temporary locations. I usually hang one cut for 20 meters
in inverted vee style with the ends low enough to reach from the ground, and cut a pair or two of extension
wires with alligator clips to hang on the ends when I want to drop down to 30 or 40. and let the autotuner
do it's thing.

But I would never count the WBFD out, after having used one for a few years to meet several HF statewide
nets where ALL the couple dozen net stations were also using them successfully and where no one experienced
anything but success. They're not just junk. In fact, it struck me at the time that one could recalibrate

his S-meter and never know the difference!

Dick

1236. Re: Out Of The Box?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-29 22:16:53 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030129171653.08900.00000265@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 60319

>Subject: Re: Out Of The Box?
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 1/29/03 12:29 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030129132922.27196.00000020@mb-ba.aol.com>

>Let's all Live In The Past Archives of Google and memories of
> DejaNews! Your Sensibilities are hurt and you need Revenge!

Truth is truth, Lennie. The archives have chronicled your misdeeds. You did this to yourself.

You've been busted. Let your psycho wife rationalize you out of that one.

Oh...excuse me...psychologist...My bust. Sorry.

Steve, K4YZ

1237. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-29 22:24:10 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030129172410.08900.00000266@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 60321

>Subject: Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 1/29/03 1:08 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0301291108.3262fd42@posting.google.com>

>Example #1. Just Sunday, you lied when you said this:
>--------------
>Message 6 in thread
>From: Steve Robeson K4YZ (k4yz@aol.com)
>Subject: Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It
>
>View this article only
>Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
>Date: 2003-01-26 20:18:44 PST
>
>>Subject: Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It
>>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>>Date: 1/26/03 9:16 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <f45722ac.0301261916.6b572c5d@posting.google.com>
>>I think Steve went to mental jump school as he's been limping along
>>for some time now.
>
> Perhaps...but I have two things on you and Lennie.
>
> (1) I don't lie.
>
> (2) I know the diffrence between an authorization to operate and
>validity
>for DXCC.
>-------------
>You have nothing "on" me.

Yes, I do. Countless assertions by you that you were "authorized" to
operate from Somalia.

You have not provided it.

United Nations regulations on the subject are available from on-line
sources. You did not meet the criteria as an authorized operator.

>First, you do lie.

OK...You have yet to provide that evidence too.

Are you following Lennie the Lame's example of "Accuse then dodge"...?!?!

>Second, I do know the difference between the FCC and the ARRL. I'm
>the one asking the others if they are confused by it.

Screwed up again, Brian. No one said ANYTHING about teh FCC. Again, you CANNOT keep your situational awareness straight.

>You just posted that I have no expeditionary medals. Do you want me
>to dig that one out, too?

No, I clearly said I DOUBT you have any. I did not say you didn't.

>I also know the difference between a Commander and any other officer.
>Do you want me to dig that one out, too?

Be my guest, Brain. You have nothing to show. As a matter of fact, I DARE you to show a statement of fact or assertions saying anything to the contrary.

>Control your emotions and your "liar quotient" will go down.

See a proctologist, Brian, and the likelyhood that you'll see the light is exponentially increased.

>Use the Force, Luke.

Just the fact, ma'am. You made the allegations...Now prove them.

Steve, K4YZ

1238. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-29 22:25:09 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030129172509.08900.00000267@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 60322

>Subject: Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 1/29/03 1:11 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0301291111.5d8e5b35@posting.google.com>

>Please, Steve, with the possible exception of Mad Dog Mike, don't tell
>another lie.

Please quote from Google where I did, Brain.

Steve, K4YZ

1239. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-29 22:27:13 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030129172713.08900.00000268@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 60323

>Subject: Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 1/29/03 1:16 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0301291116.5831a623@posting.google.com>

>You say that there are other IMMEDIATE issues..., but stated none.

CC & R pre-emptions, spectrum protection, VEC examiner liability, to name
a few.

Steve, K4YZ

1240. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-29 22:33:02 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030129173302.08900.00000269@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 60324

>Subject: Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 1/29/03 1:34 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0301291134.464131e9@posting.google.com>

>But, in a sense, you are right. For example, I've cited where the
>ARRL VEC and others are in violation of FCC Part 97 with respect to
>Morse Code testing. The ARRL VEC has taken it upon itself to
>substitute a Farnsworth exam at 13-15 wpm for the Part 97 specified
>Morse Code exam at 5 wpm. The FCC appears to be OK with it, as
>enforcement is too much work, and revising the regulations is too much
>work.

Please demonstrate where the character spacing technique is even an issue
in the regulations, Brian. This horse has been beaten, too, and proven to be
irrelevent.

The FCC interprets the "Farnsworth question" to be like the Coke-vs-Pepsi
taste tests. Who cares?

>So bad laws are ignored. Ignoring a law, however, is very different
>from enforcing a law.

Who defines what is a bad law, Brian? You? Lennie?

Youse guys confer and get back to me.

1241. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-29 22:35:37 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030129173537.08900.00000270@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 60325

>Subject: Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 1/29/03 1:37 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0301291137.3c41634@posting.google.com>

>Code Testing.

You quote three paragraphs I wrote then simple reply with the words "code testing".

Run out of ideas? "Code testing" what?

Whew.

Steve, K4YZ

1242. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-29 22:41:27 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030129174127.08900.00000271@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 60326

>Subject: Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 1/29/03 1:42 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0301291142.46cd677e@posting.google.com>

>Was that butter bar your "Commander?"

What "butter bar"...?!?!

I've never had a SECOND Lieutenant as ANY kind of "commander".

>Read it. You proved yourself invaluable and saved face for the US Forces.

I was not "invaluable" (I did my job) and I did not "save face" for the US Forces...I kept one company grade officer from wasting her time. The rest was just anecdotal and answered your question about encryption on HF. WITH specific references.

Steve, K4YZ

1243. Re: Leonard's Tall Tales - Volume I

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-29 22:49:26 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030129174926.08900.00000272@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 60327

>Subject: Re: Leonard's Tall Tales - Volume I
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 1/29/03 12:29 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030129132923.27196.00000021@mb-ba.aol.com>

>Now tell us more about Adventures in Guinea-Bisseau using
> CW as an order-wire...(SNIP)

Now tell us bumpbump Now tell us bumpbump Now tell us bumpbump Now tell us bumpbump now tell us bumpbump...

>Now contact Sgt HAH Putz on the Admissability of Material
> in this newsgroup. K4YZ has definitely said that NON-HAM
> discussion in here is NOT ALLOWED!!!!

Ooooops! Lennie is LYING! I have NEVER said any "NON-HAM discussion is NOT ALLOWED!!!!"

I HAVE repeated that your insistence on discussing MILITARY communicaiotns in an Amateur Radio forum is NOT GERMANE, and your further insistence on doing it violates your own "rules" on "Admissibility".

Nothing you did in the Armed Forces (or allege to have done, I should say), has any bering on Amateur Radio.

Shall we dig out quotes where YOU have chastised others for doing the same thing? Like where I asked a question about a model kit? You at once gave me a very nice, even civil reply, but then immeidately followed it up with a blistering "it doesn't belong here" rant.

Pot/kettle/black

Steve, K4YZ

1244. Re: Claims Of Dishonesty

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-29 22:51:24 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030129175124.08900.00000273@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 60328

>Subject: Re: Claims Of Dishonesty
>From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
>Date: 1/29/03 5:18 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <ijZZ9.192$4y4.180187@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>

>There's no requirement that anyone has to be able to read and write to take
>the test. I have been at VE sessions where an ADULT was not literate enough
>to read the test so it was read to him. Being unable to read and write,
>doesn't stop a person from memorizing the questions and the answers to those
>questions and thus being capable of passing the test.

Exactly.

73

Steve, K4YZ

1245. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-29 23:01:38 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301291501.5563d709@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60329

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030129132924.27196.00000022@mb-ba.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0301282134.6b58bd50@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >Steve, I really don't know where you're comment is coming from.
> >
> >Have you ever used HF comms in the service? Were they not encrypred?
>
> Ol' "Steam" never did any HF comms in any service.

Says he did, at least during an exercise.

1246. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-29 23:15:20 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301291515.7ff3c2d9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60330

jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu (Jeffrey Herman) wrote in message
news:<b1929n$6ad$1@news.hawaii.edu>...
> Brian <brianburke@juno.com> wrote:

> >I was an unlicensed ARRL member. No problems. The local library is
> >apparently an unlicensed member also.
>
> You mean the librarian? Someone (a person) had to sign the NCI
> "petition."
>
> 73, Jeff KH6O

Jeff, the local library has a copy of QST on the shelf. NCI has no
such publication. If they did I would ask for them to mail one to
your infamous PO Box.

1247. Re: Claims Of Dishonesty

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-29 23:18:38 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <ijZZ9.192$4y4.180187@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 60320

I'm not going to quote all the back and forth on this but simply want to add some comments.

There's no requirement that anyone has to be able to read and write to take the test. I have been at VE sessions where an ADULT was not literate enough to read the test so it was read to him. Being unable to read and write, doesn't stop a person from memorizing the questions and the answers to those questions and thus being capable of passing the test.

1248. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-30 01:45:47 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030129204547.27873.00000300@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 60332

In article <b1937m$645$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030128083623.05048.00000263@mb-cs.aol.com...
>> In article <OulZ9.1420$N5.819411@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>>
>> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> >news:20030126215637.20835.00000270@mb-fy.aol.com...
>> >>>
>> >> Are there more than 3400 current NCI members?
>> >
>> >Yes ...
>>
>> How many?
>
>What difference does it make?

Carl made a point of ARRL membership numbers and percentages. He also claimed
that the procodetest opinion was a minority view.
>
>> And since there are no dues nor membership expirations, how do you know if
>> a
>> "current member" still exists?
>
>What difference does it make?
>
The member totals get inflated. The numbers indicate how many people have
joined in the lifetime of the organization, not hwo many are currently active.
Like JA operator licenses. Imagine the screaming if ARRL did that...

>> >> >Nor, I might point out, does ARRL's membership constitute a majority
>> >> >of US hams ... more like a bit less than 25% IIRC the last numbers I
>> >> >noticed.
>> >>
>> >> Quite true. Nor does ARRL claim to constitute a majority, either.

See what I mean?
>> >
>> >ARRL claims to be "THE National Society for Amateur Radio" ...
>>
>> Is there another national society for amateur radio?
>>
>> NCI cannot claim to be one, because

>>
>> a) it is "international"
>> b) its sole stated purpose is to end stand-alone Morse code testing.
>>
>> What other "national society for amateur radio" exists in the USA?
>
>As before...what difference does all this make?

Carl and others have made an issue out of ARRL being "THE national society...".
But there is no other "national society for amateur radio" in the USA, so
ARRL's claim is perfectly accurate.
>
>> >they
>> >most certainly claim to speak for all when they file comments with the
>> >FCC etc.
>>
>> How?
>>
>> >Not directly in so many words, but it is CLEARLY implied.
>>
>> Where? Where does ARRL claim to speak for all?
>>
>> ARRL's membership number is clearly stated. Not a secret in any way.
>>
>> What is NCI's current membership, give or take 1%? Why has that number
>> been
>> such a closely guarded secret?
>>
Well? If NCI's Executive Director can make a point of ARRL member numbers and
percentages, the same rules of discussion should apply to NCI member numbers
and percentages.

>> >Fortunately, the FCC understands the reality.
>>
>> The FCC clearly does not interpret ARRL's words as claiming "to speak for
>>all
>> when they file comments with the FCC etc." Such an implication exists only
>>in
>> the minds of a few. Those few infer what is not implied.
>>
>> Does FCC know NCI's current membership, give or take 1%? Why has that
>>number
>> been such a closely guarded secret?
>>
Well?

>> Anyone who comments to the FCC is, by definition, telling the FCC that
>> their
>> ideas represent what is best. Of course "best for whom?" is a different
>> question. Some comments, like one that demanded an age limit of 14 years
>> for

>> any class of amateur license, do not represent what is best for the ARS.
>>
>> Is there another amateur radio society in the USA that provides even 1% of
>> the
>> services ARRl provides to the amateur radio community?
>
Answer: NO.

>I am both an ARRL member and a volunteer in ARRL field activities (LGL).
>I am also a director of NCI.

No problem belonging to both, either.

>Frankly, I don't see any value to this
>discussion
>since it is meaningless in the ongoing policy discussions and has been for
>some time.

Then why did NCI's Executive Director bring up ARRL membership figures as a discussion point - not just now, but several times in the past? What's good for the ARRL goose should be equally good for the NCI gander.
>
>Turns out the FCC listens to ARRL, NCI and anyone else that has anything
>credible to say...and in the end the FCC decides what to do.

Yup - been that way a long long time.

Anyone else know who the "National Amateur Radio Council" and the "Society of American Radio Amateurs" were, and what they accomplished? Quite interesting, really.

>Hell, it works for me...not to mention that NCI's track record
>with seeing NCI viewpoints taken by the FCC has been pretty
>darn good.

Considering that NCI is a one-issue organization, the tendency would be to either have very high or very low success.

But why all the secrecy about membership numbers?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1249. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-30 01:45:48 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030129204548.27873.00000301@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 60331

In article <b1929n$6ad$1@news.hawaii.edu>, jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:

>>N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote
>
>>> Membership is free and does not expire. Only way a member becomes a
>>> nonmember is to request removal. Which has been done in at least two
>>> cases that I know of.
>
>Membership in NCI sounds more like signing a petition than anything
>else.

Not exactly. All anyone has to do is visit their website, fill in an online application, and click the appropriate places to affirm that they want to be a member and agree with certain policies of NCI. Membership numbers are assigned sequentially, starting with 1000 or 1001. No license required, no dues, communication to members by email and website.

>>I'm one and I'm current. Donations are accepted to help cover costs.

The only way members are removed from the rolls is by request. This can be a request from the member him/herself, from a family member in the case of a deceased ham, or by request of the NCI BoD if a member behaves in a way prohibited by the by-laws.
>
>I asked:
>>>> Were/are they all licensed hams? How many were/are coded hams?
>
>>> Unknown - neither is a requirement of membership.
>
>Now I'm really convinced that NCI membership = signing a petition.
>
No signature required.

None of this is privileged info - it's all been discussed here.

>>I was an unlicensed ARRL member. No problems. The local library is
>>apparently an unlicensed member also.
>
>You mean the librarian?

Libraries can get QST subscriptions, but are not counted as members.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1250. Re: MARS opinions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-30 03:04:14 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030129220414.21366.00000798@mb-mu.aol.com>
Source record: 60333

In article <7a475dae.0301281250.4cda6845@posting.google.com>,
gadget@easypath.com (Jim) writes:

>Hello all,
>
> I'm thinking of joining one of the MARS groups in the NY area, and
>I'd like to hear anyone's opinion as to which group may be the best.
>I'm interested in helping with military functions and/or being
>available "just in case".
> I'm new to ham radio, but I learn very quick. I have experience as a
>Police/Fire/EMS dispatcher and have worked some local disasters. I'd
>probably be most comfortable in a progressive and active group.
> From listening in my area it seems the Air Force MARS is most active
>in voice, but I've heard little other than reads of old regulations
>and check-ins for time logging.
> I'm very experienced in computer technology, and would be most
>interested in digital radio/modem work.
>
> Any thoughts guys?
>
>Appreciate you comments,
>Jim/KC2KIW

Jim:

I used to be active in MARS while stationed in Germany (call sign AFA7LR). I was involved mainly in handling RTTY message traffic from our main station on base, but used to check into the phone nets from my home station. They were deadly BORING. If you get off on strictly routine comms, then MARS is for you! However, their digital mode operations may indeed be interesting.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1251. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-30 03:13:40 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0301291913.6de98ea0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60334

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0301290826.44224c2@posting.google.com>...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0301281641.566bb178@posting.google.com>...
> > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030128062207.12173.00000216@mb-mr.aol.com>...
> > > In article <oliZ9.6698$d66.604847@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
> > > <kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG> writes:
> > >
> > > >"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
> > > >
> > > >:
> > > >: But since the WBFD is at least the size of a G5RV or trap dipole, and
> > > >: costs at least as much as a conventional dipole plus a tuner, it is a
> > > >: mystery why any ham would use a WBFD.
>
> Rewrite that to to read "a mystery why any knowledgeable ham would use
> a WBFD in preference to an dipole of equal size".
> > >
> > > >Translation: N.I.H.
> > >
> > > Do you mean "Not Invented Here", Hans?
> > >
> > > If so, that's not the case. The WBFD has been around a long time - I learned
> > > about it from a 1948 QST article.
> > >
> > > What the WBFD offers is convenience at the price of efficiency. As both an EE
> > > and amateur radio operator, I say the tradeoff is not worthwhile for most
> > > amateur radio applications.
> > >
> > > Tell us, Hans - would YOU use a WBFD at your ham station instead of a
> > > conventional dipole of equivalent size?
> >
> > Not hardly. Without fear of contradiction I'll state that Our Chief
> > sure as hell was not running a goofyass t2fd on 7.037 that mememorable
> > nite a piece back when he boomed the whole frigging NA continent and
> > cleaned house at 30 over.
>
> Who knows what he was running? A "3-30 MHz" WBFD in the clear 100+
> feet above the prairie will prolly do a half-decent job on 40 meters,
> 'specially if fed enough suds. If the thing is only 10% efficient, it
> just brings the 1500 W boys down to barefoot-and-a-dipole level.

That's physically possible but it's an extremely improbable scenario. Anybody in their right minds who can get an antenna up at 100 feet is not about to waste that kind of precious height on a lousy antenna. Particulalry on 40 where decent antennas don't need much real estate.

> Remember, it was 40 on a good evening, and Hans is in the midwest.
> Heck, I work the West Coast with my low inverted V and 100 homebrew
> watts under those conditions - on 80 meters.

Not with a signal like Hans pumped in here that nite ya don't. I tuned around before I called the net, there were a flock of midwesterners on the air then and Hans *buried* 'em. I'll stick, he was not using a wideband, lossy antenna like a t2fd or anything like it and the chances are that he was running suds too.

>
> --
>
> "T2FD" stands for "tilted, terminated, folded dipole". Originally
> meant to be a nondirectional, frequency-insensitive RECEIVING antenna,
> fed with balanced line. Really cutting-edge stuff a half-century ago -
> hook one to yer R-390 and there's no need to fool with the antenna
> trimmer. Or run the T2FD into a multichannel "antenna coupler" (which
> most hams would call an "active splitter" and feed a bank of HF RXs
> tuned to different freqs. No adjustment required.

Which is exactly what the gummint did on HF and probably still does in pockets. There are gobs of old photos floating around of racks fulla military 390s listening on widely-separated HF freqs. That's not how hams play the antenna game then or now, not even close.

> The interesting thing is that some folks are of the mindset that "if
> the govt. and military use it, it MUST be the best". They disregard
> the differences between the govt's needs and resources vs. hams. (You
> see that sort of thinking all the time here on rrap).

Ya sorta got me there, I haven't noticed much posted around here about using gummint radio equipmemnt in the ham bands. Makes no sense, certainly military radio gear with maybe an exception or two simply doesn't meet the average ham's operating & technolgy implementation needs. This ain't ARC-5 days, we've come a long way baby and the miltary has too but in vastly different directions. Including the antennas.

> Manufacturer's
> advertising hype doesn't help, either.

They oughta add a question to the pool: "Antenna advertisers (a) Never lie (b) Only lie sometimes (c) Always lie.

_._.

>
> If some ham with more bucks than brains gives me a hard time about the

> T2FD/WBFD, I don't argue anymore.

Especially when they're firmly established village idiots whose real
hobby is trolling RRAP.

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

1252. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-30 03:33:19 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3E389CFF.E04285C@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 60335

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>
> I would do anything to possess a complete archive of all messages I've
> posted on Fidonet/Usenet over the past dozen years. My old computer's
> hard drive has about a couple of years's worth of the old Fidonet stuff,
> but none of my early Usenet postings.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

google claims to have copies of most every post ever posted, IIRC.
But I don't know if they go that far back. I first got on the usenet
as rfc@philabs.philips.com back in 1987. A few years later I was
wa2ise@cbnewsb.att.com and then wa2ise@netcom and then
my current address. But I haven't looked to see what google
has on me...

1253. Re: Claims Of Dishonesty

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-30 04:16:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030129231646.05408.00000330@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 60338

In article <f45722ac.0301290522.a0dee0@posting.google.com>, brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20030128194823.12173.00000227@mb-mr.aol.com>...
>>
>> In article <20021201183714.00112.00000794@mb-fz.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>> writes:
>>
>> >In article <20021201133916.21441.00000449@mb-mc.aol.com>, j1aguiar@aol.com
>> >(J1aguiar) writes:
>>
>> >Accusing the VECs of falsifying test results is pretty serious stuff, btw.
>Do
>> >you have any solid evidence?
>>
>> VEC test sessions are NOT monitored by anyone else DURING
>> testing. All that is monitored is the FCC scanning over test
>> RESULTS sent to them by the VEC teams.
>>
>> PAUSE QUOTE
>>
>> Despite the unnecessary shouting, this first paragraph is just a
>restatement of
>> the obvious. Note that FCC has not had any reservations about the testing
>of
>> young children for amateur radio exams, nor of the VE session in question.
>
>Now it is obvious that exams are NOT monitored? Unfrigginbelievable;
>what unpalatable concessions are made in the effort to hang Len.
>
>You might want to clue in buddy Dick Carrol/W0EX. He thinks otherwise
>and you had -ample- opportunity to correct him at the time.
>
>I'll spell it out very clearly: PCTA Double Standard.

Careful, Brian, Reverend Jimmie might be Out To Getcha!

Check for tatoos on his knuckles if you see him... :-)

1254. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-30 04:16:48 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030129231648.05408.00000332@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 60337

In article <3E37D5EF.8D05931D@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <3E366D23.DBC4D171@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >I've believe he has you clocked, Leonard.
>>
>> That "clock" is broken, doesn't tell time, chimes only when the
>> key winder is upset at time lookers not viewing with the
>> proper Heilian attitude. :-)
>
>As stated, I believe he has you clocked.

With WHAT? The poor guy can't press the buttons on a stop
watch because his skin is so thin he keeps bleeding...

>> Why not tell us more about Heil's Adventures in Guinea-Bisseau,
>> that important center of communications innovation and trial?
>
>So you can begin a new series of bald faced lies?

Lie about WHAT, colonel...I say, WHAT?

I was never in Guinea-Bisseau. Never heard of it before your
tale, had to look it up in the CIA Factbook. Wow, an
"important" country to world trade...they supply the world
with cashew nuts, their chief export.

Go ahead, go nuts...

Well, I AM clean-shaven...no mistake on that, son...I say
clean-shaven, boy, hear me? :-)

<signature here>

1255. Re: Why Dave has such a p*ss poor attitude

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-30 04:16:48 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030129231648.05408.00000331@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 60339

In article <3E37CDF7.3663EABD@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> In article <3E3676F7.7C44606B@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>> >>
>> >> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>> >> news:3E3432E5.8266EB56@earthlink.net...

>> >Nobody works 24/7, much less 24/7/365--not even Leonard H.
>>
>> Well, "there you have it, Carl..." :-)
>>
>> "Nobody" is on call or works as long as they are ordered, not
>> military members, not police or sheriff's deputies, not firemen
>> or paramedics (of professional fire departments), or Real MDs
>> on ER duty in hospitals or those on-call after office hours. Not
>> utility workers, either, like those who repaired the damage to
>> electric power or gas and water lines after the Loma Prieta or
>> Northridge earthquakes out here.
>
>Being on call is not working 24/7. Military members are given
>opportunities to sleep. None of the people described work round the
>clock for a week--none of them.

Oh, my, pedantry strikes again... :-(

"24/7" is a common coloquialism for "continuous operation."

Herr Robust is running out of ammunition for his tireless
tirade throwing.

UNITS work 24/7. Organizations work 24/7. Police and
fire and medical public safety units work 24/7. Some
supermarkets even work 24/7.

>> "NOBODY works 24/7" according to Heil. None. Zip. Nada.
>>
>> Sigh...must have been cushy duty in some State Deptartment
>> postings or in USAF units "that worked with NASA." :-)
>
>Don't you have enough egg on your face for a single week? I'll settle
>for a single example of someone who is actually working 24 hours per

>day, seven days per week.

In late 1945 the 71st Signal Service Battalion was organized, built a transmitter site on a man-made island in Tokyo Bay called Tsukishima. That transmitter site operated continuously, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week until it was moved to an abandoned airfield near the city of Kashiwa, northeast of the city of Tokyo during the years of 1954 and 1955. Operation never ceased...as circuits were downed at Tsukishima they were upped at Kashiwa. The callsign was ADA. Operation continued by the US Army until 1963 when the USAF took over all HF transmitters, receivers, torn-tape relay. Kashiwa remained in continuous operation until 1978 when the necessity for HF communications circuits as a primary means were no longer needed by the USAF.
That's 1978 - 1945 = 33 years of continuous operation by USA and USAF units of about 1000 strength, respectively.

The 71st was renamed the FEC Sig Svc Bn in late 1953 and merged with the 72nd Sig Svc Bn at Camp Zama in 1958 to form the Japan Signal Service Battalion with 7 companies total. Downsizing of US military units continued over the following years until the only Honshu island signal unit left was the 78th Sig Svc Bn at Camp Zama (the old 71st and 72nd combined after two more unit name changes). They are under command of the 516th Signal Brigade at Fort Shafter, Hawaii, that brigade attached to Headquarters, US Army Pacific. Members of the 78th still wear the Fuji patch on the left shoulder that I and thousands of others wore proudly years before. The callsign ADA is now that for the Headquarters USARPAC. It still lives about 57 1/2 years later.

The 78th Signal battalion doesn't operate on HF continuously anymore but the have an HF detachment to maintain that as a fallback emergency feature. That battalion DOES operate 24/7 for DSN maintenance and some microwave circuits.

>This excludes someone who works the
>occasional long stretch. Come up with someone who has actually put in
>148 continuous hours.

I've just come up with someone who used to be in the US government who is a pedant plus but cannot do simple arithmetic. There are 168 hours in a week, senior, not 148.

Next time order your eggs fried. They aren't so messy looking on your face...

<signature here>

1256. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-30 04:16:50 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030129231650.05408.00000333@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 60341

In article <3E37D4FE.B4856451@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> In article <3E367B14.3D42354F@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:

>> >> Amateur radio is a fun hobby, a recreation.
>> >
>> >How would you know?
>>
>> I've read the "official" ARRL output on amateur radio. :-)
>
>C'mon, Len. How would you know that amateur radio is a "fun hobby",
>having never been a participant?

My apologies, Herr Robust. I didn't know one had to have
PASSED A TEST FOR FUN to understand what "fun"
and "hobbies" are...!

I'll run right out and contact for the FFC, the Federal Fun
Commision, and apply for an FC, a Fun Credential. :-)

>> Of course, according to Heil, Robeson, Miccolis, and all
>> the PCTAs, it must be done in an "official" manner,
>> always working HF, CW whenever possible, and observing
>> all DX within sight and hearing.
>> - US amateur service general order #1
>
>This is more of you as described by N2EY. I don't only work HF and
>don't only chase DX. I certainly spend no more than half my air time
>using CW.

Bull-y for you. Code speed not up to par?

>> Tell us more about Guinea-Bisseau and how it compares to
>> a Scandinavian country. Does the US State Department radio
>> in Finland use CW as an order-wire on RTTY circuits too?
>
>What U.S. State Department radio in Finland?

You mean to tell us the US State Department DIDN'T HAVE ANY
RADIO IN FINLAND?!?!? Good grief, that's an extraordinary
revelation!

Was that information cleared through official sources?

>> Was there thin ice in Guinea-Bisseau?
>
>Club Galleon.

Any dish of cashews at the bar? :-)

Wow! High life in downtoun Guinea-Bisseau!

>I could have sworn you were just pretending to be one, despite your
>present claim to the contrary. What temperature do your Obsession and
>Hate-Rage posts generate?

About 3 Kelvin. Too hot for you, iceman? :-) :-)

>> For "credentials" in psychology, I can call on my own
>> consultant, my wife, who has two Masters degrees (both
>> from University of Illinois) with one of those being in Social
>> Work. She was a licensed private counselor in the states
>> of Illinois and Washington for a number of years. She has
>> Robeson...and you as well...tagged, labeled, pickled, and
>> put on the shelf as classic examples of dysfunction.
>
>What does she have to say about your antics?

"Antics?" Commentary in newsgroups are "antics?" :-)

She thinks I'm having fun, indulging a bit on poking all that
fun at a bunch of tight-assed holier-than-thou self-proclaimed
"superior beings" who need Credentials From Authorities in
everything. In short, like the chief export of Guinea-Bisseau
some of you are nuts. :-)

>But you aren't a licensed psychologist any more than you are a licensed
>radio amateur. You can't practice either without a license.

Colonel, are you undergoing a Religious Transformation? It looks
like you are trying to become an assistant pastor to Reverend
Jimmie, his most Holy Inquisitor of the Church of St. Hiram.

Heck and darn, I have to wait until the Federal Fun Commission
mails me my Fun Credential so that I can Know About Fun!

>Show your wife the above paragraph and ask her professional opinion of
>someone who would continue posting such unsubstantiated stuff. Explain
>to her that you and not some adolescent wrote it.

She might still be studying Your Orders, Herr Robust.

Have something to eat. Pizza a rope.

>> Yourself, on the other hand, imply you are the "expert" in
>> radio...not just amateur radio, but in ALL radio.
>
>Such a claim has never been made by me.

NO?!?!? Okay, I stand corrected. I'll rewrite your dossier,
Herr Robust, mark you down from "officious blowhard who
knows all" to "officious blowhard who once did comms for
the government." You will get a gold star if you can tell how
you could be a radio officer for State in Finland yet not have
any radio!

>All of your untruthful claims have been repeatedly and strongly refuted.
>In fact, my original statements from five years back have just been
>quoted here to show you for what you are.

Waaa, waaa, waaa. :-)

NO "refutation," senior. You haven't even come close to
copying your original statements (the colonel "makes
statements" instead of posting messages...typical).

Copy over ALL of them...then keep doing it over and over
and over again until your anger is satisfied. Goodie, by
that time everyone will have left, tired of all the outrage
quotations. Have a nice life.

>No, your current problems are explaining how you've made the untruthful
>statements about things like use of CW as an order wire and the absence
>of my name in State's "Key Officers" lists in the face of irrefutable
>proof to the contrary.

Try to LIVE with what happened, colonel. You claimed that
"your idea" of a "CW order-wire on an RTTY circuit" was a "neat
idea...something to impress the troops, few of whom had ever
worked commercial HF communications. You didn't expect
that someone who HAD done that would stuff it up your nose.
Then you backtracked and said it was "State Department
radio procedure." Oh, sure, first it is "your" idea then it is the
government's "procedure." That's nonsense, boy, I say
nonsense.
:-)

Just how did you communicate out of Helsinki without any
radio set, boy? MilSpec Nokia cell-phones? :-)

<signature here>

1257. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-30 04:16:52 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030129231652.05408.00000334@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 60340

In article <f45722ac.0301282156.22316415@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> >Not at all. I welcome not only free speech, but open debate. You on
>> >the other hand wish to silence Len in amateur radio matters as he does
>> >not have a license.
>>
>> Not at all. I would like to see Lennie silenced becasue he has lied
>> repeatedly and makes outrageous and unsupported claims against Amateur
>> Radio as a whole.
>
>You have lied repeatedly.

What? Steam was NOT "in hostile action seven times?!?"

Incredible!

>Len's opinion of the cult of amateur radio isn't far off the mark.

Can't be. I've never had an amateur license therefore "I
don't know a thing about it!"

>> You support no code, and I have no argument with that. So does Carl
and
>> several others. Do you see me responding to them like I do Lennie? No.
>
>YES!

Steam only likes to beat up on old men. He doesn't mention
Eric June, does he? :-)

>I've given a long list of the people that you incessantly badger
>whenever they might come on to the group.

Steam's trying to be an educator. He has taught many a
goyim the true meaning of "putz."

Oy gevalt! :-)

>> It's because, like it or not, they express THIER opinions without lying or
>> making easily disproved assertions about Amateur Radio, the ARRL in general
or
>> certain Hams in particular., and they show me the same courtesy.
>
>Uphill both ways.

Ol' Steam would have been right at home in a Roman coliseum,
thumbing down anyone who didn't bleed enough... :-)

>> >And what of your endless spamming?
>>
>> So people should just let Lennie lie uncontested?
>
>We're not talking about "people." We're talking about your
>unreasoned, eyes rolled back, rantings.
>
>Get over it.

Steam is too far gone...he went Over The Edge years ago.

Electro-shock might work, maybe a lobotomy. Then again,
maybe he GOT a lobotomy?

>> >They ought to be. This group is supposed to be about that.
>>
>> That argument is over with, Brian. There are other IMMEDIATE issues
that
>> need to be and should be addressed, but they aren't.

Oh, oh, everyone now HAS to Get On the "immediate issues" that
Steam demands be discussed! Amazing, he follows that with the
hypocritical double-standard below...

>> I ahve introduced and
>> reintorduced them, but they fall on deaf ears, so it shall be...I am not
>> another "Vipul" who will damn all Amateur Radio because it won't meet MY
>> needs.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Ok, everyone, Get On the "IMMEDIATE issues that
Steam demands! :-)

>Do you believe that the FCC, through a body of rules titled "Part 97"
>governs amateur radio?

...that will have in interesting answer... :-)

>> Here's some facts:
>>
>> (1) The FCC has so far refused to revisit any further petitions on the
>> Morse Code testing issue until it is addressed in WRC-03.
>
>Is this one of your "immediate" issues?

It must be that, as a beeping 1x2 like Reverend Jimmie, Steamy
KNOWS (intrinsically) what the FCC is doing and what motivates
that agency.

>I wish they would revisit it.
>
>If it is unnecessary to obey START treaty with Russia...
>If it is unnecessary to form a coalition to bomb Iraq...
>
>We ought to be able to eliminate the code exam for free American
>amateurs.

Um...morsemanship isn't quite of the same importance as
American foreign policy that matters to the entire nation.

>> (2) Most major western powers and most of the rest of the world has
>> already moved to a minimalist position on Code testing, dropping it to 5WPM
or
>> "code recognition" tests. Many of THOSE countries have stated that they
will
>> drop code testing when the ITU treaty is ammended to drop it.
>
>Wow. Forward thinkers. (30 years late)

That's on about the same "speed track" as the WARC-79
holdover on the 40m issue. :-) :-)

>> (3) The only major Amateur Radio organization in the United States has
>> dropped it's own long-standing support of Code testing. Therefore with the
>> exception of the occassional anonymous "No Code=No Ham" hold outs, there is
no
>> organized support for continued code testing.
>
>I disagree, but does there need to be organized support to maintain an
>unnecessary and arbitrary requirement?

ARRL took a neutral stand, neither pro nor con on the code test.
They did the spin thing of saying "they support US regulations
as given by the FCC." As if the Church of St. Hiram would "not
support" the law. :-)

The IARU came out against the code test over a year ago.

>
>> Do I like it? Not particularly. But I accept it and will try to
>> encourage new Hams to learn the Code even after ITU deletes or ammends
>S25.5.
>
>Our government may take years to eliminate the code exam. Unless they
>allow the VEC to misinterpret Part 97 and just stop testing.

If ol' Steamy had to jump through hoops long ago, he will cuss
and snarl at any newcomer who didn't do the same thing as
He did. Adequate demonstration of that in public in here...

>> >Your zeal only exposes you for what you are.
>>
>> Intolerant of the lying and deceitful?
>
>M-o-v-e On!

He can't. As a compulsive-obsessive sociopath he got on a
roll and slipped on the butter...

>> >> Have you seen him provide one iota of "evidence" about ARRL
>> >> "dishonesty"...?!?!

>> >
>> >Ask him if he has one iota of evidence concerning Watergate,
>> >Iran-Contra, Savings and Loan scams, Monica-gate, or Dangling Chads.
>>
>> None of those are in discussion here, now are they?
>
>I have no factual evidence about how many times a day brakes stop
>cars, either.
>
>None!

You can't bring up the subject of "stopping" to someone who has
no way (or intent) of stopping...

>> and has made countless
>> assertions that are untrue and proven false with ease.
>
>So do you.

Can't be! Steamy is an apostle of the Church of St. Hiram, their
Dill Instructor (of the kosher school, putz division honours).

>> So he has proved....what?
>
>He's said that we're full of OF's that cling to the past. If you
>can't see that, then you're part of the problem.

Oh, oh, Reverend Jimmie is even now preparing another Sermon
on the Antenna Mount, be on the lookout for the second
member of the PCTA Tag Team climbing into the ring... :-)

<signature here>

1258. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-30 04:16:53 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030129231653.05408.00000335@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 60336

In article <f45722ac.0301290504.4fc368a2@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
>news:<d22b54c3.0301281649.66b732a6@posting.google.com>...
>>
>> He obviously still don't and he never will.
>>
>> Romeo Victor
>
>Now Steve has someone else to call a liar.

He NEEDS that. Satisfies the obsessive-compulsive
behavior of the Yankee Zulu armed only with a spear,
loud voice and loincloth. :-)

<signature here>

1259. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-30 05:06:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030130000604.11487.00000443@mb-fg.aol.com>
Source record: 60343

In article <20030129204547.27873.00000300@mb-mj.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <b1937m$645$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
><billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
>>N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>>news:20030128083623.05048.00000263@mb-cs.aol.com...
>>> In article <OulZ9.1420$N5.819411@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>>> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>>>
>>> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>>> >news:20030126215637.20835.00000270@mb-fy.aol.com...
>>> >>>
>>> >> Are there more than 3400 current NCI members?
>>> >
>>> >Yes ...
>>>
>>> How many?
>>
>>What difference does it make?
>
>Carl made a point of ARRL membership numbers and percentages. He also claimed
>that the procodetest opinion was a minority view.
>>
>>> And since there are no dues nor membership expirations, how do you know if
>>> a
>>> "current member" still exists?
>>
>>What difference does it make?
>>
>The member totals get inflated. The numbers indicate how many people have
>joined in the lifetime of the organization, not hwo many are currently
>active.
>Like JA operator licenses. Imagine the screaming if ARRL did that...

Jimmie, ah say Jimmie boy...whut's all da fuss over
member numbers?

Is it because ARRL doesn't have even a full quarter of all US
amateur licensees as members? And ya all have to show
that "ARRL is better than NCI?"

'Fess up, boy...

>>> >> >Nor, I might point out, does ARRL's membership constitute a majority
>>> >> >of US hams ... more like a bit less than 25% IIRC the last numbers I
>>> >> >noticed.
>>> >>
>>> >> Quite true. Nor does ARRL claim to constitute a majority, either.
>
>See what I mean?

ARRL has been around since 1914. NCI only a few years.

Has ARRL ever had more than a quarter of US ham licensees?

If not, why not? ARRL makes no mistakes, do they? I mean,
boy, like they are of the Church of St. Hiram, the god of Ham.

>>> >
>>> >ARRL claims to be "THE National Society for Amateur Radio" ...
>>>
>>> Is there another national society for amateur radio?
>>>
>>> NCI cannot claim to be one, because
>>>
>>> a) it is "international"
>>> b) its sole stated purpose is to end stand-alone Morse code testing.
>>>
>>> What other "national society for amateur radio" exists in the USA?
>>
>>As before...what difference does all this make?
>
>Carl and others have made an issue out of ARRL being "THE national
>society...".
>But there is no other "national society for amateur radio" in the USA, so
>ARRL's claim is perfectly accurate.

ARRL is perfect in every regard. Well, said Reverend Jimmie.

>Well? If NCI's Executive Director can make a point of ARRL member numbers and
>percentages, the same rules of discussion should apply to NCI member numbers
>and percentages.

About the only reason that ARRL membership numbers are
revealed is to get advertisers for ARRL publications. The
numbers are revealed on the QST advertising page on their
website...because QST is mailed to all ARRL members...it
is ARRL membership magazine.

NCI doesn't have a membership magazine and thus no
advertisers and no need to show demographics.

>Well?

Re-calibrate your dowser...you are drilling in dry areas, boy.

>Then why did NCI's Executive Director bring up ARRL membership figures as a
>discussion point - not just now, but several times in the past? What's good

>for the ARRL goose should be equally good for the NCI gander.

Do you feel any goose?!?

I think it is rather well-known that ARRL can't get as much as a
whole quarter of US amateur licensees. Since it has never had
a much greater fraction for 89 years that ought to demonstrate
something. At least to the rational. Religious Believers can't be
shown that.

>Anyone else know who the "National Amateur Radio Council" and the "Society of
>American Radio Amateurs" were, and what they accomplished? Quite interesting,
>really.

The Radio Club of America was first organized in 1909, five
years before Hiram started his Divine Work.

The Radio Club of America still exists. They have some
interesting old photos of amateurs and their equipment on
their website. You like the past, Jimmie, ought to be right
up your alley...

>Considering that NCI is a one-issue organization, the tendency would be to
>either have very high or very low success.
>
>But why all the secrecy about membership numbers?

Sorry, Reverend Jimmie, you aren't authorized to fly those
Black Helicopters. There's NO conspiracy about "numbers"
other than the well-known failure of ARRL to get any more
than about a quarter of all US amateur licensees.

ARRL is NOT perfect.

<signature here, lest the Reverend preach another sermon>

1260. Re: feb 2003 qst article on internet linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-30 05:06:05 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030130000605.11487.00000444@mb-fg.aol.com>
Source record: 60342

In article <f45722ac.0301291501.5563d709@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20030129132924.27196.00000022@mb-ba.aol.com>...
>> In article <f45722ac.0301282134.6b58bd50@posting.google.com>,
>> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>>
>> >Steve, I really don't know where you're comment is coming from.
>> >
>> >Have you ever used HF comms in the service? Were they not encrypred?
>>
>> Ol' "Steam" never did any HF comms in any service.
>
>Says he did, at least during an exercise.

Oh? Someone brought a portable SWBC receiver to morning PT?

"...in cadence, exercise...1...2...3...4..." :-)

<signature here>

1261. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-30 05:24:43 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <k&#65533;hb@arrl.DOTORG>
Message-ID: <vG2_9.3941$wd2.312348@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 60344

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote

: > > Not hardly. Without fear of contradiction I'll state that Our Chief
: > > sure as hell was not running a goofyass t2fd on 7.037 that mememorable
: > > nite a piece back when he boomed the whole frigging NA continent and
: > > cleaned house at 30 over.
: >
: > Who knows what he was running? A "3-30 MHz" WBFD in the clear 100+
: > feet above the prairie will prolly do a half-decent job on 40 meters,
: > 'specially if fed enough suds. If the thing is only 10% efficient, it
: > just brings the 1500 W boys down to barefoot-and-a-dipole level.
:
: That's physically possible but it's an extremely improbable scenario.
: Anybody in their right minds who can get an antenna up at 100 feet is
: not about to waste that kind of precious height on a lousy antenna.
: Particulalry on 40 where decent antennas don't need much real estate.
:
: > Remember, it was 40 on a good evening, and Hans is in the midwest.
: > Heck, I work the West Coast with my low inverted V and 100 homebrew
: > watts under those conditions - on 80 meters.
:
: Not with a signal like Hans pumped in here that nite ya don't. I tuned
: around before I called the net, there were a flock of midwesterners on
: the air then and Hans *buried* 'em. I'll stick, he was not using a
: wideband, lossy antenna like a t2fd or anything like it and the
: chances are that he was running suds too.

Homebrew two-element linear-loaded yagi at 70ft. Single 3CX1200A7 running
about 1350W give or take a few cents.

73,
de Hans, K0HB

1262. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-30 05:59:06 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E38BF6A.AB2C6E2F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60345

Brian wrote:
>
> jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu (Jeffrey Herman) wrote in message
news:<b1929n$6ad$1@news.hawaii.edu>...
> > Brian <brianburke@juno.com> wrote:
>
> > >I was an unlicensed ARRL member. No problems. The local library is
> > >apparently an unlicensed member also.
> >
> > You mean the librarian? Someone (a person) had to sign the NCI
> > "petition."
> >
> > 73, Jeff KH6O
>
> Jeff, the local library has a copy of QST on the shelf.

Let's see if we have this one right. You believe that because a library
has a subscription to QST, the library is an unlicensed member of the
ARRL?
Read the fine print, Brian.

Dave K8MN

1263. GB0CCE

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-30 09:41:25 UTC
From: paul@gw0gvq.com
Message-ID: <26e950ad.0301300141.567af979@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60346

During Saturday / Sunday 1st & 2nd February 2003 - Barry Amateur Radio Society (South Wales) will be operating a Special
Event station under the call sign - GB0CCE. The station will operate on HF amateur bands and issue a special QSL card.
The callsign CCE (Captain Cook's Endeavour) has been issued to mark the visit to Cardiff Docks in Wales of the replica of the sailing ship HMS Endeavour used by Captain Cook in his journeys around the world.
The ship is in Cardiff dock for a refit until March prior to making journeys to ports in the UK during 2003 and other parts of the world at a later date.
The ship is open to the general public together with an exhibition of the work and craftmanship involved. The Barry club also
welcomes all to its special event station or make contact them and receive the special QSL card that has been issued.
Further operation until March is planned and may well form part of National Science week. Details will be issued when confirmed.

For further information contact the Barry Society Chairman Brain Brown (GW0PUP) Tel 02920 832253.

Paul/GW0GVQ (Barry Amateur Radio Society Webmaster - http://www.bars.ipfox.com)

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.445 / Virus Database: 250 - Release Date: 21/01/2003

1264. Re: Why Dave has such a p*ss poor attitude

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-30 11:32:07 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030130063207.04059.00000344@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 60347

>Subject: Re: Why Dave has such a p*ss poor attitude
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 1/29/03 10:16 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030129231648.05408.00000331@mb-fx.aol.com>

>In late 1945 the 71st Signal Service Battalion was organized...bumpbump...

>In late 1945 the 71st Signal Service Battalion was organized...bumpbump

>In late 1945 the 71st Signal Service Battalion was organized...bumpbump

>In late 1945 the 71st Signal Service Battalion was organized...bumpbump

>In late 1945 the 71st Signal Service Battalion was organized...bumpbump

>In late 1945 the 71st Signal Service Battalion was organized..bumpbump

1265. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-30 13:14:54 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301300514.9ecc7ed@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60348

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E38BF6A.AB2C6E2F@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu (Jeffrey Herman) wrote in message
news:<b1929n$6ad$1@news.hawaii.edu>...
> > > Brian <brianburke@juno.com> wrote:
> >
> > > >I was an unlicensed ARRL member. No problems. The local library is
> > > >apparently an unlicensed member also.
> > >
> > > You mean the librarian? Someone (a person) had to sign the NCI
> > > "petition."
> > >
> > > 73, Jeff KH6O
> >
> > Jeff, the local library has a copy of QST on the shelf.
>
> Let's see if we have this one right. You believe that because a library
> has a subscription to QST, the library is an unlicensed member of the
> ARRL?
> Read the fine print, Brian.
>
> Dave K8MN

All the print came across the in the same font and size.

1266. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-30 13:26:09 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301300526.7c283077@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60349

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030129172410.08900.00000266@mb-mf.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 1/29/03 1:08 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0301291108.3262fd42@posting.google.com>
>
> >Example #1. Just Sunday, you lied when you said this:
> >--------------
> >Message 6 in thread
> >From: Steve Robeson K4YZ (k4yz@aol.com)
> >Subject: Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It
> >
> >View this article only
> >Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> >Date: 2003-01-26 20:18:44 PST
> >
> >>Subject: Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It
> >>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >>Date: 1/26/03 9:16 PM Central Standard Time
> >>Message-id: <f45722ac.0301261916.6b572c5d@posting.google.com>
> >>I think Steve went to mental jump school as he's been limping along
> >>for some time now.
> >
> > Perhaps...but I have two things on you and Lennie.
> >
> > (1) I don't lie.
> >
> > (2) I know the diffrence between an authorization to operate and
> >validity
> >for DXCC.
> >-------------
> >You have nothing "on" me.
>
> Yes, I do. Countless assertions by you that you were "authorized" to
> operate from Somalia.

> You have not provided it.

I wasn't the provider, I was the recipient. My permission was not
transferrable, therefore I cannot give it to you.

> United Nations regulations on the subject are available from on-line
> sources. You did not meet the criteria as an authorized operator.

I had permission from my commander. It was enough.

> >First, you do lie.
>
> OK...You have yet to provide that evidence too.
>
> Are you following Lennie the Lame's example of "Accuse then dodge"...?!?!
>
> >Second, I do know the difference between the FCC and the ARRL. I'm
> >the one asking the others if they are confused by it.
>
> Screwed up again, Brian. No one said ANYTHING about teh FCC. Again, you
> CANNOT keep your situational awareness straight.

You lie again.

> >You just posted that I have no expeditionary medals. Do you want me
> >to dig that one out, too?
>
> No, I clearly said I DOUBT you have any. I did not say you didn't.

Why would you doubt I had any? Do you doubt I was in Somalia? If you
doubt I was in Somalia, then why do you accuse me of illegal operation
from there?

Your brain is squirming like a toads.

What lie to come up with next.

> >I also know the difference between a Commander and any other officer.
> >Do you want me to dig that one out, too?
>
> Be my guest, Brain. You have nothing to show. As a matter of fact, I
> DARE you to show a statement of fact or assertions saying anything to the
> contrary.
>
> >Control your emotions and your "liar quotient" will go down.
>
> See a proctologist, Brian, and the likelyhood that you'll see the light is
> exponentially increased.
>
> >Use the Force, Luke.
>
> Just the fact, ma'am. You made the allegations...Now prove them.

Concensus.

1267. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-30 13:27:39 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301300527.435379f4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60350

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030129172713.08900.00000268@mb-mf.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 1/29/03 1:16 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0301291116.5831a623@posting.google.com>
>
> >You say that there are other IMMEDIATE issues..., but stated none.
>
> CC & R pre-emptions, spectrum protection, VEC examiner liability, to name
> a few.

Well, Steve, you're a little late. I've alread brought up issues.
We'll discuss them first.

1268. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-30 13:30:01 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301300530.7176bf9a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60351

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030129173302.08900.00000269@mb-mf.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 1/29/03 1:34 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0301291134.464131e9@posting.google.com>
>
> >But, in a sense, you are right. For example, I've cited where the
> >ARRL VEC and others are in violation of FCC Part 97 with respect to
> >Morse Code testing. The ARRL VEC has taken it upon itself to
> >substitute a Farnsworth exam at 13-15 wpm for the Part 97 specified
> >Morse Code exam at 5 wpm. The FCC appears to be OK with it, as
> >enforcement is too much work, and revising the regulations is too much
> >work.
>
> Please demonstrate where the character spacing technique is even an issue
> in the regulations, Brian. This horse has been beaten, too, and proven to be
> irrelevent.

Proven to be irrelevent?

OK, prove it.

> The FCC interprets the "Farnsworth question" to be like the Coke-vs-Pepsi
> taste tests. Who cares?

The patent office.

> >So bad laws are ignored. Ignoring a law, however, is very different
> >from enforcing a law.
>
> Who defines what is a bad law, Brian? You? Lennie?
>
> Youse guys confer and get back to me.

So why did you clip the part about you not knowing who is in charge of
enforcement? The FCC or Major Organizations? Huh?

Another lie.

1269. Re: Claims Of Dishonesty

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-30 14:03:00 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301300603.26f915b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60352

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030129231646.05408.00000330@mb-fx.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0301290522.a0dee0@posting.google.com>, brianburke@juno.com
> (Brian) writes:
>
> >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> >news:<20030128194823.12173.00000227@mb-mr.aol.com>...
> >>
> >> In article <20021201183714.00112.00000794@mb-fz.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
> (N2EY)
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >In article <20021201133916.21441.00000449@mb-mc.aol.com>, j1aguiar@aol.com
> >> >(J1aguiar) writes:
> >
> >> >Accusing the VECs of falsifying test results is pretty serious stuff, btw.
> Do
> >> >you have any solid evidence?
> >>
> >> VEC test sessions are NOT monitored by anyone else DURING
> >> testing. All that is monitored is the FCC scanning over test
> >> RESULTS sent to them by the VEC teams.
> >>
> >> PAUSE QUOTE
> >>
> >> Despite the unnecessary shouting, this first paragraph is just a
> restatement of
> >> the obvious. Note that FCC has not had any reservations about the testing
> of
> >> young children for amateur radio exams, nor of the VE session in question.
> >
> >Now it is obvious that exams are NOT monitored? Unfrigginbelievable;
> >what unpalatable concessions are made in the effort to hang Len.
> >
> >You might want to clue in buddy Dick Carrol/W0EX. He thinks otherwise
> >and you had -ample- opportunity to correct him at the time.
> >
> >I'll spell it out very clearly: PCTA Double Standard.
>
> Careful, Brian, Reverend Jimmie might be Out To Getcha!
>
> Check for tatoos on his knuckles if you see him... :-)

Len, give it up! He nailed you good on the Extra out of the box (no time limit stipulated, however). I think I told Bruce I was going to get Extra, also.

So what are we going to do about it?

BTW, I heard Jim's looking for a prison artist to get a tear tattooed on his cheek bone in your honor. ;^)

73, Brian

1270. Re: Claims Of Dishonesty

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-30 14:04:00 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301300604.3c8ebe2a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60353

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<ijZZ9.192$4y4.180187@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> I'm not going to quote all the back and forth on this but simply want to add
> some comments.
>
> There's no requirement that anyone has to be able to read and write to take
> the test. I have been at VE sessions where an ADULT was not literate enough
> to read the test so it was read to him. Being unable to read and write,
> doesn't stop a person from memorizing the questions and the answers to those
> questions and thus being capable of passing the test.

So that's how Bruce didit!

1271. Re: The coders embarrass themselves on 14.275 MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-30 14:07:04 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301300607.33872b6a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60354

"William" <w341x@releyviaserver341x.com> wrote in message
news:<b18ot4smk0@pita.alt.net>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
>
> > Could it be that the FCC no longer has a pool of trained CW operators
> > to monitor amateur CW communications?
>
> I am beginning to wonder exactly what expertise they have left
> anymore. I work in a component of DOD, and they called our office,
> requesting assistance with a signal they were tracking. I denied the
> request, whereupon the FCC official flew into a rage. sure nuff,
> they had one of their higher ups call one of my higher ups, and got the
> same answer I gave them, "no."
>
> William

Can you say which service you work for?

Ever go to Eglin?

1272. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-30 14:08:19 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0301300608.53ed702@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60355

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E385232.1ABB9D56@att.net>...
> N2EY wrote:
>
> >
> > > > > >: But since the WBFD is at least the size of a G5RV or trap dipole, and
> > > > > >: costs at least as much as a conventional dipole plus a tuner, it is a
> > > > > >: mystery why any ham would use a WBFD.
> > >
> > > Rewrite that to to read "a mystery why any knowledgeable ham would use
> > > a WBFD in preference to an dipole of equal size".
> >
> > No one I know would. But make no mistake, they are a useful solution to some HF antenna problems, and are
> > in useful service at some ham stations where multiple antennas of better efficiency are simply not
> > possible. My only experiences with the B&W WBFD (at work) surprised me very much. They performed much
> > better than I ever expected, having previously viewed them as aircooled dummy loads. Clearly their
> > efficiency is variable and beyond the fact that maximum efficiency must be limited by the resistive
> > loading, is just as clearly is largely dependent on the operating frequency in use. On higher frequencies
> > they certainly work acceptably well while on lower bands the term "aircooled dummy load" is no misnomer.
> >
> > Although I picked up a "bargain" used B&W unit when I ran accross one, I did so mainly for the wideband
> > balun and large terminating resistor, worth more than what I paid. Under some circumstances I might indeed
> > string it up intact, or modify it to my own requirements of the moment. But so far I've been quite happy
> > with individual dipoles, even when operating in temporary locations. I usually hang one cut for 20 meters
> > in inverted vee style with the ends low enough to reach from the ground, and cut a pair or two of extension
> > wires with alligator clips to hang on the ends when I want to drop down to 30 or 40. and let the autotuner
> > do it's thing.

That's as SOP as ham radio gets. We don't operate 2-30Mhz inclusive
like the military does or has done where a t2fd makes sense. We
operate in discrete slivers of HF space where $4 homebrewed dipoles
are far more efficient than any t2fd.

>
> But I would never count the WBFD out, after having used one for a few years to meet several HF statewide
> nets where ALL the couple dozen net stations were also using them successfully and where no one experienced
> anything but success. They're not just junk. In fact, it struck me at the time that one could recalibrate
> his S-meter and never know the difference!

Any efficient cloud warmer will work fine in those applications.

The real attraction of the t2fd to some is that the thing will present
a low enough SWR at the feedpoint on the ham bands for them to be able
to duck around the need for a decent tuner. And/or knowing how to use
one. Which, considering one particular t2fd admirer in this thread is
most likely the case.

>
> Dick

w3rv

1273. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-30 14:52:29 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0301300652.4f0a45e8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60356

"K HB" <k hb@arrl.DOTORG> wrote in message
news:<vG2_9.3941$wd2.312348@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>...
> "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote
>
> : > > Not hardly. Without fear of contradiction I'll state that Our Chief
> : > > sure as hell was not running a goofyass t2fd on 7.037 that mememorable
> : > > nite a piece back when he boomed the whole frigging NA continent and
> : > > cleaned house at 30 over.
> : >
> : > Who knows what he was running? A "3-30 MHz" WBFD in the clear 100+
> : > feet above the prairie will prolly do a half-decent job on 40 meters,
> : > 'specially if fed enough suds. If the thing is only 10% efficient, it
> : > just brings the 1500 W boys down to barefoot-and-a-dipole level.
> :
> : That's physically possible but it's an extremely improbable scenario.
> : Anybody in their right minds who can get an antenna up at 100 feet is
> : not about to waste that kind of precious height on a lousy antenna.
> : Particulalry on 40 where decent antennas don't need much real estate.
> :
> : > Remember, it was 40 on a good evening, and Hans is in the midwest.
> : > Heck, I work the West Coast with my low inverted V and 100 homebrew
> : > watts under those conditions - on 80 meters.
> :
> : Not with a signal like Hans pumped in here that nite ya don't. I tuned
> : around before I called the net, there were a flock of midwesterners on
> : the air then and Hans *buried* 'em. I'll stick, he was not using a
> : wideband, lossy antenna like a t2fd or anything like it and the
> : chances are that he was running suds too.
>
> Homebrew two-element linear-loaded yagi at 70ft. Single 3CX1200A7 running
> about 1350W give or take a few cents.

BWAAAHAHA! 'Nuff sed!

>
> 73,
> de Hans, K0HB

w3rv.

1274. Re: arrl article on echolink - impress a non ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-30 15:12:20 UTC
From: shortwave dingalings <boinkboobies3@aol.com>
Message-ID: <3e3940c8@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 60357
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

By jove, I think Herbie's got it!

:) :) :)

ps: don't forget to give those non-hams a taste
of k1man's redundant poor-audio quality
broadcasts. we need more psudeo RF
ambulance-chasing "jump teams" you know.

pss: saw one guy at a ham club meeting here last week.
3 HT's on his belt....belt/waistline being what looked
like a size-58. (he actually had to *turn sideways* to
go thru a standard 30 by 76 inch door frame) Great image
for ham radio eh? Someone should videotape him trying
to get into a phone booth at the next hamfest and send it in
to America's Funniest Home Videos before he drops dead
of a massive cornary and they bury him in a piano crate.

"Herb" <Herbie@KingOftheJammers.net> wrote in message
news:b1bb9j$1t2$0@pita.alt.net...
> Impress a non ham even more. Take them to a ham radio club
> meeting or better yet, a hamfest. Here the non ham will see no
> code techs, fresh off the CB, who have brought all their CB habits
> with them to ham radio. Then there is the over 75 segment, bent
> over and hunched, who do nothing but bitch about all that is wrong
> with ham radio today and how the good old days were so good.
> View the assortment of ex-cons, wife beaters, alcoholics, druggies,
> nut cases, slobs, fruits, and societal misfits who make up the crowd that
> attends hamfests and ham club meetings today. Then view the obese
> slobs in wrinkled filthy clothing who haven't bathed in months, as they
> charge the food table and stuff a dozen donuts in their mouths while
> talking at the same time, soda spilling all over their clothes. Oh, and
> be sure not to miss the guys with five HTs on their belt with microphone
> cords wrapped around them and several microphones clipped to their
> shirts. They'll be wearing four or five badges with their ham call sign,
a
> belt buckle with ham call, a shirt with a call sign, and a hat with their
> call
> sign in six places on the hat! Hams will tell you they are war heroes,
> former Navy SEALs, Green Berets, and the president of their own high
> tech company, making millions a year. Or they work for a large high
> tech company, just got a big pay raise and make $100,000 a year. Oh,
> and last but not least, check out the cars hams drive. The vehicles will
> have at least five antennas on it, call signs plastered all over the

> windows,
> ham call letter license tags on the front and back and bald tires. YES,
> DO impress a non ham friend with today's ham radio hobby!
>
> Herb
>
>
>
> tom" <tom35@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> news:3e38d122.347326@news.btinternet.com...
> > http://www.arrl.org/news/features/2003/01/23/1/
> >
> >
> > Tom
> >
> >
>
>

1275. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-30 15:52:00 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0301300752.42e75297@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60358

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0301291913.6de98ea0@posting.google.com>...
> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0301290826.44224c2@posting.google.com>...
> > kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0301281641.566bb178@posting.google.com>...
> > > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030128062207.12173.00000216@mb-mr.aol.com>...
> > > > In article <oliZ9.6698$d66.604847@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
> > > > <kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG> writes:
> > > >
> > > > >"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
> > > > >
> > > > >:
> > > > >: But since the WBFD is at least the size of a G5RV or trap dipole, and
> > > > >: costs at least as much as a conventional dipole plus a tuner, it is a
> > > > >: mystery why any ham would use a WBFD.
> > >
> > > Rewrite that to to read "a mystery why any knowledgeable ham would use
> > > a WBFD in preference to an dipole of equal size".
> > > >
> > > > >Translation: N.I.H.
> > > >
> > > > Do you mean "Not Invented Here", Hans?
> > > >
> > > > If so, that's not the case. The WBFD has been around a long time - I
> > > > learned
> > > > about it from a 1948 QST article.
> > > >
> > > > What the WBFD offers is convenience at the price of efficiency. As both > > > >an
EE
> > > > and amateur radio operator, I say the tradeoff is not worthwhile for
> > > >most
> > > > amateur radio applications.
> > > >
> > > > Tell us, Hans - would YOU use a WBFD at your ham station instead of a
> > > > conventional dipole of equivalent size?
> > >
> > > Not hardly. Without fear of contradiction I'll state that Our Chief
> > > sure as hell was not running a goofyass t2fd on 7.037 that mememorable
> > > nite a piece back when he boomed the whole frigging NA continent and
> > > cleaned house at 30 over.
> >
> > Who knows what he was running? A "3-30 MHz" WBFD in the clear 100+

> > feet above the prairie will prolly do a half-decent job on 40 meters,
> > 'specially if fed enough suds. If the thing is only 10% efficient, it
> > just brings the 1500 W boys down to barefoot-and-a-dipole level.
>
> That's physically possible but it's an extremely improbable scenario.
> Anybody in their right minds who can get an antenna up at 100 feet is
> not about to waste that kind of precious height on a lousy antenna.

Note the cautionary phrase "in their right minds"...

> Particulalry on 40 where decent antennas don't need much real estate.

A simple coax-fed 40 meter dipole is about 66 feet long and has
radiation efficiency of 90% or better across the whole band - not just
one frequency.
>
> > Remember, it was 40 on a good evening, and Hans is in the midwest.
> > Heck, I work the West Coast with my low inverted V and 100 homebrew
> > watts under those conditions - on 80 meters.
>
> Not with a signal like Hans pumped in here that nite ya don't. I tuned
> around before I called the net, there were a flock of midwesterners on
> the air then and Hans *buried* 'em.

He was stronger, yes indeed.

> I'll stick, he was not using a
> wideband, lossy antenna like a t2fd or anything like it and the
> chances are that he was running suds too.

Thanks to his informative post, we know that what he was using closely
matches what you predicted. Why am I not surprised?
>
> > --
> >
> > "T2FD" stands for "tilted, terminated, folded dipole". Originally
> > meant to be a nondirectional, frequency-insensitive RECEIVING antenna,
> > fed with balanced line. Really cutting-edge stuff a half-century ago -
> > hook one to yer R-390 and there's no need to fool with the antenna
> > trimmer. Or run the T2FD into a multichannel "antenna coupler" (which
> > most hams would call an "active splitter" and feed a bank of HF RXs
> > tuned to different freqs. No adjustment required.
>
> Which is exactly what the gummint did on HF and probably still does in
> pockets. There are gobs of old photos floating around of racks fulla
> military 390s listening on widely-separated HF freqs.

Obviously.

> That's not how
> hams play the antenna game then or now, not even close.

Not how hams in their right minds do it, anyway.
>
> > The interesting thing is that some folks are of the mindset that "if
> > the govt. and military use it, it MUST be the best". They disregard
> > the differences between the govt's needs and resources vs. hams. (You
> > see that sort of thinking all the time here on rrap).
>
> Ya sorta got me there, I haven't noticed much posted around here about
> using gummint radio equipmemnt in the ham bands.

I'm not talking about equipment per se, though there has been some
ranting about SINGCARS equipment. (How SINGCARS would ever relate to
amateur comms has not been explained). And endless recounts of high
power point-to-point transpacific military RTTY comms of a
half-century ago.

Plus lotta discussion about the WBFD/T2FD, fer one. HF spread spectrum
is another.

> Makes no sense,
> certainly military radio gear with maybe an exception or two simply
> doesn't meet the average ham's operating & technolgy implementation
> needs.

The needs and resources are entirely different. Plus the new stuff is
too costly for almost all hams anyway.

> This ain't ARC-5 days, we've come a long way baby and the
> miltary has too but in vastly different directions. Including the
> antennas.

With a few exceptions, most WW2-vintage surplus was better utilized by
hams as a parts source than as a conversion project. The low cost of
today's ham gear makes the point moot - you're not going to find the
equivalent of, say, a Ten Tec Omni 6 in surplus at anything like the
price you can be a clean used TT with all the filters.

The amateur solder slingers are too busy homebrewing or building kits.
More bang fer the buck than fooling with surplus.
>
> > Manufacturer's
> > advertising hype doesn't help, either.
>
> They oughta add a question to the pool: "Antenna advertisers (a) Never
> lie (b) Only lie sometimes (c) Always lie.
>
> _._.
>
Ads for the WBFD don't actually "lie" in the sense of saying things
that are not true. The advertised antennas do cover the advertised
frequency range with the advertised SWR when installed as recommended,
and contacts can be made with them.

What's not mentioned is how inefficient they are, particularly at the
low end of the frequency range.
> >
> > If some ham with more bucks than brains gives me a hard time about the
> > T2FD/WBFD, I don't argue anymore.
>
> Especially when they're firmly established village idiots whose real
> hobby is trolling RRAP.
>
Well, that leaves me and a few others out...

73 de Jim, N2EY

1276. Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, FCC, Cronkite, ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-30 16:04:02 UTC
From: drakeswl@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <c0588492.0301300804.69039ba9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60359
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

I'm new to this topic so don't flame me, but if W1AW has a bulletin, why can't Baxter have one? What is Baxter doing that is so bad that the FCC would want to shut him down? He has been on a long time and they haven't done anything... so doesn't that mean he is perfectly legal as far as the FCC goes? Last question. If Cronkite gave Baxter that announcement he uses, why should Baxter have to stop using it now? I heard Baxter used to call people and the government names and sent out some felony complaints, but isn't interfering with Baxter's show illegal?

I know I'm new and I'm not a ham, but I started to listen to Baxter's show this month, and it just sounds like he is trying to help minority kids and some kind of peace corp, plus he is putting other people's material on, like newsline and arrl and rain and the like. So where's the beef?

Please, no flames, I'm just trying to learn and keep an open mind.

Paul

1277. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-30 16:38:54 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030130113854.03252.00000362@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 60360

>Subject: Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 1/30/03 7:30 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0301300530.7176bf9a@posting.google.com>

>Proven to be irrelevent?
>
>OK, prove it.

The FCC's done that for me, Brian. They have stated that they will not consider any further petitions on this subject as no new evidence on the validity of code testing hes been provided.

Furthermore, FCC officials of some repute (ie Messrs Hollingsworth and Cross) have publically stated that any further badgering of the FCC on this matter only hurts the Service's overall standing with them...And they made it clear they were addressing both the pro and anti factions.

>> The FCC interprets the "Farnsworth question" to be like the
>Coke-vs-Pepsi
>> taste tests. Who cares?
>
>The patent office.

The Patent Office is now regulating Amateur Radio?

>>Youse guys confer and get back to me.
>
>So why did you clip the part about you not knowing who is in charge of
>enforcement? The FCC or Major Organizations? Huh?

Brain, are you gay?

Are your eyes so obstructed with Lennie's withering manhood (I've given the benefit of the doubt in using the term "man"hood) that the previous day's posts were invisible to you? did you MISS the part where I said that the FCC's authority in matters pertaining to the FCC were NEVER in question, least of all by me?

>Another lie

Not by me.

Steve, K4YZ

1278. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-30 16:46:15 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030130114615.03252.00000363@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 60361

>Subject: Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 1/30/03 7:41 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0301300541.fbbf509@posting.google.com>

>Steve, another nice dodge and evasion.

Brian Burke musta got a blood transfusion from Lennie the Lame...

>"No one in any club I belong to (three) even remotely supports
>"clinging to
>the past"."
>
>I said: "Code Testing." Code Testing is clinging to an outdated,
>unnecessary, and arbitrary licensing requirement. It was fine in the
>20's, 30's, 40's, 50's, and maybe even the 60's. Today it is merely
>an anachronism chained around the neck of amateur radio.

OK. So says you. NOW, please prove where this overwhelming support for
code testing supposedly is.

The FCC, not the ARRL or any club I am aware of, has stated taht code
testing will remain until it's underlying need (ITU treaty) has been deleted or
amended.

>Steve said:
>
>"Nothing I read in ANY periodical suggests that Amateur Radio "cling
>to the past" other than the usual historical interest expressed by ANY
>group in it's development."
>
>I say: ARRL/QST January Issue.
>
>Steve said:
>
>"Every major periodical is ripe with new technology and techniques
>articles.
>
> Nothing, Brian..."
>
>I say: ARRL/QST January Issue.

And I am still correct.

Re-read what I said above, then go back through the issue YOU cite
page-by-page.

There is not ONE article in the issue you cite that mandates or supports continued code testing for the Amateur Radio service past the deletion or modification of ITUI S25.5.

There ARE ads and offers of support for those who must still complete the current code test inorer to obtain an HF-grade Amateur license.

That is no support for the testing concept itself.

Steve, K4YZ

1279. Re: Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, FCC, Cronkite, ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-30 18:16:11 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E396BEB.90608@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 60364
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Paul wrote:
> I'm new to this topic so don't flame me, but if W1AW has a bulletin,
> why can't Baxter have one? What is Baxter doing that is so bad that
> the FCC would want to shut him down? He has been on a long time and
> they haven't done anything... so doesn't that mean he is perfectly
> legal as far as the FCC goes? Last question. If Cronkite gave Baxter
> that announcement he uses, why should Baxter have to stop using it
> now? I heard Baxter used to call people and the government names and
> sent out some felony complaints, but isn't interfering with Baxter's
> show illegal?
>
> I know I'm new and I'm not a ham, but I started to listen to Baxter's
> show this month, and it just sounds like he is trying to help minority
> kids and some kind of peace corp, plus he is putting other people's
> material on, like newsline and arrl and rain and the like. So where's
> the beef?
>
> Please, no flames, I'm just trying to learn and keep an open mind.

Blustruous Baxter's transmission are nothing more that a radio
talk mostly for the benefit of a few hams who like to hear
themselves brag on the air about how great they are. 99% of his
transmission have nothing to do with bulletins pertaining to ham
radio. He assumes he owns certain frequencies, which he does not.
The best thing that could happen to ham radio would be to take
k1man off the air.

1280. Re: Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, FCC, Cronkite, ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-30 18:19:45 UTC
From: LRod@removethispartpobox.com
Message-ID: <3e395af8.1260765032@netnews.att.net>
Source record: 60362
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

On 30 Jan 2003 08:04:02 -0800, drakeswl@hotmail.com (Paul) wrote:

Although this has all the earmarks of a troll, I'll give one shot at explaining it to you. However, the second clause in the first sentence of your second paragraph is a serious impediment to your understanding of the issues.

W1AW is the station of the ARRL, which is the sole effective representative of amateur radio to Congress, the FCC, and other governing entities. The bulletins that it transmits meet every standard of permissible transmissions set forth by the FCC.

The principle standards are set out in Part 97, Sections 111 and 113, the pertinent excerpts of which are shown below:

Authorized one way transmissions:

97.111 (b)
(5) Transmissions necessary to assisting persons learning, or

improving proficiency in, the international Morse code;

(6) Transmissions necessary to disseminate information bulletins;

Prohibited transmissions:

97.113 (b)
An amateur station shall not engage in any form of broadcasting,

nor may an amateur station transmit one-way communications except

as specifically provided in these rules; nor shall an amateur station engage in any activity related to program production or news gathering for broadcasting purposes...

Baxter doesn't fall into the Morse code practice category, and it may be a stretch to characterize his tramsmissions as "information bulletins" given the vitriolic and personal nature of much of them.

The more important consideration is that to listen to W1AW bulletins, the format is clearly that of a bulletin. They are about amateur related topics, they are a recitation of the text, and that is all.

Baxter's transmissions include call-ins and interviews, and he refers to them as programs. They may not even be amateur radio related. In short, they sound like a broadcast, they feel like a broadcast, they look like a broadcast. They fail the duck test. They are broadcasts, and they are prohibited.

The other significant point is that W1AW has been providing its service for about 80 years, give or take a few. There is every reason to believe the service will still be provided 80 years from now.

Baxter, on the other hand has only been broadcasting his programs for a few years, and given his age, are unlikely to continue more than 15 or 20 years.

So, who is providing an amateur radio service and who is broadcasting illegally? Not too hard to figure out.

There are other legal issues regarding station control, etc., that will probably be his ultimate downfall. For me, the broadcasting is the part that sullies amateur radio.

The Cronkite "issue" is one that will ultimately be settled by attorneys, and is not really an FCC issue.

The slander and the felony complaints are also legal issues that will eventually bite Baxter, too. However, no matter what illegal acts others may do to him does not mitigate in any way his illegal acts. They are an entirely separate matter.

>I'm new to this topic so don't flame me, but if W1AW has a bulletin,
>why can't Baxter have one? What is Baxter doing that is so bad that
>the FCC would want to shut him down? He has been on a long time and
>they haven't done anything... so doesn't that mean he is perfectly
>legal as far as the FCC goes? Last question. If Cronkite gave Baxter
>that announcement he uses, why should Baxter have to stop using it
>now? I heard Baxter used to call people and the government names and
>sent out some felony complaints, but isn't interfering with Baxter's
>show illegal?
>
>I know I'm new and I'm not a ham, but I started to listen to Baxter's
>show this month, and it just sounds like he is trying to help minority
>kids and some kind of peace corp, plus he is putting other people's
>material on, like newsline and arrl and rain and the like. So where's
>the beef?
>
>Please, no flames, I'm just trying to learn and keep an open mind.
>
>Paul

LRod

Master Woodbutcher and seasoned termite

Shamelessly whoring my website since 1999

http://www.woodbutcher.net

1281. Re: MARS opinions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-30 19:13:49 UTC
From: H Johnson <classy-kg4wou@kg4wou.com>
Message-ID: <75ui3v04kq2cnv84s8ivbn14q2ornahtnl@4ax.com>
Source record: 60363

On 28 Jan 2003 12:50:51 -0800, gadget@easypath.com (Jim) wrote:

>Hello all,
>
> I'm thinking of joining one of the MARS groups in the NY area, and
>I'd like to hear anyone's opinion as to which group may be the best.
>I'm interested in helping with military functions and/or being
>available "just in case".
> I'm new to ham radio, but I learn very quick. I have experience as a
>Police/Fire/EMS dispatcher and have worked some local disasters. I'd
>probably be most comfortable in a progressive and active group.
> From listening in my area it seems the Air Force MARS is most active
>in voice, but I've heard little other than reads of old regulations
>and check-ins for time logging.
> I'm very experienced in computer technology, and would be most
>interested in digital radio/modem work.
>
> Any thoughts guys?
>
>Appreciate you comments,
>Jim/KC2KIW

From what I am told you have to have HF capability to even be
considered for MARS.

- H. Johnson
73, KG4WOU
==========
*** SPAM Filter in place ***
Just de-classify the e-mail address for correct reply-to
==========

1282. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-30 20:31:34 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030130153134.05573.00000462@mb-mh.aol.com>
Source record: 60365

In article <3E38BF6A.AB2C6E2F@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Brian wrote:
>>
>> jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu (Jeffrey Herman) wrote in message
>news:<b1929n$6ad$1@news.hawaii.edu>...
>> > Brian <brianburke@juno.com> wrote:
>>
>> > >I was an unlicensed ARRL member. No problems. The local library is
>> > >apparently an unlicensed member also.
>> >
>> > You mean the librarian? Someone (a person) had to sign the NCI
>> > "petition."
>> >
>> > 73, Jeff KH6O
>>
>> Jeff, the local library has a copy of QST on the shelf.
>
>Let's see if we have this one right. You believe that because a library
>has a subscription to QST, the library is an unlicensed member of the
>ARRL?
>Read the fine print, Brian.

Does Herr Robust need a napkin for the second day's Egg
Foo Face?

Go thee to Google and search for direct quotes from K0HB
on ARRL membership. Go thee to ARRL website and find
direct statements of membership.

Anyone or any entity can become a member of ARRL. Their
"membership" is so loosely defined that ARRL must make
statement (ugh) that ONLY licensed amateurs can VOTE in
ARRL elections.

If Marian the Librarian signs a subscription request of QST
for her library, she becomes a non-voting "member" or the
library itself becomes a non-voting "member." ARRL won't
play 76 Trombones for her during ARRL elections.

<signature here, not for subscriptions>

1283. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-30 20:31:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030130153137.05573.00000463@mb-mh.aol.com>
Source record: 60367

In article <c2356669.0301300752.42e75297@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
>news:<d22b54c3.0301291913.6de98ea0@posting.google.com>...
>> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<c2356669.0301290826.44224c2@posting.google.com>...
>> > kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
>news:<d22b54c3.0301281641.566bb178@posting.google.com>...
>> > > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20030128062207.12173.00000216@mb-mr.aol.com>...
>> > > > In article <oliZ9.6698$d66.604847@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>,
>"Kï¿½HB"
>> > > > <kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG> writes:
>> > > >
>> > > > >"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
>> > > > >
>> > > > >:
>> > > > >: But since the WBFD is at least the size of a G5RV or trap dipole,
>and
>> > > > >: costs at least as much as a conventional dipole plus a tuner, it
>is a
>> > > > >: mystery why any ham would use a WBFD.
>> > >
>> > Rewrite that to to read "a mystery why any knowledgeable ham would use
>> > a WBFD in preference to an dipole of equal size".
>> > > >
>> > > > >Translation: N.I.H.
>> > > >
>> > > > Do you mean "Not Invented Here", Hans?
>> > > >
>> > > > If so, that's not the case. The WBFD has been around a long time - I
>> > > > learned
>> > > > about it from a 1948 QST article.
>> > > >
>> > > > What the WBFD offers is convenience at the price of efficiency. As
>both > > > >an EE
>> > > > and amateur radio operator, I say the tradeoff is not worthwhile for
>> > > >most
>> > > > amateur radio applications.
>> > > >
>> > > > Tell us, Hans - would YOU use a WBFD at your ham station instead of a
>> > > > conventional dipole of equivalent size?
>> > >

>> > > Not hardly. Without fear of contradiction I'll state that Our Chief
>> > > sure as hell was not running a goofyass t2fd on 7.037 that mememorable
>> > > nite a piece back when he boomed the whole frigging NA continent and
>> > > cleaned house at 30 over.
>> >
>> > Who knows what he was running? A "3-30 MHz" WBFD in the clear 100+
>> > feet above the prairie will prolly do a half-decent job on 40 meters,
>> > 'specially if fed enough suds. If the thing is only 10% efficient, it
>> > just brings the 1500 W boys down to barefoot-and-a-dipole level.
>>
>> That's physically possible but it's an extremely improbable scenario.
>> Anybody in their right minds who can get an antenna up at 100 feet is
>> not about to waste that kind of precious height on a lousy antenna.
>
>Note the cautionary phrase "in their right minds"...
>
>> Particulalry on 40 where decent antennas don't need much real estate.
>
>A simple coax-fed 40 meter dipole is about 66 feet long and has
>radiation efficiency of 90% or better across the whole band - not just
>one frequency.

Oh, my! NO statement of height above ground, Reverend
Jimmie, NO mention of parasitic effects of nearby
conductors, NO mention of vegetation absorption or any
other dielectric or partial dielectric absorption...it is stated
in the Absolutist "has a radiation efficience of 90% or
better across the whole band!" :-)

NO mention of the pattern influenced by nearby things
within the near field. "Radiation efficiency" deduced by
relatively low SWR (which reads VSWR) as measured on
an uncalibrated hamswrmeter? :-)

Take all of that to r.r.a.a. and see if anyone raises a flag
to it, okay? There is NO Part 97 regulation on HF antennas
that MUST be used nor are there any prohibitions AGAINST
certain HF antennas.

>> > "T2FD" stands for "tilted, terminated, folded dipole". Originally
>> > meant to be a nondirectional, frequency-insensitive RECEIVING antenna,
>> > fed with balanced line. Really cutting-edge stuff a half-century ago -
>> > hook one to yer R-390 and there's no need to fool with the antenna
>> > trimmer. Or run the T2FD into a multichannel "antenna coupler" (which
>> > most hams would call an "active splitter" and feed a bank of HF RXs
>> > tuned to different freqs. No adjustment required.
>>
>> Which is exactly what the gummint did on HF and probably still does in
>> pockets. There are gobs of old photos floating around of racks fulla
>> military 390s listening on widely-separated HF freqs.
>

>Obviously.

"Obviously?!?" NO PROOF presented, Reverend.

I've touched such "390s" at Camp Owada. Jimmie Carpenter
worked there (he's a WA2...).

But...the antennas there were rhombics and delta-match
dipoles.

>> That's not how
>> hams play the antenna game then or now, not even close.
>
>Not how hams in their right minds do it, anyway.

Yes, Reverend. Follow the Good Book religiously. No
infidel "in his right mind" would DARE use something
else. That would be heresy.

>> > The interesting thing is that some folks are of the mindset that "if
>> > the govt. and military use it, it MUST be the best". They disregard
>> > the differences between the govt's needs and resources vs. hams. (You
>> > see that sort of thinking all the time here on rrap).

Go thee to Google, Reverend Jimmie...you will find MANY
messages on morse code use BY the military as an
incorrect rationalization for continued morse testing for
amateur licenses having below-30-MHz-privileges.
Especially so by ex-USN types who learned morsemanship
in the Navy.

>> Ya sorta got me there, I haven't noticed much posted around here about
>> using gummint radio equipmemnt in the ham bands.
>
>I'm not talking about equipment per se, though there has been some
>ranting about SINGCARS equipment. (How SINGCARS would ever relate to
>amateur comms has not been explained). And endless recounts of high
>power point-to-point transpacific military RTTY comms of a
>half-century ago.

Does the Reverend KNOW what is "SINCGARS?" :-)

Frequency range 30 to 88 MHz. Bridges the amateur 6m
band. It is portable, a small manpack, has an RF power
output control...like ham QRP rigs for outdoors work. FCC
allows hams to use spread spectrum which is an option on
that set by panel control. A quarter million sets have been
produced so far...does the Reverend think they will "never"
become surplus? :-)

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Reverend Jimmie was never in the US military,
not even working for State, never did HF comms for the
government lately or even 50 years ago (he wasn't born yet
50 years ago)...so anyone else who DID do that is, in his

absolutist, religious mind, spewing "endless recounts" of
HF communications experience. If the Reverend didn't do
it and the Good Book of the Church of St. Hiram hasn't
printed it, it is no good.

Kellie can't say squat either...he shot his catapult piston
as a civilian and while taking intelligence photos of a
flying Russian bear. :-)

>> Makes no sense,
>> certainly military radio gear with maybe an exception or two simply
>> doesn't meet the average ham's operating & technolgy implementation
>> needs.
>
>The needs and resources are entirely different. Plus the new stuff is
>too costly for almost all hams anyway.

Ham and lima beans in MREs isn't too bad... :-)

Ham radio does NOT work 24/7. The US military works 24/7.
With the exception of the Prussian Colonel's service, of
course.

However, let's just look at the 1948 surplus radio market as
represented by prices at H&H Electronics on Kishwaukee
Street in Rockford Illinois then: ARC-5 receivers for $6 each,
ARC-5 transmitters for $12 each, ARC-5 antenna tuning unit
and voice modulator for $18 each; racks for the above in
several models ranging from $3 to $10 each. All working,
aligned, packed in individual domestic cartons, ready to plug
and play, including dynamotors. [ideal for mobile if one had
a 28 VDC vehicle ignition system such as Kellie had...?]

ARC-5 (aka SCR-274) units were made by the thousands at
government cost easily 10 or more times surplus prices,
flew in all sorts of WW2 aircraft (aircraft did not have much
in the way of nice environmental control).

>> This ain't ARC-5 days, we've come a long way baby and the
>> miltary has too but in vastly different directions. Including the
>> antennas.
>
>With a few exceptions, most WW2-vintage surplus was better utilized by
>hams as a parts source than as a conversion project. The low cost of
>today's ham gear makes the point moot - you're not going to find the
>equivalent of, say, a Ten Tec Omni 6 in surplus at anything like the
>price you can be a clean used TT with all the filters.

Reverend forgot that nearly all WW2 surplus radios worked
well outside ham bands of then...or today.

Gosh, Reverend Jimmie KNOWS what US hams DID before
he was born! He KNOWS the sets were "just parts sources!"

He does NOT know of dozens of ham periodicals featuring
WHOLE SETS converted for ham use.

>The amateur solder slingers are too busy homebrewing or building kits.
>More bang fer the buck than fooling with surplus.

He KNOWS all...SEES all... :-)

>> Especially when they're firmly established village idiots whose real
>> hobby is trolling RRAP.
>>
>Well, that leaves me and a few others out...

Holy Men never troll.

The Church of St. Hiram is never wrong for they are the god of
Ham.

This is getting to be better than a can of imported cashew nuts!

<signature here as registered with Copyright Office>

1284. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-30 20:31:38 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030130153138.05573.00000464@mb-mh.aol.com>
Source record: 60366

In article <f45722ac.0301300530.7176bf9a@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
>news:<20030129173302.08900.00000269@mb-mf.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It
>> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>> >Date: 1/29/03 1:34 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0301291134.464131e9@posting.google.com>
>>
>> >But, in a sense, you are right. For example, I've cited where the
>> >ARRL VEC and others are in violation of FCC Part 97 with respect to
>> >Morse Code testing. The ARRL VEC has taken it upon itself to
>> >substitute a Farnsworth exam at 13-15 wpm for the Part 97 specified
>> >Morse Code exam at 5 wpm. The FCC appears to be OK with it, as
>> >enforcement is too much work, and revising the regulations is too much
>> >work.
>>
>> Please demonstrate where the character spacing technique is even an
issue
>> in the regulations, Brian. This horse has been beaten, too, and proven to
be
>> irrelevent.
>
>Proven to be irrelevent?
>
>OK, prove it.

Dill Sergeant Putz seems to have a memory problem. The US amateur
regulations concerning definition of morse rate has been discussed at
length and shown that the FCC had been using an outdated CCITT
Recommendation that did not define word rates. Dennis Ferguson
did the cap on that showing the relationship to morse word rate as
given in the very latest version of Part 97. There is NO specific
definition of character rate versus word rate, though that was de
facto (not de jure) ruled by the FCC giving VECs permission to send
characters at a higher rate than word rate.

>> The FCC interprets the "Farnsworth question" to be like the
Coke-vs-Pepsi
>> taste tests. Who cares?
>
>The patent office.

Brian, you are too subtle for the humorless Dill Sergeant. The
Patent Office rules on the formulation of beverages and the
subsidiary Trademark folks rule on trademarks of products.
Dill Sergeants not only lack humor, they mix metaphors
meaninglessly...

Metaphors be with them...

>> >So bad laws are ignored. Ignoring a law, however, is very different
>> >from enforcing a law.
>>
>> Who defines what is a bad law, Brian? You? Lennie?
>>
>> Youse guys confer and get back to me.
>
>So why did you clip the part about you not knowing who is in charge of
>enforcement? The FCC or Major Organizations? Huh?
>
>Another lie.

Dill Sergeants of the Amateur CORPS are the lawgivers. You are
supposed to obey their Commands...for the corps, God, and
country in that order. They get confused when they can't find the
answer in the UCAJ (Uniform Code of Amateur Justice) and try
to get by on bluster with shouting.

Temper fry.

<signature here in accordance with the Geneva Convention>

1285. Re: Claims Of Dishonesty

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-30 20:31:39 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030130153139.05573.00000465@mb-mh.aol.com>
Source record: 60368

In article <f45722ac.0301300603.26f915b@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> Careful, Brian, Reverend Jimmie might be Out To Getcha!
>>
>> Check for tatoos on his knuckles if you see him... :-)
>
>Len, give it up! He nailed you good on the Extra out of the box (no
>time limit stipulated, however). I think I told Bruce I was going to
>get Extra, also.

Reverend Jimmie rode into town, found an old message
under an old stack of messages, yanked it out and
Issued Orders to Get Out Of Town By Sunset.

He was livid with fury and righteousness and took time
from working DX on HF with CW (and his family?) to
spend more countless hours on Google digging, digging,
digging for "dirt." His Wrath knows no bounds and all
Sinners against the Church of St. Hiram Shall Be
Punished!

He can't take things in context but must take them out of
context, highlight them, separate them to Illuminate The
Transgressions of The Ungodly. Another compulsive-
obsessive who MUST be RIGHT (anywhich way he can).
"Face" must be preserved.

"Extra out of the box" should not be difficult...except for
the needless morsemanship test in the year 2003...107
years after radio was first proved as a comm medium...
94 years after the first USA organization (Radio Club of
America) was formed...58 years after the end of World
War 2 (also the end of using morse behind enemy lines).*
US radio amateurs MUST revere and venerate beloved
morse code and worship at the Church of St. Hiram or be
virtually burned at the stake, forbidden the Rights of the
US Constitution and petitioning their government for the
redress of grievances.

The Haulers Of Infidels To The Stake must keep igniting
their burning bushes for THEIR HONOR is really at stake.
They managed to pass a code test long ago so ALL must
pass a similar test or be branded, castigated, spit upon
as "inferior."

Reverend Jimmie: "I'll have my stake medium rare, no explitives, with a large sprig of prissiness on the side."

>So what are we going to do about it?

Dunno, Brian. Seeing what the Extra does to former human beans...along with the Mark of the 1x2...and the neverending fantasy stories...plus the marching in ranks to the drum beat of morse, morse, morse in the "service" of their nation doesn't sound all that attractive to rational social persons.

Our house doesn't have any wallpaper so DX contesting isn't on the List Of Things Desired. Keeping the Traditions of Morsemanship Alive (or Dead) is very low on that List, last in fact. Accumulations of certificates and brag sheets on the wall for all to admire (wife's two Master's sheepskins are in a box in the northern house, mine in the file cabinet here) about WAS and DXCC and the like aren't an inducement. I once worked HF "DX" circuits trans-Pacific on a 24/7 basis (meaning continuously) and know it as a definite possibility as far back as 50 years ago. I've used radio personally to communicate on LF, MF, HF, VHF, UHF and microwaves in other radio services so that act of using radio is not strange nor un-familiar nor magic nor mystic, not even metaphysical. After making a comfortable living pushing electrons around, I know one has to obey the laws of physics first, the laws of humans second.

Maybe it's from an interest in technology? No, that can't be it for the Prussian Oberst has commanded that "interest in radio" ONLY happens when one has an amateur license.

Maybe it's from an interest in socializing with others, sort of like early CB Radio Service was? No, that can't be it for the chest-thumping, morse-beating, mind-boggling Bigots all say that CB is evil incarnate. Heaven forfend that anyone stoop so low as to suggest such heresy?

Maybe for its historical value of minutae, mountains of minutae heaped by the Reverends who were unborn then yet "know" the motivations for everything? Now that might be an incentive, a chance to exhibit paranormal powers not possible by ordinary mortals uncertificated as amateurs by the Power of Morse.

Maybe it would be nice to be an Absolutist, a Correctivist who vehemently commands strict obediance to certain things, certain technologies, certain antennas, certain jargon and phraseology, and The Way To Do Everything? No, that's just too rigid, too inflexible, non-adaptive, marching-in-ranks hive mentality where one is spoon-fed only the True Gospel according to the Church of St. Hiram, the god of Ham. That's kind of low on the list, too much like those Al Quaida Believers. Besides, it's too much work to memorize all those monthly

QST ads so that one can go the Zen route of Being One With
The Latest Radio Technology, knowing All About Radio as a
result.

Maybe it would just be a fun hobby? That sounds okay.

NO! NO! HAM RADIO IS A SERVICE, IT IS NOT A HOBBY!
shout the Absolutists, marching in ranks in amateur uniform
with ham medals tinkling on their manly chests, waving their
ARRL PR news squibs like swords.

Definitely NOT a hobby or recreation. I'm told (more than once)
that it is Dedication...working at it like I've never worked for
anything else in my life. The Don Quixotes shout and swear
much and their misery mules kick and carry on that it cannot
ever be enjoyable...it is duty, honor, tradition that Must Be
Upheld In A Neverending Dedication...Forever. Uuuugh!!!

Hmmm...I'm kind of running out of motivations. Maybe you can
supply a few? I would be obliged.

>BTW, I heard Jim's looking for a prison artist to get a tear tattooed
>on his cheek bone in your honor. ;^)

Oh! That would be so touching!

Does Elecraft sell a do-it-yourself tattoo kit? Reverend Jimmie
could do it hisself and then brag about "designing his own
tattoos!" :-)

I'm surprised no one remarked on a classic novel of absolutist
morals, "The Scarlet Letter." A red "A" for Amateur might
be appropriate or a red "H" for Ham...but no doubt the dispute
of the one versus the other holds some folks back.

<signature here, with the needle...>

==========

* Precalculated numbers included to avoid errors by former
foreign office members.

1286. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-30 20:47:21 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0301301247.318c459e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60369

"K HB" <k hb@arrl.DOTORG> wrote in message
news:<vG2_9.3941$wd2.312348@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>...

(W3RV wrote):
> : I tuned
> : around before I called the net, there were a flock of midwesterners on
> : the air then and Hans *buried* 'em. I'll stick, he was not using a
> : wideband, lossy antenna like a t2fd or anything like it and the
> : chances are that he was running suds too.
>
> Homebrew two-element linear-loaded yagi at 70ft. Single 3CX1200A7 running
> about 1350W give or take a few cents.

YES!!

HEAVY METAL THUNDER!!!!!!

Sounded really good here in EPA, Hans. As usual.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1287. Re: Out Of The Box?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-30 21:29:30 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E399979.C9DD45C9@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60370

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20030128194825.12173.00000228@mb-mr.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:
>
> >In article <20030128112728.02295.00000280@mb-bk.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
> >Robeson K4YZ) writes:

> >
> >RESUME QUOTE:
> >
> >I'm going for Amateur Extra "out of the box." Maybe I'll
> >make it, maybe not. The personal point is irrelevant.
> >
> >PAUSE QUOTE
> >
> >Well, there you have it. Nothing ambiguous or qualified about it at all. Not a
> >claim of what could be done, or might be done, but of what he was going to do.
>
> Bullshit, boy. Take that into the entire context of the
> message...and then go "interpret" your buddie Kellie's
> message text the same way you "interpreted" mine.
>
> You can't do it, boy. You're a PCTA and so is Kellie.

I take it that "Bullshit" means "I wrote it; they found it; they
re-posted the quote". What interpretation is necessary, Leonard? You
wrote the statement.
You haven't taken a single step toward bringing it to reality.

> >Of course there is no time frame mentioned, and it is always possible he
> >changed his mind in the three years since he wrote those words. But it is
> >clear he DID say he was going to get the Extra class license.
>
> Extra WHAT? :-)
>
> I also said around that time, elsewhere, that I would invent
> antigravity and win the Nobel Prize, writing my own speech
> of acceptance in Swedish! :-)

Sure you did. Nice attempt a dodge. It fails, but nice attempt.

> Jimmie-boy, DO NOT GET SO PEDANTIC. Do NOT go
> that way, for such things can misfire on YOU!

Just take the heat coming to you and suck it up, Len. When you go into your capital letters mode, you simply appear frantic.

> >"I'm going for Amateur Extra "out of the box.""
> >
> >It's clear to any reasonable person what that sentence means.
>
> Jimmie, Jimmie, Jimmie...it is "clear" that you are NO
> "reasonable person!" You're a PCTA...that says it all.

That isn't clear at all, Len. You did write what had long been attributed to you. That says it all.

> Okay, I'll give you another thing to let you Live in Google:
>
> I'M GOING FOR EXTRA-OUT-OF-THE-BOX. SOME TIME.

Why should you be believed now? Your first statement to that effect proved to be a crock.

> Some time...after I've been brainwashed into thinking that
> morse code will "always get through when ALL other modes
> fail," that US amateur radio is not a hobby but a vital
> service to this country, that amateur radio is a Way Of
> Life that requires some kind of Right Attitude just like
> Jimmie's, Kellie's, Steamy's (Sgt HAH Putz, that is),
> the Colonel's (when he isn't innovating order-wires).

I'd have thought that you'd have had enough twisting in the wind for a while.
Your often-repeated statements that I claimed origination of the idea for use of a CW order wire aren't borne out by a google search. In fact, Google reveals just the opposite, a statement by me that I had to work with what was in place. Then again, you don't have much of a reputation for fact--witness your "Key Officers list" statement. It has been a bad week for you, Len.

Dave K8MN

1288. Re: Leonard's Tall Tales - Volume I

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-30 21:34:27 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E399AA2.EB1D1E9D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60371

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E3701BA.5D4EE245@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >It looks as if Len has been propagating an untruth for a number of
> >years.
> >He's as far off base on the order wire yarn as he was on the Key
> >Officers listings.
>
> Bravo on SELECTIVE QUOTING for whatever suits your
> weird little outraged mind!

Where's the SELECTIVE QUOTING, Leonard? If you can find any relevant
material which you believe to be missing, furnish it. Anyone interested
in seeing your past untruths has only to do a search.

> Now tell us more about Adventures in Guinea-Bisseau using
> CW as an order-wire on an RTTY circuit.

To what end? You didn't understand the first part.

> Gotta love those
> tales of innovation and dering-do in a "sensitive posting!"

Shall I run N2EY's summary of your actions toward others who disagree
with you?
Naaaaah! You've probably seen it enough to memorize it by now.

Dave K8MN

1289. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-30 21:38:49 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E399BA9.2066B394@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60372

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E37D5EF.8D05931D@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <3E366D23.DBC4D171@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >I've believe he has you clocked, Leonard.
> >>
> >> That "clock" is broken, doesn't tell time, chimes only when the
> >> key winder is upset at time lookers not viewing with the
> >> proper Heilian attitude. :-)
> >
> >As stated, I believe he has you clocked.
>
> With WHAT? The poor guy can't press the buttons on a stop
> watch because his skin is so thin he keeps bleeding...
>
> >> Why not tell us more about Heil's Adventures in Guinea-Bisseau,
> >> that important center of communications innovation and trial?
> >
> >So you can begin a new series of bald faced lies?
>
> Lie about WHAT, colonel...I say, WHAT?

It had to happen sooner or later. You've told so many that you can't
remember them all.

>
> I was never in Guinea-Bisseau. Never heard of it before your
> tale, had to look it up in the CIA Factbook. Wow, an
> "important" country to world trade...they supply the world
> with cashew nuts, their chief export.

I would imagine that there any number of things you've never heard of
and which you had to look up. Then you begin posting about them as if
you were an expert on the subject. You know--sort of like what you do
about amateur radio.

> Go ahead, go nuts...
>

> Well, I AM clean-shaven...no mistake on that, son...I say
> clean-shaven, boy, hear me? :-)

Thanks, Foghorn.

Dave K8MN

1290. Re: Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, FCC, Cronkite, ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-30 21:44:11 UTC
From: Paul Vanasse <pvanasse@cox.net>
Message-ID: <L0h_9.127667$ui1.2464306@news1.east.cox.net>
Source record: 60373
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

> W1AW is the station of the ARRL, which is the sole effective
> representative of amateur radio to Congress, the FCC, and other
> governing entities.

The ARRL doesnt speak for all amateurs. That's the problem here. They actually think they do.

>The bulletins that it transmits meet every
> standard of permissible transmissions set forth by the FCC.

WHOA! Hold on a minute buddy. Im no fan of K1MAN or his antics but the W1AW station isnt conforming to Part 97 or Good Amateur Practice either.

Try holding a CW QSO on any of the W1AW Bulletin frequencies right before the ARRL CW bulletin commences. What you'll find is that the bulletin will begin REGARDLESS of the existing QSO which means that the W1AW station is either: A. Not following good amateur practice by knowingly interferring with an ongoing QSO or B. The bulletin begins broadcasting automatically at the scheduled time, which means that there is no control operator present in the shack at the W1AW station in Newington. Either way, whether preadvertised or not, these are both clear violations of Part 97 and Section 33. No-one has taken them to the mat yet.

Keep in mind, just like K1MAN, the ARRL doesnt own those frequencies either. Out of 636,000 U.S. hams, only 157,000 are league members. The bands are supposed to be for EVERYONE, not a vocal minority.

Try this experiment, I have.

1291. Re: Why Dave has such a p*ss poor attitude

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-30 21:50:07 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E399DF7.3B212EE8@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60374

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E37CDF7.3663EABD@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >> In article <3E3676F7.7C44606B@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> >> >>
> >> >> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >> >> news:3E3432E5.8266EB56@earthlink.net...
>
> >> >Nobody works 24/7, much less 24/7/365--not even Leonard H.

> >Being on call is not working 24/7. Military members are given
> >opportunities to sleep. None of the people described work round the
> >clock for a week--none of them.
>
> Oh, my, pedantry strikes again... :-(
>
> "24/7" is a common coloquialism for "continuous operation."
>
> Herr Robust is running out of ammunition for his tireless
> tirade throwing.
>
> UNITS work 24/7. Organizations work 24/7. Police and
> fire and medical public safety units work 24/7. Some
> supermarkets even work 24/7.

Ohhhhhhh! So you are now a UNIT! You told us that YOU worked 2/47.

> >> "NOBODY works 24/7" according to Heil. None. Zip. Nada.
> >>
> >> Sigh...must have been cushy duty in some State Deptartment
> >> postings or in USAF units "that worked with NASA." :-)
> >
> >Don't you have enough egg on your face for a single week? I'll settle
> >for a single example of someone who is actually working 24 hours per
> >day, seven days per week.
>
> In late 1945 the 71st Signal Service Battalion was organized,
> built a transmitter site on a man-made island in Tokyo Bay
> called Tsukishima. That transmitter site operated

> continuously, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week until it was
> moved to an abandoned airfield near the city of Kashiwa,
> northeast of the city of Tokyo during the years of 1954 and
> 1955. Operation never ceased...as circuits were downed at
> Tsukishima they were upped at Kashiwa. The callsign was
> ADA. Operation continued by the US Army until 1963 when
> the USAF took over all HF transmitters, receivers, torn-tape
> relay. Kashiwa remained in continuous operation until 1978
> when the necessity for HF communications circuits as a
> primary means were no longer needed by the USAF.
> That's 1978 - 1945 = 33 years of continuous operation by
> USA and USAF units of about 1000 strength, respectively.

> The 71st was renamed the FEC Sig Svc Bn in late 1953 and
> merged with the 72nd Sig Svc Bn at Camp Zama in 1958 to
> form the Japan Signal Service Battalion with 7 companies
> total. Downsizing of US military units continued over the
> following years until the only Honshu island signal unit left
> was the 78th Sig Svc Bn at Camp Zama (the old 71st and
> 72nd combined after two more unit name changes). They
> are under command of the 516th Signal Brigade at Fort
> Shafter, Hawaii, that brigade attached to Headquarters, US
> Army Pacific. Members of the 78th still wear the Fuji patch
> on the left shoulder that I and thousands of others wore
> proudly years before. The callsign ADA is now that for the
> Headquarters USARPAC. It still lives about 57 1/2 years
> later.
>
> The 78th Signal battalion doesn't operate on HF continuously
> anymore but the have an HF detachment to maintain that as
> a fallback emergency feature. That battalion DOES operate
> 24/7 for DSN maintenance and some microwave circuits.

Thanks for the really lengthy history lesson. If your legal name is "ADA", perhaps you can claim that you worked "24/7". Otherwise, your statement is false. You went to a lot of trouble to post three paragraphs of crap to cover your lack of answer for the question asked of you.

> >This excludes someone who works the
> >occasional long stretch. Come up with someone who has actually put in
> >148 continuous hours.
>
> I've just come up with someone who used to be in the US
> government who is a pedant plus but cannot do simple
> arithmetic. There are 168 hours in a week, senior, not 148.

Simple typo. You know--ever since I suffered that spinal injury. ;-)

> Next time order your eggs fried. They aren't so messy looking
> on your face...

I haven't made any false statement about working 24/7, Key Officers lists or CW order wires. Live with it.

Dave K8MN

1292. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-30 22:11:15 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E39A342.59208604@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60375

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E37D4FE.B4856451@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >> In article <3E367B14.3D42354F@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> writes:
>
> >> >> Amateur radio is a fun hobby, a recreation.
> >> >
> >> >How would you know?
> >>
> >> I've read the "official" ARRL output on amateur radio. :-)
> >
> >C'mon, Len. How would you know that amateur radio is a "fun hobby",
> >having never been a participant?
>
> My apologies, Herr Robust. I didn't know one had to have
> PASSED A TEST FOR FUN to understand what "fun"
> and "hobbies" are...!

How would you know that mussels taste good unless you've eaten mussels?
How would you know that skiing is an exhilarating sport unless you've
skied?
You don't know if ham radio is fun or not. You've never been a ham.

> >> Tell us more about Guinea-Bisseau and how it compares to
> >> a Scandinavian country. Does the US State Department radio
> >> in Finland use CW as an order-wire on RTTY circuits too?
> >
> >What U.S. State Department radio in Finland?
>
> You mean to tell us the US State Department DIDN'T HAVE ANY
> RADIO IN FINLAND?!?!? Good grief, that's an extraordinary
> revelation!

> >> For "credentials" in psychology, I can call on my own
> >> consultant, my wife, who has two Masters degrees (both
> >> from University of Illinois) with one of those being in Social
> >> Work. She was a licensed private counselor in the states
> >> of Illinois and Washington for a number of years. She has
> >> Robeson...and you as well...tagged, labeled, pickled, and
> >> put on the shelf as classic examples of dysfunction.
> >

> >What does she have to say about your antics?
>
> "Antics?" Commentary in newsgroups are "antics?" :-)

Yours are.

> She thinks I'm having fun, indulging a bit on poking all that
> fun at a bunch of tight-assed holier-than-thou self-proclaimed
> "superior beings" who need Credentials From Authorities in
> everything. In short, like the chief export of Guinea-Bisseau
> some of you are nuts. :-)

So, she really doesn't know what you do here then?

> >But you aren't a licensed psychologist any more than you are a licensed
> >radio amateur. You can't practice either without a license.
>
> Colonel, are you undergoing a Religious Transformation? It looks
> like you are trying to become an assistant pastor to Reverend
> Jimmie, his most Holy Inquisitor of the Church of St. Hiram.

Was there something not factual about what I wrote? Did you have a
denial?

> Heck and darn, I have to wait until the Federal Fun Commission
> mails me my Fun Credential so that I can Know About Fun!

They'll mail it right after you pass your fun exam. Perhaps you can go
for "Mister Top Fun right out of the box".

> >Show your wife the above paragraph and ask her professional opinion of
> >someone who would continue posting such unsubstantiated stuff. Explain
> >to her that you and not some adolescent wrote it.
>
> She might still be studying Your Orders, Herr Robust.
>
> Have something to eat. Pizza a rope.

I'm sure she'd find something interesting in your response.

> >> Yourself, on the other hand, imply you are the "expert" in
> >> radio...not just amateur radio, but in ALL radio.
> >
> >Such a claim has never been made by me.
>
> NO?!?!? Okay, I stand corrected. I'll rewrite your dossier,
> Herr Robust, mark you down from "officious blowhard who
> knows all" to "officious blowhard who once did comms for
> the government." You will get a gold star if you can tell how
> you could be a radio officer for State in Finland yet not have
> any radio!

You don't get very much right. I've never ever held the job title
"Radio Officer" anywhere. My early Foreign Service specialty was called

"Support Communications Officer". Later it was changed to "Information Management Specialist". My job was never solely about radio.

> >All of your untruthful claims have been repeatedly and strongly refuted.
> >In fact, my original statements from five years back have just been
> >quoted here to show you for what you are.
>
> Waaa, waaa, waaa. :-)

Don't cry, Len. In time, people will forget what a boob you made of yourself.

> NO "refutation," senior. You haven't even come close to
> copying your original statements (the colonel "makes
> statements" instead of posting messages...typical).

If I've omitted anything relevant, kindly post it.

> Copy over ALL of them...then keep doing it over and over
> and over again until your anger is satisfied. Goodie, by
> that time everyone will have left, tired of all the outrage
> quotations. Have a nice life.

Ohhhh. You've already searched and can't find anything else in the "ALL of them", huh? I'm having a nice life, Len. I didn't need any assistance from you.

> >No, your current problems are explaining how you've made the untruthful
> >statements about things like use of CW as an order wire and the absence
> >of my name in State's "Key Officers" lists in the face of irrefutable
> >proof to the contrary.
>
> Try to LIVE with what happened, colonel. You claimed that
> "your idea"

Wrong, Bucko. Never stated by me. It has been denied repeatedly and Google backs me up. Twist in the wind--like you're doing in your false "Key Officers" claim.

> of a "CW order-wire on an RTTY circuit" was a "neat
> idea...

Yep, I said that. It didn't take me long to see the value in it. That has been explained here several times.

> ...something to impress the troops, few of whom had ever
> worked commercial HF communications.

I've never stated anything like that. I made the statement in response to some clown--I think it was you--who stated that the government didn't use CW.

> You didn't expect
> that someone who HAD done that would stuff it up your nose.

Right. I didn't expect that to happen and it never did.

> Then you backtracked and said it was "State Department
> radio procedure." Oh, sure, first it is "your" idea then it is the
> government's "procedure." That's nonsense, boy, I say
> nonsense.
> :-)

Do your homework and offer proof. Your only alternative is to be known
as a liar.

> Just how did you communicate out of Helsinki without any
> radio set, boy? MilSpec Nokia cell-phones? :-)

Why do you want to know? Are you beginning a new series of lies?
Shall I reproduce N2EY's insightful quote?

Dave K8MN

1293. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-30 23:00:41 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E39AE80.903FF25C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60376

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E38BF6A.AB2C6E2F@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Brian wrote:
> >>
> >> jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu (Jeffrey Herman) wrote in message
> >news:<b1929n$6ad$1@news.hawaii.edu>...
> >> > Brian <brianburke@juno.com> wrote:
> >>
> >> > >I was an unlicensed ARRL member. No problems. The local library is
> >> > >apparently an unlicensed member also.
> >> >
> >> > You mean the librarian? Someone (a person) had to sign the NCI
> >> > "petition."
> >> >
> >> > 73, Jeff KH6O
> >>
> >> Jeff, the local library has a copy of QST on the shelf.
> >
> >Let's see if we have this one right. You believe that because a library
> >has a subscription to QST, the library is an unlicensed member of the
> >ARRL?
> >Read the fine print, Brian.
>
> Does Herr Robust need a napkin for the second day's Egg
> Foo Face?
>
> Go thee to Google and search for direct quotes from K0HB
> on ARRL membership. Go thee to ARRL website and find
> direct statements of membership.
>
> Anyone or any entity can become a member of ARRL. Their
> "membership" is so loosely defined that ARRL must make
> statement (ugh) that ONLY licensed amateurs can VOTE in
> ARRL elections.
>
> If Marian the Librarian signs a subscription request of QST
> for her library, she becomes a non-voting "member" or the
> library itself becomes a non-voting "member." ARRL won't
> play 76 Trombones for her during ARRL elections.
>
> <signature here, not for subscriptions>

Nope. I forgot that in addition to not being a licensed psychologist or radio amateur, you aren't an ARRL member. Page 5 of the January 2003 issue of QST says (in the fine print despite what Brian says): Subscription rate for libraries and institutions is $39 per year." No membership for libraries but you get some more egg for your own mug, Len. Pass some to Brian.

Dave K8MN

1294. Re: arrl article on echolink - impress a non ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-30 23:00:49 UTC
From: Scott <scott@scotti.sh!t>
Message-ID: <C_mdnVwvqt4GM6SjXTWcqg@comcast.com>
Source record: 60377
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

shortwave dingalings wrote:
>
> By jove, I think Herbie's got it!
>
> :) :) :)
>
> ps: don't forget to give those non-hams a taste
> of k1man's redundant poor-audio quality
> broadcasts. we need more psudeo RF
> ambulance-chasing "jump teams" you know.
>
> pss: saw one guy at a ham club meeting here last week.
> 3 HT's on his belt....belt/waistline being what looked
> like a size-58. (he actually had to *turn sideways* to
> go thru a standard 30 by 76 inch door frame) Great image
> for ham radio eh? Someone should videotape him trying
> to get into a phone booth at the next hamfest and send it in
> to America's Funniest Home Videos before he drops dead
> of a massive cornary and they bury him in a piano crate.

Why does he need a phone? He'll just whip out one of his
handy dandy snazzy do-all 2-meter CB radios and do an
autopatch to order a double-cheese works pizza.

1295. Re: The coders embarrass themselves on 14.275 MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-30 23:10:37 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0301301510.64798a37@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60378

Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns93119D63D93EFelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
> news:20030128062208.12173.00000217@mb-mr.aol.com:
>
> > In article <Xns9310674182842elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
> > <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
> >
> >>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
> >>news:20030127083647.16889.00000237@mb-cc.aol.com:
> >>
> >>> In article <Xns930FEFFD5E116elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
> >>> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
> >>>
> >>>>Riley Hollingsworth recently visited our local club. One of the
> >>>>things he said in his talk was that he had never heard of a complaint
> >>>>of a CW op jamming.
> >>>
> >>> I think what he meant was CW ops jamming other CW/digital ops.
> >>>
> >>> In other words, jamming in the 'phone bands is much, much more common
> >>> that in the CW/digital bands.
> >>>
> >>>> It occurred to me at the time, although I didn't get the chance to
> >>>> tell him, that I had heard someone sending
> >>>
> >>> (expletive deleted)
> >>>
> >>>> repeatedly in CW on a repeater.
> >>>
> >>> I don't doubt it, even though I've never heard such on a ham
> >>> repeater.
> >>>
> >>>>It's a myth that there's no jamming or swearing on CW.
> >>>>
> >>> Of curse it's a myth. The point is, however, that it's far less
> >>> common on CW than on voice modes. Just read the FCC enforcement
> >>> letters. Lots of enforcement actions against hams using voice in the
> >>> voice bands, extremely few (if any) against hams using CW or digital
> >>> in the CW/digital bands.
> >>>
> >>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >>>
> >>>

> >>
> >>So, let me see if I've got this right. You're saying that only us phone
> >>ops are the victims, and just because they don't send obscene CW at the
> >>CW end of the band that somehow makes CW better?
> >
> > Nope.
> >
> > I'm saying that jamming and obscenity are extremely rare in the
> > CW/digital parts of the bands. So rare that enforcement actions against
> > them are practically unknown. Much rarer than those sorts of violations
> > in the 'phone bands. Since many if not most HF ham rigs manufactured in
> > the past 20 years or so have built-in electronic keyers, and many have
> > a memory feature, sending a word or two of Morse with them does not
> > require a lot of skill.
> >
> > There are certain frequencies in the 'phone bands, (3950, 14313) and
> > some VHF/UHF repeaters (W6NUT) that have become infamous for poor
> > operator behavior. No such freqs exist in the CW/digital bands.

Is this not true?
> >
> > If the use of a certain mode results in far fewer violations by those
> > using the mode, doesn't that make the mode somewhat better?
>
> I think it's merely that it's harder to attract attention using CW.

I find that I can attract a lot of attention on CW with just my
homebrew 100 watt transceiver and trap inverted vee antenna. It's a
little harder with my QRP rig, but not by much.

From actual observation I can say that violations such as jamming,
obscenity/profanity, and failure to identify are uncommon in amateur
radio as a whole, and extremely rare in the CW/digital parts of the HF
bands. In the past 35 years of operating amateur radio CW I don't
recall a single instance where I heard obscenity/profanity on CW in
the CW/digital bands. Can you say that about the 'phone bands?

FCC enforcement actions today are largely complaint-driven. Somebody
sends a credible complaint (such as audio tapes with
time/date/frequency clearly marked) to the FCC, and FCC follows up
with their own investigation. Why are there so many complaints about
'phone but so few about CW and digital?

If the use of a certain mode results in far fewer violations by those
using the mode, doesn't that make the mode somewhat better?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1296. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-30 23:27:31 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0301301527.5b5326e6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60379

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E385232.1ABB9D56@att.net>...
> N2EY wrote:
>
> >
> > > > > >: But since the WBFD is at least the size of a G5RV or trap dipole, and
> > > > > >: costs at least as much as a conventional dipole plus a tuner, it is a
> > > > > >: mystery why any ham would use a WBFD.
> > >
> > Rewrite that to to read "a mystery why any knowledgeable ham would use
> > a WBFD in preference to an dipole of equal size".
>
> No one I know would.

>I'm sure there are a few you "know" who would argue endlessly in
favor of the WBFD.

But make no mistake, they are a useful solution to some HF antenna
problems, and are
> in useful service at some ham stations where multiple antennas of better efficiency are
simply not
> possible.

Multiple antennas are not needed for greater efficiency. Despite the
disinformation spread by some, a dipole is NOT a one-frequency
antenna.

For example, a parallel or trap dipole, or a G5RV of equivalent size
will easily beat the WBFD in efficiency. Or the classic
dipole-fed-with-open-line and a tuner will do the job on practically
any frequency. AG6K's article on simple balanced tuners (see his
website or QST for February, 1990) pretty much rules out any cost
advantage of the WBFD.

>My only experiences with the B&W WBFD (at work) surprised me very
much. They performed much
> better than I ever expected, having previously viewed them as aircooled dummy loads.

A lot depends on the frequency used, propagation, power level, etc.
Only really useful comparison would be if you had a high-efficiency
antenna for comparison.

Heck, I made over 300 QSOs in the past two CW SS contests with just 5
watts output. That's 13 dB lower than my 100 watt rig.

> Clearly their
> efficiency is variable and beyond the fact that maximum efficiency must be limited by the
resistive

> loading, is just as clearly is largely dependent on the operating frequency in use. On higher frequencies
> they certainly work acceptably well while on lower bands the term "aircooled dummy load" is no misnomer.
>
> Although I picked up a "bargain" used B&W unit when I ran accross one, I did so mainly for the wideband
> balun and large terminating resistor, worth more than what I paid. Under some circumstances I might indeed
> string it up intact, or modify it to my own requirements of the moment. But so far I've been quite happy
> with individual dipoles, even when operating in temporary locations. I usually hang one cut for 20 meters
> in inverted vee style with the ends low enough to reach from the ground, and cut a pair or two of extension
> wires with alligator clips to hang on the ends when I want to drop down to 30 or 40. and let the autotuner
> do it's thing.

That's one solution. I use trap dipoles with homemade traps - can
cover two bands without adjustment, and most HF bands with just a bit
of help from the tuner.
>
> But I would never count the WBFD out, after having used one for a few years to meet several HF statewide
> nets where ALL the couple dozen net stations were also using them successfully and where no one experienced
> anything but success. They're not just junk. In fact, it struck me at the time that one could recalibrate
> his S-meter and never know the difference!

If you have enough suds and a clear frequency.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1297. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-30 23:34:28 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301301534.665285be@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60380

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030130113854.03252.00000362@mb-cr.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 1/30/03 7:30 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0301300530.7176bf9a@posting.google.com>
>
> >Proven to be irrelevent?
> >
> >OK, prove it.
>
> The FCC's done that for me, Brian. They have stated that they will not
> consider any further petitions on this subject as no new evidence on the
> validity of code testing hes been provided.
>
> Furthermore, FCC officials of some repute (ie Messrs Hollingsworth and
> Cross) have publically stated that any further badgering of the FCC on this
> matter only hurts the Service's overall standing with them...And they made it
> clear they were addressing both the pro and anti factions.

Steve, I didn't ask you to tell me about it, I asked you to prove it.
Post your proof.

> >> The FCC interprets the "Farnsworth question" to be like the
> Coke-vs-Pepsi
> >> taste tests. Who cares?
> >
> >The patent office.
>
> The Patent Office is now regulating Amateur Radio?

Steve, you changed the subject, not me. The Pepsi and Coca-cola
recipes are patented.

>
> >>Youse guys confer and get back to me.
> >
> >So why did you clip the part about you not knowing who is in charge of
> >enforcement? The FCC or Major Organizations? Huh?
>
> Brain, are you gay?
>
> Are your eyes so obstructed with Lennie's withering manhood (I've given
> the benefit of the doubt in using the term "man"hood) that the previous day's
> posts were invisible to you? did you MISS the part where I said that the FCC's

> authority in matters pertaining to the FCC were NEVER in question, least of all
> by me?

You are sick.

> >Another lie
>
> Not by me.

Yup.

1298. Re: arrl article on echolink - impress a non ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-30 23:36:52 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030130183652.14205.00000229@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 60381

From: "shortwave dingalings" boinkboobies3@aol.com
>pss: saw one guy at a ham club meeting here last week.
>3 HT's on his belt....belt/waistline being what looked
>like a size-58. (he actually had to *turn sideways* to
>go thru a standard 30 by 76 inch door frame) Great image
>for ham radio eh? Someone should videotape him trying
>to get into a phone booth at the next hamfest and send it in
>to America's Funniest Home Videos before he drops dead
>of a massive cornary and they bury him in a piano crate.

To be fair, all those HT's on his belt must have made it more difficult to get through the door.

"Herb" <Herbie@KingOftheJammers.net> wrote in message news:b1bb9j$1t2$0@pita.alt.net...
>> Impress a non ham even more. Take them to a ham radio club
>> meeting or better yet, a hamfest.

Yes, invite a non-Ham to a club meeting or a Hamfest. There one can see the typical Ham. The non-Ham will see that Hams are weird.

>"Herb" <Herbie@KingOftheJammers.net> wrote
>> View the assortment of ex-cons, wife beaters, alcoholics, druggies,
>> nut cases, slobs, fruits, and societal misfits who make up the crowd that
>> attends hamfests and ham club meetings today.

Hams are mostly good people. Most of this stuff isn't true. Societal misfits seems to hold true.

>"Herb" <Herbie@KingOftheJammers.net> wrote
Then view the obese
>> slobs in wrinkled filthy clothing who haven't bathed in months, as they
>> charge the food table and stuff a dozen donuts in their mouths while
>> talking at the same time, soda spilling all over their clothes.

True, most Hams are fat. The really obese tend to stand out. This is just more confirmation of that.

>"Herb" <Herbie@KingOftheJammers.net> wrote
>>Oh, and
>> be sure not to miss the guys with five HTs on their belt with microphone
>> cords wrapped around them and several microphones clipped to their
>> shirts. They'll be wearing four or five badges with their ham call sign,
>a
>> belt buckle with ham call, a shirt with a call sign, and a hat with their
>> call
>> sign in six places on the hat!

Obsessed, cult like.

>"Herb" <Herbie@KingOftheJammers.net> wrote
>>Hams will tell you they are war heroes,
>> former Navy SEALs, Green Berets, and the president of their own high
>> tech company, making millions a year. Or they work for a large high
>> tech company, just got a big pay raise and make $100,000 a year. Oh,
>> and last but not least, check out the cars hams drive. The vehicles will
>> have at least five antennas on it, call signs plastered all over the
>> windows,
>> ham call letter license tags on the front and back and bald tires.

The achievements of a few are made to represent the hobby. These are not the typical Hams. Attend a Hamfest to see a typical Ham.

>"Herb" <Herbie@KingOftheJammers.net> wrote
YES,
>> DO impress a non ham friend with today's ham radio hobby!
>>
>> Herb

Exactly. I have been saying this, but you have expressed it in more detail and more eloquently than I have. One just has to go to a Hamfest and/or club meeting and non-Hams will see the typical Ham. Societal misfits, fat, obsessed, cult-like, and a fantasy of importance.

1299. Re: Out Of The Box?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-30 23:54:33 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0301301554.3a534333@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60382

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E384C8C.5860DFAC@att.net>...
> N2EY wrote:
>
> >
> > So the question I would ask of you, Steve, is this: Why let Mr. Anderson's
> > mistakes, errors, and insults bother you so much? Why should anyone take him or
> > his comments seriously?
> >
>
> Ya got it, James OM. Why waste time even paying attention to a pair of gasbags
> such as he and his
> minor clone T5-Slim Burke? Such a pair of gasbags of proportions such as to make
> the Hindenberg
> look like a party baloon does make one wonder when they'll fire off in similar
> fashion.
>
> Defintely a collosal waste of time and talent. For such drivel is clearly the
> extent of their talent.
>
>
>
> > And why would anyone interested in the good of the ARS want him to make good on
> > his intention?
>
> I can't imagine that'll ever be much of a problem, can you?
>
> Dick

I agree. Those of us who get involved in the scratchings of the gas
bags apparently either have too much time on our hands or we have a
problem with priority-setting. Which needs fixing. I suggest that we
stick to ham radio and let The Pointless Duo babble at each other.

w3rv

1300. Re: Claims Of Dishonesty

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-31 00:24:54 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0301301624.6e8e5d71@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60383

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030129171107.08900.00000264@mb-mf.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Claims Of Dishonesty
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >Date: 1/29/03 12:29 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20030129132919.27196.00000019@mb-ba.aol.com>
>
> >Wanna-be pediatrics expert Jimmie Miccolis seems to think
> > that ALL six-year-olds have full comprehension of reading
> > along with full judgement of responsibility at that age.
>
> It's not about wether or not these kids did or did not have comprehension
> of the material.
>
> It's wether or not you said what you said.

Exactly. The issue is whether Mr. Anderson accused the ARRL of
"dishonesty". He claims not to have done that. My earlier post showed
that he accused the ARRL of "very mild fraud", which by any rational
definition means he accused them of dishonesty. (Anybody ever see
fraud committed honestly?)

Note how Mr. Anderson attempts to evade the actual issue and attacks
the messenger.
>
> You have not answered why you made an accusation you ahve not backed up
> with evidence.

Actually, Steve, that should be self-evident. Mr. Anderson thinks that
his own personal observations of six-year-olds proves that the two
children could not have passed the tests honestly. As Dee, N8UZE,
points out, there is no requirement that a person be able to read and
write in order to pass the exam. The testing of blind persons comes to
mind (Braille exams may not be universally available).
>
> >I would assume that nearly all parents of THEIR children
> > would claim that...(SNIP)
>
> Quick, Lennie...remind us how many children YOU have sired and raised?

That's irrelevant, Steve. The issue is whether Mr. Anderson accused
ARRL of dishonesty. The answer is YES. Is there any credible evidence
to back up such a claim? The answer is NO.
>
> >I still don't "present any proof" because any trip to a large

> > market with kids in tow of mamas or any visit to a first-grade
> > classroom will demonstrate to ANY observer that first-graders
> > do NOT have adult or even teen-age reading ability OR
> > comprehension of difficult subjects involving science and law.
>
> The "proof" is you delivering the hard evidence of YOUR allegations of
> dishonesty.

Note again how Mr. Anderson uses his own personal observations as if
they were universal.

I have known six-year-olds whose reading ability was so advanced that
their parent would give them the shopping list and the child would
read help out with the shopping by reading the list aloud and finding
some items on the shelves. (No, the parent did not let the child run
loose in the store).
>
> I for one have no doubt the kids did not use a "cheat sheet" or other
> unethical aid, and I have no doubt the examiners made no effort to "prompt"
> them or "fudge" the grading process.

How do you know, Steve? I don't think you were there. I wasn't there,
Mr. Anderson wasn't there. All we can say for sure is that there has
been NO evidence presented of any rules violations or dishonesty at
that VE session.

The issue is whether Mr. Anderson accused ARRL of dishonesty. The
answer is YES. Is there any credible evidence to back up such a claim?
The answer is NO.
>
> Does this mean the kids "knew" the material? That's irrelevent. If an
> adult can read and re-read a "study guide" to the point of recognizing the
> questions, so what if a 6 year old does it? A 60 year old?

Or a 70 year old? FCC doesn't care - and they're the "expert agency",
right? FCC makes the rules - not me, not you, and certainly not Mr.
Anderson.

For more than 42 years, FCC has used only multiple-choice questions on
the amateur radio written exams. Answer enough questions right without
prohibited assistance (cheat sheets, etc.) and the test is passed. FCC
sees no problem with that system, and also has no problem with young
people getting amateur radio licenses. And FCC is the "expert
agency"....
>
> >>Also never mentioned is the fact that most people taking the test would
> >>probably have seen the questions and answers before, with plenty of time to
> >>learn unfamiliar words and phrases.
>
> > "Most people!" Jimmie KNOWS "most people."
>
> Complete the sentence, Your Lameness.

Now Steve - why the name-calling? You're giving Mr. Anderson exactly
what he wants - an excuse to continue his behavior.

>"Most people taking the test". In
> that specific contest, he is right. This is a known fact. One need but stand
> at the door of any VE session and watch the last minute cramming.

And FCC has no problem with it.
>
> >Pity he was 8 years late getting his first license...missed all the
> > "fun and activity" of late-night beeping, saving the Titanic, etc.
>
> And you've been....70 plus years late...?!?!
>
> >Yup. Jimmie thinks ARRL is the god of Ham.
>
> As opposed to you who IS "god of Ham"...?!?!
>
> (...see me choking back the laughter!)
>
> >And here we've had another...(SNIP)
>
> ...example of Lennie the Lame doing one of his tent revival sermons
> against the person asking the questions...but NOT answering the questions.

Steve, Mr. Anderson has been posting here under various screen names
for at least 5 years. Do you really think his behavior will change
just because he is presented with facts and logical arguments?
>
> >>Note that Mr. Anderson acts as prosecutor, judge and jury, yet presents
> >>absolutely no proof whatsoever to support his claims.
> >
> > Oooo! A Supreme Judge has Spoken!
>
> Nope. Absolue fact. You made accusations you cannot or will not
> substantiate.
>
> You got caught lying...
>
> Again.

Only Mr. Anderson really knows if he is "lying", Steve. That is, if we
define "lying" as "saying that which is known to be untrue, with the
intention of deceiving others". Perhaps Mr. Anderson simply made a
mistake when he said he never accused the ARRL of "dishonesty".
Perhaps he forgot what he wrote. This newsgroup has provided us with
many examples of Mr. Anderson's memory lapses about what he and others
have written, as well as examples of his errors in logic and
historical facts.
>
> >"Mistakes" again. Sigh. The Right Reverend has wound up his
> > Sermon on the Antenna Mount...hopefully.

>
> I am sure you ARE hopeful...Hopeful that you successfully obfuscated the
> context of Jim's post and hopeful that you can blow enough smoke as to avoid
> the truth that you are caught lying again.

Why not just say he made a mistake, Steve? That has been proven
conclusively here.

Mr. Anderson does not admit to such mistakes, of course, because he
cannot tolerate, let alone accept, the idea that someone he considers
an inferior (that would be me) could actually find a mistake in his
writing. Thus he fills his posts with name-calling, personal insults,
infantile behavior, claims of being misunderstood, etc., in a failed
attempt to anger those who disagree with him and deflect attention
from the actual issue.

The issue is whether Mr. Anderson accused ARRL of dishonesty. The
answer is YES. Is there any credible evidence to back up such a claim?
The answer is NO.
>
> >Reverend Jimmie KNOWS everyone's motivations and is
> > preaching the Gospel according to the Church of Hiram. All
> > fear Him for He is So Serious and Righteous!
>
> We don't have to know "everyone's", Lennie...Just you.

Note how Mr. ANderson never does tell us his motivations.
>
> Lying creep.

Why not just say he made a mistake and won't admit it?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1301. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-31 00:25:57 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b1cgb0$6it$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 60384

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030128105004.19271.00000651@mb-fp.aol.com...
> In article <b14ga0jjc1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >
> >But you don't care enough about to allow the future of morse
> >to be a free choice decision. You want code testing to be that
> >recruiting effort. Well at least that's an honest statement.
> >
> >Cheers
> >Bill K2UNK
>
> Bill:
>
> No, I don't. Like it or not, amateur radio is not a democracy, and
doesn't
> have to be!

I agree.

> It needs to be "democratic" only to the extent that all people
> are equally eligible to apply for a license, assuming they can meet the
> established licensing requirements.

Agree again.

> However, the Welfare State liberals
> saw the Morse code testing requirements as an inconvenience which
> forestalled their progress toward the goal of getting an HF microphone
> in front of their faces, so they whined long and hard enough to get them
> reduced to the point of insignificance.

Well, so you think. Did I miss the debate where that
line of reasoning was brought forth? Seems the FCC simply
judged morse as a test requirement and found no rational reason
for it. Difficulty had nothing to do with...although I'm pretty
sure you'll disagree with that in spite of the lack of any arguments in the
public
record to support your viewpoint.

> It's amazing how our hobby's backward progress has tracked that of
> society as a whole.

Yawn! Same ole, same ole... the country's going to hell in a hand basket
I guess.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1302. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-31 00:32:42 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b1cgb2$6it$2@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 60385

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030129204547.27873.00000300@mb-mj.aol.com...
> In article <b1937m$645$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20030128083623.05048.00000263@mb-cs.aol.com...
> >> In article <OulZ9.1420$N5.819411@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> >> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
> >>
> >> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >> >news:20030126215637.20835.00000270@mb-fy.aol.com...
> >> >>>
> >> >> Are there more than 3400 current NCI members?
> >> >
> >> >Yes ...
> >>
> >> How many?
> >
> >What difference does it make?
>
> Carl made a point of ARRL membership numbers and percentages. He also
claimed
> that the procodetest opinion was a minority view.

I have every belief that IF a valid "survey" was taken today, pro-code test
would be a minority viewpoint. It was not much of a majority within
the ARRL when ARRL did a survey some time about 1996 or so.

> >> And since there are no dues nor membership expirations, how do you know
if
> >> a
> >> "current member" still exists?
> >
> >What difference does it make?
> >
> The member totals get inflated. The numbers indicate how many people have
> joined in the lifetime of the organization, not hwo many are currently
active.
> Like JA operator licenses. Imagine the screaming if ARRL did that...

Personally I don't give a hoot.

> >> >>Nor, I might point out, does ARRL's membership constitute a
majority

> >> >> >of US hams ... more like a bit less than 25% IIRC the last numbers
I
> >> >> >noticed.
> >> >>
> >> >> Quite true. Nor does ARRL claim to constitute a majority, either.
>
> See what I mean?

I don't see any absolute numbers.

> >> >ARRL claims to be "THE National Society for Amateur Radio" ...
> >>
> >> Is there another national society for amateur radio?
> >>
> >> NCI cannot claim to be one, because
> >>
> >> a) it is "international"
> >> b) its sole stated purpose is to end stand-alone Morse code testing.
> >>
> >> What other "national society for amateur radio" exists in the USA?
> >
> >As before...what difference does all this make?
>
> Carl and others have made an issue out of ARRL being "THE national
society...".
> But there is no other "national society for amateur radio" in the USA, so
> ARRL's claim is perfectly accurate.

Still seems to have no impact in the FCC.

> >> >they
> >> >most certainly claim to speak for all when they file comments with the
> >> >FCC etc.
> >>
> >> How?
> >>
> >> >Not directly in so many words, but it is CLEARLY implied.
> >>
> >> Where? Where does ARRL claim to speak for all?
> >>
> >> ARRL's membership number is clearly stated. Not a secret in any way.
> >>
> >> What is NCI's current membership, give or take 1%? Why has that number
> >> been
> >> such a closely guarded secret?
> >>
> Well? If NCI's Executive Director can make a point of ARRL member numbers
and
> percentages, the same rules of discussion should apply to NCI member
numbers
> and percentages.

Fair point.

> >> >Fortunately, the FCC understands the reality.
> >>
> >> The FCC clearly does not interpret ARRL's words as claiming "to speak
for
> >>all
> >> when they file comments with the FCC etc." Such an implication exists
only
> >>in
> >> the minds of a few. Those few infer what is not implied.
> >>
> >> Does FCC know NCI's current membership, give or take 1%? Why has that
> >>number
> >> been such a closely guarded secret?
> >>
> Well?

I doubt the FCC cares.

> >> Anyone who comments to the FCC is, by definition, telling the FCC that
> >> their
> >> ideas represent what is best. Of course "best for whom?" is a different
> >> question. Some comments, like one that demanded an age limit of 14
years
> >> for
> >> any class of amateur license, do not represent what is best for the
ARS.
> >>
> >> Is there another amateur radio society in the USA that provides even 1%
of
> >> the
> >> services ARRl provides to the amateur radio community?
> >
> Answer: NO.
>
> >I am both an ARRL member and a volunteer in ARRL field activities (LGL).
> >I am also a director of NCI.
>
> No problem belonging to both, either.
>
> >Frankly, I don't see any value to this
> >discussion
> >since it is meaningless in the ongoing policy discussions and has been
for
> >some time.
>
> Then why did NCI's Executive Director bring up ARRL membership figures as
a
> discussion point - not just now, but several times in the past? What's
good for
> the ARRL goose should be equally good for the NCI gander.

> >
> >Turns out the FCC listens to ARRL, NCI and anyone else that has anything
> >credible to say...and in the end the FCC decides what to do.
>
> Yup - been that way a long long time.
>
> Anyone else know who the "National Amateur Radio Council" and the "Society
of
> American Radio Amateurs" were, and what they accomplished? Quite
interesting,
> really.
>
> >Hell, it works for me...not to mention that NCI's track record
> >with seeing NCI viewpoints taken by the FCC has been pretty
> >darn good.
>
> Considering that NCI is a one-issue organization, the tendency would be to
> either have very high or very low success.
>
> But why all the secrecy about membership numbers?

Why all the interest in them?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1303. Re: Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, FCC, Cronkite, ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-31 01:17:00 UTC
From: Bruce <Apply@anon.com>
Message-ID: <b1cioafic0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 60386
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Paul Vanasse" <pvanasse@cox.net> wrote in message
news:L0h_9.127667$ui1.2464306@news1.east.cox.net...
>
> > W1AW is the station of the ARRL, which is the sole effective
> > representative of amateur radio to Congress, the FCC, and other
> > governing entities.
>
> The ARRL doesnt speak for all amateurs. That's the problem here. They
> actually think they do.
>
> >The bulletins that it transmits meet every
> > standard of permissible transmissions set forth by the FCC.
>
> WHOA! Hold on a minute buddy. Im no fan of K1MAN or his antics but the
W1AW
> station isnt conforming to Part 97 or Good Amateur Practice either.
>
> Try holding a CW QSO on any of the W1AW Bulletin frequencies right before
> the ARRL CW bulletin commences. What you'll find is that the bulletin will
> begin REGARDLESS of the existing QSO which means that the W1AW station is
> either: A. Not following good amateur practice by knowingly interferring
> with an ongoing QSO or B. The bulletin begins broadcasting automatically
at
> the scheduled time, which means that there is no control operator present
in
> the shack at the W1AW station in Newington. Either way, whether
> preadvertised or not, these are both clear violations of Part 97 and
Section
> 33. No-one has taken them to the mat yet.
>
> Keep in mind, just like K1MAN, the ARRL doesnt own those frequencies
either.
> Out of 636,000 U.S. hams, only 157,000 are league members. The bands are
> supposed to be for EVERYONE, not a vocal minority.
>
> Try this experiment, I have.

ARRL? K1MAN? Who cares? By your count there are 479,000 of us out here that
do NOT belong to either. And why bother? Why waste the money on either one?
They do not speak for me.

1304. Re: Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, FCC, Cronkite, ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-31 01:40:56 UTC
From: Paul Vanasse <pvanasse@cox.net>
Message-ID: <luk_9.127968$ui1.2551678@news1.east.cox.net>
Source record: 60387
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

> ARRL? K1MAN? Who cares? By your count there are 479,000 of us out here
that
> do NOT belong to either. And why bother? Why waste the money on either
one?
> They do not speak for me.

I agree Bruce.

It's kinda like two fleas arguing over who owns the dog.....one good
scratch and they'll both be homeless.

1305. Re: Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, FCC, Cronkite, ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-31 01:49:58 UTC
From: LRod@removethispartpobox.com
Message-ID: <3e39c751.1288505520@netnews.att.net>
Source record: 60388
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

On Thu, 30 Jan 2003 21:44:11 GMT, "Paul Vanasse" <pvanasse@cox.net>
wrote:

>
>> W1AW is the station of the ARRL, which is the sole effective
>> representative of amateur radio to Congress, the FCC, and other
>> governing entities.
>
>The ARRL doesnt speak for all amateurs. That's the problem here. They
>actually think they do.

I didn't say they did. I said they are the sole effective
representative. That remains unchallenged.

>>The bulletins that it transmits meet every
>> standard of permissible transmissions set forth by the FCC.
>
>WHOA! Hold on a minute buddy. Im no fan of K1MAN or his antics but the W1AW
>station isnt conforming to Part 97 or Good Amateur Practice either.
>
>Try holding a CW QSO on any of the W1AW Bulletin frequencies right before
>the ARRL CW bulletin commences.

Why would you do that? There is only one reason, with all the vast
allocation of CW frequencies (that is, every single frequency ham
radio has), why anyone would do that, and that is just to try and make
a point. And a poor point at that.

In all of ham radio, is there anyone who doesn't know when and where
the code practice/bulletins are transmitted? You sound like someone
who would jump in front of an oncoming truck and then while lying
broken on the pavement, proclaim, "I was here first."

> What you'll find is that the bulletin will begin REGARDLESS of the existing QSO...

Well, duh. Are you new?

>which means that the W1AW station is either: A. Not following good amateur
>practice by knowingly interferring with an ongoing QSO...

Nonsense. See below.

>or B. The bulletin begins broadcasting automatically at the scheduled time, which
>means that there is no control operator present in the shack at the W1AW station
>in Newington.

Uh, huh. Have you ever been there? Have you seen the operation? Do you even understand how they do all of that?

>Either way, whether preadvertised or not, these are both clear violations of Part 97
>and Section 33. No-one has taken them to the mat yet.

Sure, if you want to take the narrowest possible construction of the rules, you may be right. The reason given and the slack cut is because of the fact that W1AW transmits their bulletins on 7 or 8 different bands simultaneously, and that it is impractical to "check" each frequency for squatters trying to pick a fight.

The consensus among right thinking amateurs is that the greater good from the bulletin/code practice service overwhelmingly outweighs the apparent violation of the rules because the occasional muck raker wants to jump in front of a truck.

Why don't you file a complaint with the FCC? See how your interpretation of the rules jibes with theirs.

>Keep in mind, just like K1MAN, the ARRL doesnt own those frequencies either.
>Out of 636,000 U.S. hams, only 157,000 are league members. The bands are
>supposed to be for EVERYONE, not a vocal minority.

I repeat, compare the purpose and the service to ALL amateurs of the respective parties plus the history and expected continued effort of the respective parties and weigh them against the common good of ALL amateurs and there is no issue, except for a few rabble rousers.

>Try this experiment, I have.

No thank you. I'm blessed with a little common sense. Find some other windmills to tilt.

LRod

Master Woodbutcher and seasoned termite

Shamelessly whoring my website since 1999

http://www.woodbutcher.net

1306. Re: Why Dave has such a p*ss poor attitude

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-31 01:54:38 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030130205438.08181.00000269@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 60389

>Subject: Re: Why Dave has such a p*ss poor attitude
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 1/30/03 3:50 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3E399DF7.3B212EE8@earthlink.net>

>>Lenover21 wrote:

>> UNITS work 24/7. Organizations work 24/7. Police and
>> fire and medical public safety units work 24/7. Some
>> supermarkets even work 24/7.
>
>Ohhhhhhh! So you are now a UNIT! You told us that YOU worked 2/47.

Multiple personality disorder, Dave...it's the only explanation.

73

Steve, K4YZ

1307. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-31 01:57:45 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030130205745.08181.00000270@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 60390

>Subject: Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 1/30/03 2:31 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030130153138.05573.00000464@mb-mh.aol.com>

>Dill Sergeant Putz seems to have a memory problem.

Who's "Dill Sergeant Putz"?

>There is NO specific
> definition of character rate versus word rate, though that was de
> facto (not de jure) ruled by the FCC giving VECs permission to send
> characters at a higher rate than word rate.

If you were addressing me, I made no reference to there BEING a "word rate" vs "character rate" problem. I said there was NO problem.

Please try to get your rants aimed in the right direction, Your Sightlessness..

1308. Re: Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, FCC, Cronkite, ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-31 02:07:54 UTC
From: h4mb0ne@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <b0a445bd.0301301807.61daa655@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60391
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message news:<3E396BEB.90608@mailcity.moc>...
> Paul wrote:
> > I'm new to this topic so don't flame me, but if W1AW has a bulletin,
> > why can't Baxter have one? What is Baxter doing that is so bad that
> > the FCC would want to shut him down? He has been on a long time and
> > they haven't done anything... so doesn't that mean he is perfectly
> > legal as far as the FCC goes? Last question. If Cronkite gave Baxter
> > that announcement he uses, why should Baxter have to stop using it
> > now? I heard Baxter used to call people and the government names and
> > sent out some felony complaints, but isn't interfering with Baxter's
> > show illegal?
> >
> > I know I'm new and I'm not a ham, but I started to listen to Baxter's
> > show this month, and it just sounds like he is trying to help minority
> > kids and some kind of peace corp, plus he is putting other people's
> > material on, like newsline and arrl and rain and the like. So where's
> > the beef?
> >
> > Please, no flames, I'm just trying to learn and keep an open mind.
>

For someone who hasn't been on "top" of this you seem to know soooooo
much about Mr. Baxter. HE WILL GO DOWN.

A quick question for you. When you go blue fishing what kind of lure
do you use? I figured asking such a troll you would have the perfect
answer!

Back to you.

1309. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-31 02:17:36 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030130211736.08181.00000271@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 60392

>Subject: Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 1/30/03 5:30 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0301301530.198cb3a3@posting.google.com>

>Your diatribes are overwhelming. You support code testing.

I support honoring the laws we have. I don't like the idea that code testing is going away, but , as I have said repeatedly (and within the last 48 hours) that I accept it's demise.

I'm also sorry they stopped making 65 Mustangs...But got over that too.

>Some think it is needed regardless of the ITU requirement. A
>particularly large club began rejecting changes in the code as early
>as 1975 when forward thinking hams begans questioning it relavence.

A "particularly large club" in the 70's.

Now there's timeliness and relevence for ya.

>You are wrong.

Not until you provide some specific cite I'm not. Sorry you "think" otherwise.

>January is about tube radios.

And I SPECIFICALLY said with the exception of items of historical relevence...That article is about history and nostalgia...NOT about excluding new technology.

>Tube technology, Steve, tube technology. Clinging to the past, Steve,
>clinging to the past.

"Clinging to the past" would be publishing stories on tube technology TO THE EXCLUSION of all other technologies.

The January QST ALSO includes items on: A 222mHz transverter, computer interface with the TRX-Manager program, orientation to test equipment for new hams, product reviews on new HT's and weather station, plus the usual operating articles, ads and other "human interest" items.

Within the first 12 pages of QST are ads for all sorts of new technology, INCLUDING I-Link soft and hardware. Not a single tube in sight.

Whew.

Steve, K4YZ

1310. Re: Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, FCC, Cronkite, ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-31 03:30:07 UTC
From: Paul Vanasse <pvanasse@cox.net>
Message-ID: <35m_9.128183$ui1.2596699@news1.east.cox.net>
Source record: 60393
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

> I didn't say they did. I said they are the sole effective
> representative. That remains unchallenged.

What planet do you live on? Please prove to the group that the ARRL is effective. They've lobbied the FCC for the 60 meter band, the return of half of the 220 band that was previously taken away, and implentation of CC&R administrative law passage.....all for naught. They are losing in excess of 4000 members per year, not to metion that they've been tapping into cash reserves to stay afloat because of their ill funded agendas. The 440 band is on the verge of being taken away. A "Band Defense Fund" was started that has raised about $400K over the last 3 years which is about 5% what a commercial carrier will pay the FCC for a decent amateur band. During the 9/11 disaster the information coming out of Newington was 3 days old in addition to Jim Haynie not even setting foot in NY until Sept 25. Now they are promoting the "Hinternet" which is a pathetic, ill conceived attempt to recruit Technicians more interested in computers than amateur radios as a ploy for these individuals to join their ranks. Even the FCC has recognized that the ARRL doesnt carry any clout any longer, which is why the government doesnt give them the time of day anymore! Where I come from this is called a joke, NOT efficiency. My local Welfare office is more efficient, at least they give out vouchers for free blocks of cheese to people who really need it. Lets not forget that big score they made by getting us the 160KC experimental band. The only problem is one needs an antenna the length of Long Island, NY to work it.

> Why would you do that?

You're contradicting your own previous statements. The league, nor anyone else has the right to interfere with a frequency thats being used by others. Your ill conceived and malafide rationale is that the league has some sort of squatters rights to a particular frequency. I hate to tell you but league membership is dropping by the thousands every year because of the very modus operandi that you're spouting. Just think, in 5 more years you and your league will have less than 100k members while at the same time licensees are on the rise. How do you explain this one? Its thinking like yours that is driving people out and preventing newbies from joining in. In the former Soviet Union, the Politbureau of 42,000 really believed they could control 150,000,000 people. This is the same mindset. THE LEAGUE DOES NOT SPEAK FOR THE HOBBY BECAUSE THEY ARE IN THE MINORITY. And getting smaller every day.....

>> Well, duh. Are you new?

I was first licensed in 1968. What does this have to do with good amateur practice?

> Uh, huh. Have you ever been there? Have you seen the operation? Do you
> even understand how they do all of that?

As a matter of fact I have, and Im still not impressed. Although I must say that I do have a problem with pulling up into the league parking lot and seeing a dozen or so new Jeep Cheokee's owned by the people that cry poverty and desperately want my $39 per year. Personally I liked the old building much better.

> Sure, if you want to take the narrowest possible construction of the
> rules, you may be right.

I know Im right. There is no such thing as narrowly breaking the law. In the future if you're going to lay on the tracks for the league and defend them at least have your facts (and quote the law) straight. The law is the law, and the law is for EVERYONE equally.

1311. Re: Out Of The Box?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-31 03:47:21 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301301947.383bf95e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60394

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E384C8C.5860DFAC@att.net>...

> Defintely a collosal waste of time and talent. For such drivel is clearly the
> extent of their talent.

Is that anything like you wasting your coveted morse code talent by
sending code so atrociously so that it cannot be copied by machine.

Your words, not mine.

1312. Re: Out Of The Box?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-31 03:51:52 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301301951.11b4988b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60395

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0301301554.3a534333@posting.google.com>...

> I agree. Those of us who get involved in the scratchings of the gas
> bags apparently either have too much time on our hands

Boink

or we have a
> problem with priority-setting.

Boink

> Which needs fixing.

Boink

I suggest that we
> stick to ham radio and let The Pointless Duo babble at each other.

RV, did I do good on the "Boinks?" I'm still not sure how they're used.

And good luck sticking to ham radio.

1313. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-31 04:01:49 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301302001.42c65cf4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60396

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E39AE80.903FF25C@earthlink.net>...

> Nope. I forgot that in addition to not being a licensed psychologist or
> radio amateur, you aren't an ARRL member. Page 5 of the January 2003
> issue of QST says (in the fine print despite what Brian says):
> Subscription rate for libraries and institutions is $39 per year." No
> membership for libraries but you get some more egg for your own mug,
> Len. Pass some to Brian.

Oh, -that- fine print. Why didn't you say so? Im thought you meant
there was fine print to read in your posting.

1314. Re: Why Dave has such a p*ss poor attitude

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-31 04:04:41 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0301302004.13ad8bff@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60397

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E399DF7.3B212EE8@earthlink.net>...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > In article <3E37CDF7.3663EABD@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > writes:
> >
> > >> In article <3E3676F7.7C44606B@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > >> writes:
> > >>
> > >> >"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > >> >>
> > >> >> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > >> >> news:3E3432E5.8266EB56@earthlink.net...
>
> > >> >Nobody works 24/7, much less 24/7/365--not even Leonard H.
>
> > >Being on call is not working 24/7. Military members are given
> > >opportunities to sleep. None of the people described work round the
> > >clock for a week--none of them.
> >
> > Oh, my, pedantry strikes again... :-(
> >
> > "24/7" is a common coloquialism for "continuous operation."
> >
> > Herr Robust is running out of ammunition for his tireless
> > tirade throwing.
> >
> > UNITS work 24/7. Organizations work 24/7. Police and
> > fire and medical public safety units work 24/7. Some
> > supermarkets even work 24/7.
>
> Ohhhhhhh! So you are now a UNIT! You told us that YOU worked 2/47.

Steve, I'd like to work 2 on 47 off. I'm jealous.

1315. Re: Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, FCC, Cronkite, ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-31 04:11:31 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@att.net>
Message-ID: <THm_9.13547$rq4.975828@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 60398
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Paul Vanasse" <pvanasse@cox.net> wrote in message
news:35m_9.128183$ui1.2596699@news1.east.cox.net...
>
> operandi that you're spouting. Just think, in 5 more years you and your
> league will have less than 100k members while at the same time licensees
are
> on the rise. How do you explain this one? Its thinking like yours that is
> driving people out and preventing newbies from joining in. In the former
> Soviet Union, the Politbureau of 42,000 really believed they could control
> 150,000,000 people. This is the same mindset. THE LEAGUE DOES NOT SPEAK
FOR
> THE HOBBY BECAUSE THEY ARE IN THE MINORITY. And getting smaller every
> day.....
> As a matter of fact I have, and Im still not impressed. Although I must
say
> that I do have a problem with pulling up into the league parking lot and
> seeing a dozen or so new Jeep Cheokee's owned by the people that cry
poverty
> and desperately want my $39 per year. Personally I liked the old building
> much better.
>

The only cure for the ARRL demise (that is the organization of volunteer rank and file) is to move HQ to Atlanta or Fort Wayne or somewhere far away from Newington and clean house. IMHO this latest K1MAN thing is a canard foisted by the Newington crowd to provide a cause celeb for shutting down W1AW. Then, with no apologies to the rank and file, they can blame it all on Baxter, and with the operating savings and station sell off give HQ another raise. My local bookseller has taken QST off of the shelves so I don't keep up anymore. What did the HQ folks do with their homeland defense grant?

73,
Clay N4AOX

1316. Re: Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, FCC, Cronkite, ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-31 04:17:14 UTC
From: skuld-chan <skuld@mail.ru>
Message-ID: <eNm_9.100159$Ve4.7491@sccrnsc03>
Source record: 60399
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

My only problem with k1man is that he doesn't relinquish the frequency before his bulletin. He can't claim its pre-scheduled because thats for club stations only - and k1man is not a club callsign.

Guess there's two problems I have with k1man - to be honest his group (aara), and bulletins attract a lot of wierdo's.

sc

"Paul" <drakeswl@hotmail.com> wrote in message news:c0588492.0301300804.69039ba9@posting.google.com...
> I'm new to this topic so don't flame me, but if W1AW has a bulletin,
> why can't Baxter have one? What is Baxter doing that is so bad that
> the FCC would want to shut him down? He has been on a long time and
> they haven't done anything... so doesn't that mean he is perfectly
> legal as far as the FCC goes? Last question. If Cronkite gave Baxter
> that announcement he uses, why should Baxter have to stop using it
> now? I heard Baxter used to call people and the government names and
> sent out some felony complaints, but isn't interfering with Baxter's
> show illegal?
>
> I know I'm new and I'm not a ham, but I started to listen to Baxter's
> show this month, and it just sounds like he is trying to help minority
> kids and some kind of peace corp, plus he is putting other people's
> material on, like newsline and arrl and rain and the like. So where's
> the beef?
>
> Please, no flames, I'm just trying to learn and keep an open mind.
>
> Paul

1317. Re: Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, FCC, Cronkite, ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-31 04:24:28 UTC
From: drakeswl@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <c0588492.0301302024.69d1af3c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60400
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Paul Vanasse" wrote:
> > W1AW is the station of the ARRL, which is the sole effective
> > representative of amateur radio to Congress, the FCC, and other
> > governing entities.

> WHOA! Hold on a minute buddy. Im no fan of K1MAN or his antics but the W1AW
> station isnt conforming to Part 97 or Good Amateur Practice either.

I've read a lot of the material pro and con since my last post, including Part 97 and procedures for revocation. W1AW is also in violation if it fires up on ongoing conversations. RAIN and ARnewsline are broadcasts too, and the definition of bulletin in Part 97 is god awful, so the bulletin/broadcast argument is moot. Whenever definitions are vague, they are held to be meaningless, and the courts always boot any argument until the definition can be clearly stated.

If FCC prosecutes K1MAN for firing up on people, they need to prosecute W1AW for the same thing. Otherwise it is blatant favoritism. Same with K1MAN's bulletin. If they shut him down for his "show", they need to shut down everyone who carries RAIN and newsline. Those are definitely pre-prepared broadcast programs of a pretty high quality. All of it could be, AND IS, "alternately delivered by other services."

K1MAN has said he has a control op, he just didn't open the door when FCC came over to inspect. Since they didn't get in, they don't know if anyone was there or not, although it "appeared" no one was there.

So if the ALJ tosses the broadcasting argument, the control operator argument, and tosses the argument that K1MAN fires up over conversations in progress, what is left?

Lack of popularity and perceived obnoxiousness and the fact that he hasn't been around for 100 years like W1AW, can't be used to justify yanking someone's license.

Someone said there were character issues involved, and the FCC could use those because they are an administrative body and that was a precedent used as recently as the Herb Schoenbaum case. Can someone with the facts (not hearsay or rumors) tell us the character issues involved?

There better be better and different arguments out there, or the guys that want K1MAN off the air are going to be disappointed. My guess is there must be more issues than just these. What are they?

Paul Jennings, (and yes, I am a lawyer ;)

1318. Re: arrl article on echolink - impress a non ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-31 04:30:40 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E39FC2A.79E1C9AC@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60401

Vshah101 wrote:
> "Herb" <Herbie@KingOftheJammers.net> wrote in message
> news:b1bb9j$lt2$0@pita.alt.net...

> >> Impress a non ham even more. Take them to a ham radio club
> >> meeting or better yet, a hamfest.
>
> Yes, invite a non-Ham to a club meeting or a Hamfest. There one can see the
> typical Ham. The non-Ham will see that Hams are weird.

Hams are wired.

> >"Herb" <Herbie@KingOftheJammers.net> wrote
> YES,
> >> DO impress a non ham friend with today's ham radio hobby!
> >>
> >> Herb
>
> Exactly. I have been saying this, but you have expressed it in more detail and
> more eloquently than I have. One just has to go to a Hamfest and/or club
> meeting and non-Hams will see the typical Ham. Societal misfits, fat, obsessed,
> cult-like, and a fantasy of importance.

That's quite a unique manner of newsgroup attribution you use, Vipul.
Let me ask--how do you see yourself? Do you see yourself as fitting
into society? Do you believe yourself to be a fully functional, well
rounded individual? In your quest to expose radio amateurs for whatever
it is you believe they are, do you see yourself as having a "fantasy of
importance"? What type of individual obtains an amateur radio license
and spends large amounts of his time complaining that hams aren't like
he believes they should be and that amateur radio isn't what he thought
it would be?

Dave K8MN

1319. Re: Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, FCC, Cronkite, ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-31 04:41:42 UTC
From: skuld-chan <skuld@mail.ru>
Message-ID: <a8n_9.15202$G83.284@sccrnsc04>
Source record: 60402
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

If you were a lawyer you'd understand Part 97 rules just a tad bit better - K1MAN and W1AW do claim temporary ownership of these bulletin frequencies - which you can do. It is after all why k1man claims he can just ride over the top of 14.275 and send his "bulletin" - the fact that its scheduled.

look up 97.113 section D) which specifically states,

"The control operator of a club station may accept compensation for the periods of time when the station is transmitting telegraphy practice or information bulletins, provided that the station transmits such telegraphy practice and bulletins for at least 40 hours per week; schedules operations on at least six amateur service MF and HF bands using reasonable measures to maximize coverage; where the schedule of normal operating times and frequencies is published at least 30 days in advance of the actual transmissions; and where the control operator does not accept any direct or indirect compensation for any other service as a control operator."
97.113 is rules for amateur broadcasting. Schedules and bulletins can only be made by club stations. K1MAN call sign according to the uls data base is classified as "Amateur Individual"

Just like Riley's original letter to k1man,

"It appears that you may be under the misconception that by publishing a transmitting schedule of K1MAN, you have certain rights under Commission rules regarding the control operator and frequency sharing requirements that you would not otherwise have.

With regard to the requirement for a control operator, publishing a schedule does not relieve you of that requirement in any way whatsoever. Section 97.113(d) of the Amateur Radio rules states that by publishing a schedule of transmissions at least 30 days in advance, a control operator of a club station may accept compensation for the periods of time when the station is transmitting...information bulletins, providing certain additional conditions are met. Publishing a schedule of proposed transmissions, therefore, relates only to a club station control operator accepting compensation. We note that this is irrelevant to the operation of K1MAN because K1MAN is not a club station.

Simply put, to the extent that you start your transmissions on top of ongoing communications of other amateur service stations, you will be engaging in deliberate interference, in violation of Section 97.101 of the Commission's rules. No amateur service frequency is assigned for the exclusive use of any station. Your publishing an intended transmission schedule does not exempt you from that rule."

I'm curious of the name of your law firm btw.

sc

"Paul" <drakeswl@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:c0588492.0301302024.69d1af3c@posting.google.com...
> "Paul Vanasse" wrote:
> > > W1AW is the station of the ARRL, which is the sole effective
> > > representative of amateur radio to Congress, the FCC, and other
> > > governing entities.
>
> > WHOA! Hold on a minute buddy. Im no fan of K1MAN or his antics but the
W1AW
> > station isnt conforming to Part 97 or Good Amateur Practice either.
>
>
> I've read a lot of the material pro and con since my last post,
> including Part 97 and procedures for revocation. W1AW is also in
> violation if it fires up on ongoing conversations. RAIN and ARnewsline
> are broadcasts too, and the definition of bulletin in Part 97 is god
> awful, so the bulletin/broadcast argument is moot. Whenever
> definitions are vague, they are held to be meaningless, and the courts
> always boot any argument until the definition can be clearly stated.
>
> If FCC prosecutes K1MAN for firing up on people, they need to
> prosecute W1AW for the same thing. Otherwise it is blatant favoritism.
> Same with K1MAN's bulletin. If they shut him down for his "show", they
> need to shut down everyone who carries RAIN and newsline. Those are
> definitely pre-prepared broadcast programs of a pretty high quality.
> All of it could be, AND IS, "alternately delivered by other services."
>
> K1MAN has said he has a control op, he just didn't open the door when
> FCC came over to inspect. Since they didn't get in, they don't know if
> anyone was there or not, although it "appeared" no one was there.
>
> So if the ALJ tosses the broadcasting argument, the control operator
> argument, and tosses the argument that K1MAN fires up over
> conversations in progress, what is left?
>
> Lack of popularity and perceived obnoxiousness and the fact that he
> hasn't been around for 100 years like W1AW, can't be used to justify
> yanking someone's license.
>
> Someone said there were character issues involved, and the FCC could
> use those because they are an administrative body and that was a
> precedent used as recently as the Herb Schoenbaum case. Can someone
> with the facts (not hearsay or rumors) tell us the character issues
> involved?
>
>
> There better be better and different arguments out there, or the guys
> that want K1MAN off the air are going to be disappointed. My guess is

> there must be more issues than just these. What are they?
>
> Paul Jennings, (and yes, I am a lawyer ;)

1320. Re: Claims Of Dishonesty

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-31 04:53:55 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E3A019D.737290D7@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60403

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <f45722ac.0301300603.26f915b@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >> Careful, Brian, Reverend Jimmie might be Out To Getcha!
> >>
> >> Check for tatoos on his knuckles if you see him... :-)
> > >
> > >Len, give it up! He nailed you good on the Extra out of the box (no
> > >time limit stipulated, however). I think I told Bruce I was going to
> > >get Extra, also.
> >
> > Reverend Jimmie rode into town, found an old message
> > under an old stack of messages, yanked it out and...

...posted it for all to see. There is was in black and white.

Googled again.

> He was livid with fury and righteousness and took time
> from working DX on HF with CW (and his family?)

He works DX on HF with his family? Really? No wonder he's upset.

> He can't take things in context but must take them out of
> context, highlight them, separate them to Illuminate The
> Transgressions of The Ungodly.

What was the context, Leonard. How was your statement used out of
context.
I don't recall you prefacing your statement with, "I'm only kidding
but..."

> "Extra out of the box" should not be difficult...except for
> the needless morsemanship test in the year 2003...107
> years after radio was first proved as a comm medium...
> 94 years after the first USA organization (Radio Club of
> America) was formed...58 years after the end of World
> War 2 (also the end of using morse behind enemy lines).*

...and 137 years after the end of the Civil War, 104 years after the end
of the Spanish-American War and 937 years after the Battle of Hastings.
"Extra out of the box" isn't difficult, even with the incredibly slow 5
wpm morse test.

> US radio amateurs MUST revere and venerate beloved
> morse code and worship at the Church of St. Hiram or be
> virtually burned at the stake, forbidden the Rights of the
> US Constitution and petitioning their government for the
> redress of grievances.

Uh...you've petitioned your government. Your government just didn't get
around to doing what you wanted.

> >So what are we going to do about it?
>
> Dunno, Brian. Seeing what the Extra does to former human
> beans...along with the Mark of the 1x2...and the neverending
> fantasy stories...plus the marching in ranks to the drum
> beat of morse, morse, morse in the "service" of their nation
> doesn't sound all that attractive to rational social persons.

Enough about the rational, social persons. What are you and Brian going
to do about it?

> I once
> worked HF "DX" circuits trans-Pacific on a 24/7 basis (meaning
> continuously)...

You did not work trans-Pacific DX continuously. Do try and get it
right.
You worked shifts at a place which was in operation 'round the clock.

> Maybe it's from an interest in technology? No, that can't be
> it for the Prussian Oberst has commanded that "interest in
> radio" ONLY happens when one has an amateur license.

Nope. You can't get anything right this week. You've stated that
you've had an interest in amateur radio for some decades. It can't be
much of an interest if you've never acted upon it.

Dave K8MN

1321. Re: Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, FCC, Cronkite, ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-31 05:42:31 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E3A0CC7.7010601@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 60407
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

h4mb0ne wrote:
> JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message news:<3E396BEB.90608@mailcity.moc>...
>
>>Paul wrote:
>>
>>>I'm new to this topic so don't flame me, but if W1AW has a bulletin,
>>>why can't Baxter have one? What is Baxter doing that is so bad that
>>>the FCC would want to shut him down? He has been on a long time and
>>>they haven't done anything... so doesn't that mean he is perfectly
>>>legal as far as the FCC goes? Last question. If Cronkite gave Baxter
>>>that announcement he uses, why should Baxter have to stop using it
>>>now? I heard Baxter used to call people and the government names and
>>>sent out some felony complaints, but isn't interfering with Baxter's
>>>show illegal?
>>>
>>>I know I'm new and I'm not a ham, but I started to listen to Baxter's
>>>show this month, and it just sounds like he is trying to help minority
>>>kids and some kind of peace corp, plus he is putting other people's
>>>material on, like newsline and arrl and rain and the like. So where's
>>>the beef?
>>>
>>>Please, no flames, I'm just trying to learn and keep an open mind.
>>

Please learn to quote properly, I did not post this.

1322. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-31 05:56:38 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E3A104F.DEB7453A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60404

```
Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E36F9E9.42FD8459@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E367B86.5F2FFB61@earthlink.net>...
>
> > > > Brian is making great progress in his quest for knowledge about the
> > > > antenna. Just a few short months ago he didn't understand what it was.

> > >
> > > Dave, you couldn't be more wrong. I was using that type of antenna
> > > more than a decade ago.
> > >
> > > Better luck next time.
> >
> > I prefer my luck THIS time. Remember the following stuff?
> >
> > ----------------------------------------------------------------
> >
> > From: Brian P Burke (bpburke@prodigy.net)
> > Subject: Re: Sixty Meter Band Planning
> > Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> > Date: 2002-06-22 08:44:09 PST
> >
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3D1401E6.37D682@earthlink.net...
> > > Brian P Burke wrote:
> > > >
> > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:3D0FFDC5.9241EE3E@earthlink.net...
> > > > > Brian P Burke wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Do you want to be the guy up on the American Embassy wall changing the
> > > > > > length of an antenna, or doing the same in a chemical environment? Many
> > > > > > embassy's I've seen have two T2FD's, at 90deg angles.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Not American embassies, Brian. U.S. embassies use basically five
> > > > > > varieties of HF antenna: RX only broadband dipoles (resistive network,
> > > > > > works poorly), B&W broadband folded dipole (resistive network, works
> > > > > > poorly),
```

> > > >
> > > > A T2FD "clone." Shorter, less spacing in the folded portion.
> > >
> > > Not really. A T2FD is erected with a 20 to 40 degree tilt and is fed
> > > with open wire line. To quote Gilbert Countryman the W3HH of the day,
> > > "Basically , the antenna is the hyptoenuse of a right triangle, one leg
> > > of which is along the ground."
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > Then the manuals that I've seen illustrating the "T2FD" are incorrect.
> > ----------
> >
> > You can thank the folks at Google.

>
> Dave, how nice that you are finally able to use google.
>
> I'll say it again, "Then the manuals that I've seen illustrating the
> "T2FD" are incorrect," and everyone listed below is wrong, including
> one manufacturer.

Let's examine the urls provided by you as we go along.

> Just wishing I were wrong doesn't make it so.
>
> Would you mind exercising your newfound web skills to educate
> yourself? Here, I've done the hard work for you:
>
> From L. Cebik: http://www.cebik.com/t2fd.html

> ----------
> I'm sorry, but what were you saying about tilting the tilted antenna?
> ----------

Cebik gives you a hint and then proceeds to ignore the name of the
antenna.
Do you remember that T2FD is short for Terminated, TILTED, Folded
Dipole?
It would seem that it isn't a T2FD if it isn't tilted. Maybe you meant
T(erminated)FD.

I note the SWR curve using the 390 ohm terminating resistor. Ratios as
high as 9:1 give you an idea that using this antenna with a balun and 50
ohm coaxial cable would introduce even more loss to the system than that
50-90%% wasted in the resistor.

> More examples of non-tilted antennas can be found at
>
> http://www.armymars.net/personal/hamstation.html

Nothing about the T2FD here. Plenty of B&W folded dipoles though.

> ---
> Notice in the following link that the T2FD is matched to 50 ohm
> transmission line: http://www.johncon.com/john/T2fd/

"Matched" is a euphemism. Adding a balun and 50 ohm coaxial feeder only
increases the loss in the system.

> ---
> Now navigate to : http://www.dxzone.com/ and witness the feed line
> used on this T2FD.
>
> Note that in paragraph 3, the 20-40 deg slope is mentioned.

The url provided by you takes me to a main page for dxzone.com. There
is no feedline to witness.

> After Cebik's analysis, where he said, "Perhaps the only advantage may
> be mechanical, for those lacking a suitable high support from which to
> hang the antenna vertically," one would be wise to mount the tilted
> antenna horizontally, use two of them perpendicular to each other, and
> take advantage of their directional nature.
>
> Where have you heard that before?

From another guy who discounts the very name of the antenna.
> ---
> Now check out http://www.bwantennas.com/pro/instr/fdipole.pdf, the B&W
> installation notes, page 3.

Sorry, I don't currently have Adobe Acrobat installed on this computer.
I'll check it out in a few days if I remember.

> Must this antenna be deployed with a 20 to 40 deg slope? I don't
> think so. At least the manufacturer doesn't think so.

The antenna is not sold as a T2FD. I don't have any idea of what is
inside the sealed assembly nor do I know anyone who does. There may be
other than a single resistor in it.

> Also notice the similarities to the antennas described as "T2FD" on
> the other web sites. Do you know why that might be?

How many ways are there to make a folded dipole? Can one add a lossy
network to a folded dipole? Can it be tilted? Folded dipoles were
known in radio long before the introduction of the T2FD.
> ---
> From http://www.ominous-valve.com/antennas.txt:
>
> "Folded dipole- This is basically a dipole that has been folded
> back upon itself, using parallel wires with insulated spacers. Not
> only does the antenna become shorter, but its impedance changes,
> often for the better depending on application. Most people know
> these antennas from the little twinlead dipoles provided with
> consumer FM tuners.

> On HF, the folded dipoles are very popular with the military, due
> to their ruggedness, portability, and adaptability. They can be
> hung from flagpoles as an inverted V, stretched out straight, or
> sloped, depending on the tactical need of the situation. The classic
> military dipole is by Barker & Williamson, and you can buy one too,
> for a price."

While folded dipoles offer some increase in SWR bandwidth, they are one band antennas. We were not discussing one band antennas. The paragraph above is simply incorrect.

> ---
> From: http://www.pacificsites.com/~brooke/Ant.shtml
>
> The B&W Broadband Folded Dipole Antennas (ASW-90) U.S. Patent 4423423
> is an excellent receiving antenna for broad band signals like chirp
> sounders. This design is also called a T2FD. The efficiency for
> transmission goes down rapidly below 40 meters.

If a patent was issued to B&W for the antenna, it would have to be somehow different from the T2FD, a Navy antenna brought into amateur use. That would lead me to believe that there is indeed something aside from a simple terminating resistor inside the sealed assembly. Maybe it is the spiffy stainless steel wire which adds even more loss. By the way, I have the assembly instructions for the B&W antenna. B&W does not refer to the antenna as a T2FD.

> ---
> Oh, gosh no! The B&W antenna is a variant of the T2FD? Like Cebik's
> "narrow/short" version?

That case hasn't been made though there are some similarities. The B&W would have to be tilted and we'd have to know what is inside the sealed assembly. We'll discount the lossy stainless steel wire.

> It looks like it's "Dave against the world" again.
>
> Dave, what were you saying?

That only several months ago, you didn't know much about the antenna (like that it was designed to be tilted).

Allow me to recommend the June, 1949 QST article by Countryman. It is entitled "An Experimental All-Band Nondirectional Transmitting antenna (Some Possibilities Offered by the Tilted Folded Dipole). You can also try "Performance of the Terminated Folded Dipole" by Countryman, November 1951 CQ magazine and "More on the T2FD" by Countryman, February 1953 CQ magazine.
The latter two articles can be found reprinted in CQ's "Antenna Roundup" book, published in 1963.

Dave K8MN

1323. Re: MARS opinions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-31 06:02:36 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b1htif25nq@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 60514

I believe you must be able to operate on AT LEAST 2 HF bands to qualify.
That is the last I knew....

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

"Symbolism is for the simple minded....."

> From what I am told you have to have HF capability to even be
> considered for MARS.
>
> - H. Johnson
> 73, KG4WOU
> ==========
> *** SPAM Filter in place ***
> Just de-classify the e-mail address for correct reply-to
> ==========
>

1324. Re: Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, FCC, Cronkite, ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-31 06:12:03 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@att.net>
Message-ID: <Tso_9.13687$rq4.989546@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 60405
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Paul" <drakeswl@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:c0588492.0301302024.69d1af3c@posting.google.com...

> So if the ALJ tosses the broadcasting argument, the control operator
> argument, and tosses the argument that K1MAN fires up over
> conversations in progress, what is left?
>
> Lack of popularity and perceived obnoxiousness and the fact that he
> hasn't been around for 100 years like W1AW, can't be used to justify
> yanking someone's license.
>
>
If I were the ALJ, it would be "cease all BC in the phone portions, conduct BC-like stuff on OOK Morse, 15 wpm, on a frequency of your choice in the non-voice portions of the ARS bands, include no more than two subsequent retransmissions on the latest digital fad mode(s), same frequency". Why?, because this is the "alternate service of delivery". Case closed, K1MAN gone. W1AW saved.

73,
Clay N4AOX

1325. Re: Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, FCC, Cronkite, ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-31 06:29:47 UTC
From: Tom Sevart <n2uhcNOSPAM@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <b1d553$11podc$1@ID-52518.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 60406
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"LRod" <LRod@removethispartpobox.com> wrote in message
news:3e39c751.1288505520@netnews.att.net...
> >
> >Try holding a CW QSO on any of the W1AW Bulletin frequencies right before
> >the ARRL CW bulletin commences.
>
> Why would you do that? There is only one reason, with all the vast
> allocation of CW frequencies (that is, every single frequency ham
> radio has), why anyone would do that, and that is just to try and make
> a point. And a poor point at that.

I have been interfered with by W1AW in the past. I was engaged in a
legitimate QSO on the freq, not knowing it was a W1AW bulletin time/freq.
If a regular ham did that to another ham, it would be a violation of the
rules. It's hard to compete with 1500 watts when you're only running 100,
or even QRP.

> In all of ham radio, is there anyone who doesn't know when and where
> the code practice/bulletins are transmitted?

Obviously I don't, and I'm sure most other hams don't, either. I'm not an
ARRL member, so why am I supposed to know when & where W1AW will pop up?
It's not my responsibility to stay clear of the freqs they use, since I'm
licensed to use them too. Obviously, if I know when a broadcast is going to
start, I'd stay clear, but if I'm in QSO already, they should wait for me to
finish.

> > What you'll find is that the bulletin will begin REGARDLESS of the
existing QSO...
>
> Well, duh. Are you new?

And this is legal how?

> he reason given and the slack cut is because
> of the fact that W1AW transmits their bulletins on 7 or 8 different
> bands simultaneously, and that it is impractical to "check" each
> frequency for squatters trying to pick a fight.

So if I wanted to transmit a CW bulletin on several different bands whenever
I want, I can go ahead and do it because it's "impractical" to check for
people already using the frequencies? That's not good practice. The ARRL
is taking it upon itself to transmit on all those different bands at the
same time, so they should find a way to ensure the bands aren't in use.

> The consensus among right thinking amateurs is that the greater good
> from the bulletin/code practice service overwhelmingly outweighs the
> apparent violation of the rules because the occasional muck raker
> wants to jump in front of a truck.

The frequencies belong to all amateurs, not just W1AW. If someone honestly doesn't know a particular frequency is going to be used for a broadcast and is engaged in a QSO, then they should be able to carry on their QSO without being interfered with.

Nevertheless, I don't think much of K1MAN's broadcasts either. Neither he nor the ARRL owns any particular frequency. I think if an organization or an individual takes it upon themself to transmit an information bulletin, they should first check to see of the frequency is in use or not, regardless whether it's an inconvenience.

--
Tom Sevart N2UHC
Frontenac, KS

http://www.geocities.com/n2uhc

1326. Re: Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, FCC, Cronkite, ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-31 11:50:26 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030131065026.25403.00000063@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 60408

In article <L0h_9.127667$ui1.2464306@news1.east.cox.net>, "Paul Vanasse"
<pvanasse@cox.net> writes:

>> W1AW is the station of the ARRL, which is the sole effective
>> representative of amateur radio to Congress, the FCC, and other
>> governing entities.
>
>The ARRL doesnt speak for all amateurs. That's the problem here. They
>actually think they do.

ARRL speaks for their membership. FCC knows this, and how big that membership
is. The ARRL staff/directors don;t think they speak for all hams, or even all
US hams.

However, when ARRL does something that benefits ham radio, all hams benefit.
Does anyone think ham radio needs LESS rules enforcement? How do you think we
got Riley & Co.?
>
>>The bulletins that it transmits meet every
>> standard of permissible transmissions set forth by the FCC.
>
>WHOA! Hold on a minute buddy. Im no fan of K1MAN or his antics but the >W1AW
station isnt conforming to Part 97 or Good Amateur Practice either.

Really? FCC disagrees.
>
>Try holding a CW QSO on any of the W1AW Bulletin frequencies right before
>the ARRL CW bulletin commences. What you'll find is that the bulletin will
>begin REGARDLESS of the existing QSO which means that the W1AW station >is
>either: A. Not following good amateur practice by knowingly interferring
>with an ongoing QSO or B. The bulletin begins broadcasting automatically at
>the scheduled time, which means that there is no control operator present in
>the shack at the W1AW station in Newington. Either way, whether
>preadvertised or not, these are both clear violations of Part 97 and Section
>33. No-one has taken them to the mat yet.

Or C. There is a control operator present, but it is impractical to check each
and every bulletin frequency before the bulletin begins.

I have been at W1AW when bulletins and code practice were being sent. There was
a control operator present.
>
>Keep in mind, just like K1MAN, the ARRL doesnt own those frequencies either.

True. However, W1AW's schedules are published and easily available. It's a
simple matter to avoid them - just look in QST, or on the website, or invest a

stamp.

If K1MAN follows the same rules that allow W1AW to operate, what's the problem? If K1MAN doesn't follow those rules, it's a different story.

Three questions:

Why have a QSO on a frequency used by W1AW at a time close to bulletins and/or code practice?

Was the band so crowded that it was impossible for you to move a few hundred Hz?

What would you have W1AW do - shut down? Would it benefit amateur radio to eliminate W1AW bulletins and code practice?

>Out of 636,000 U.S. hams, only 157,000 are league members.

I think your numbers are off, but the proportion is about 25%. So what? Is there any other amateur radio organization in the USA that provides even 1% of the services provided by ARRL?

>The bands are
>supposed to be for EVERYONE, not a vocal minority.

The bands are for everyone with the appropriate license to use them.
>
>Try this experiment, I have.
>
Ah - so you INTENTIONALLY set up a QSO on a frequency you knew was used by W1AW, then blamed W1AW for "interference". Was that "good amateur practice"?

Suppose someone waited for a repeater to be quiet, then had a simplex QSO on the repeater output freq. and complained when the repeater ID came on. Would that be "good amateur practice"?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1327. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-31 12:22:18 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <_Tt_9.471969$FT6.95943779@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 60409

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:b1cgb2$6it$2@slb0.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> I have every belief that IF a valid "survey" was taken today, pro-code
test
> would be a minority viewpoint. It was not much of a majority within
> the ARRL when ARRL did a survey some time about 1996 or so.

"Por fin!" Let's do it! Let's then make the results of that valid "suvey"
into a petition to the FCC. I'd wager that the majority of the ARRL
membership would have no problem "footing the bill" via their dues to hold
an open election on this issue. I happen to work for a shareholder
communications firm that provides just such a service to a number of clients
and a 700,000 pc. job is no major feat. (Approx. 680,000 licensed folks plus
20,000 or so "interested" parties.) The results of which could then be
submitted to the FCC for their review or "non"-review. It'll never happen,
of course...but it'd sure be nice.

> Still seems to have no impact in the FCC.
> I doubt the FCC cares.

The above just about says it all re. this issue. :'-(

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

1328. Re: Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, FCC, Cronkite, ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-31 12:49:53 UTC
From: LRod@removethispartpobox.com
Message-ID: <3e3a655b.1328970247@netnews.att.net>
Source record: 60410
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

On Fri, 31 Jan 2003 03:30:07 GMT, "Paul Vanasse" <pvanasse@cox.net>
wrote:

>> Why would you do that?

>What planet do you live on? Please prove to the group that the ARRL is
>effective.

[rest of vitriolic anti-ARRL rant snipped]

Thank you. You answered my question.

LRod

Master Woodbutcher and seasoned termite

Shamelessly whoring my website since 1999

http://www.woodbutcher.net

1329. Re: Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, FCC, Cronkite, ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-31 12:59:47 UTC
From: Paul Vanasse <pvanasse@cox.net>
Message-ID: <7ru_9.130569$ui1.2732129@news1.east.cox.net>
Source record: 60411
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Ditto Paul!

> Paul Jennings, (and yes, I am a lawyer ;)

A fortiori. Suffolk U. Law 93'

1330. Re: Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, FCC, Cronkite, ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-31 12:59:47 UTC
From: Paul Vanasse <pvanasse@cox.net>
Message-ID: <7ru_9.130570$ui1.2732129@news1.east.cox.net>
Source record: 60412
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

> "The control operator of a club station may accept compensation for the
> periods of time when the station is transmitting telegraphy practice or
> information bulletins, provided that the station transmits such telegraphy
> practice and bulletins for at least 40 hours per week; schedules
operations
> on at least six amateur service MF and HF bands using reasonable measures
to
> maximize coverage; where the schedule of normal operating times and
> frequencies is published at least 30 days in advance of the actual
> transmissions; and where the control operator does not accept any direct
or
> indirect compensation for any other service as a control operator."
> 97.113 is rules for amateur broadcasting. Schedules and bulletins can only
> be made by club stations. K1MAN call sign according to the uls data base
is
> classified as "Amateur Individual"

This is a weak argument and sounds great on paper, but it DOES NOT preclude or give advantage to ANY club or organization from interfering with an on going QSO. Good Amateur Practice calls for requesting the frequency from those in the QSO, or having provisions (in advance) for moving up or down in frequency. It does NOT mean W1AW or K1MAN possess the right to start broadcasting on top of anyone, regardless if they meet the aforementioned criteria or not.

Remember last year that PA contester that was fined for broadcasting on top of two guys who were QSOing in LA? He lost his argument with the FCC and to top it off, the guys who he was interfering with were on the side of his beam which he himself couldn't even hear their transmissions.

The down and dirty facts are the ARRL has gotten away with this for years because no-one has challenged them on it, plus they had the governmental clout. Now their clout is waning due to declining numbers and others are looking to gain from the same applicability of the rule and regulations.

1331. Re: Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, FCC, Cronkite, ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-31 13:46:30 UTC
From: drakeswl@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <c0588492.0301310546.7251aac2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60413
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"skuld-chan" <skuld@mail.ru> wrote in message news:<a8n_9.15202$G83.284@sccrnsc04>...
> If you were a lawyer you'd understand Part 97 rules just a tad bit better -
> K1MAN and W1AW do claim temporary ownership of these bulletin frequencies -
> which you can do. It is after all why k1man claims he can just ride over the
> top of 14.275 and send his "bulletin" - the fact that its scheduled.

Read my post again. My argument was/is K1MAN CAN'T fire up on
frequency over other hams legally. So if FCC wants to prosecute K1MAN,
they will have to prosecute W1AW, for the same thing, and they
probably do not want to do that. Therefore, they will not want to use
that argument in any real enforcement action, like in front of an ALJ.
No one has ownership of any frequency. Use is all on a first come,
first served, basis.

They also will not want to use the broadcasting argument, since RAIN
and ARnewsline sound like broadcasts too. If they use the broadcasting
argument against K1MAN, then no one could carry RAIN and ARnewsline
either. According to the duck test, all 3 go quack, quack, quack.

The FCC CAN use character issues in enforcement. People have said
there are character issues to consider in K1MAN's operation. My
question was, what are they?

Paul

1332. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-31 14:12:23 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0301310612.59fff774@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60414

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0301300752.42e75297@posting.google.com>...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0301291913.6de98ea0@posting.google.com>...

> > > 'specially if fed enough suds. If the thing is only 10% efficient, it
> > > just brings the 1500 W boys down to barefoot-and-a-dipole level.
> >
> > That's physically possible but it's an extremely improbable scenario.
> > Anybody in their right minds who can get an antenna up at 100 feet is
> > not about to waste that kind of precious height on a lousy antenna.
>
> Note the cautionary phrase "in their right minds"...

Actually anybody who can put up a 100ft tower has to be in their right
mind.

> > I'll stick, he was not using a
> > wideband, lossy antenna like a t2fd or anything like it and the
> > chances are that he was running suds too.
>
> Thanks to his informative post, we know that what he was using closely
> matches what you predicted. Why am I not surprised?

Odd phenomenon there. I've noticed that the signals from the guys who
run serious power into serious antennas are laced with what I call
"high power signatures". Take two signals which tickle the S-meter to
the same level. One is using a big station like Hans has. The other
guy is running let's say a K2 into a dipole like you do. Which happens
all the time depending on the condx & distances involved. It's subtle
and hard to describe but I can usually pick out the sigs from the big
station vs. the little guys. I figger it might be that the big guns'
signals are coming in from more directions and I'm hearing the effects
of the delays via multipath reception. Or something. But whatever it
is about the "high power signatures" I can sense Hans' signal reeked
of it that nite.

> I'm not talking about equipment per se, though there has been some
> ranting about SINGCARS equipment. (How SINGCARS would ever relate to
> amateur comms has not been explained). And endless recounts of high
> power point-to-point transpacific military RTTY comms of a
> half-century ago.

Oh, that worn out old crap. The eternal search for relevance, zzzzz .
. .

> > Makes no sense,
> > certainly military radio gear with maybe an exception or two simply
> > doesn't meet the average ham's operating & technolgy implementation
> > needs.
>
> The needs and resources are entirely different. Plus the new stuff is
> too costly for almost all hams anyway.

There are hams out there who can afford the stuff. The Mil stuff just
doesn't *work* the way hams use HF. How do ya hit the KV4 10m FM
repeater with standard-issue military gear? Then turn around and get
on 75m AM with the same piece of equipment? Where da hell do ya plug
in the paddles??

> With a few exceptions, most WW2-vintage surplus was better utilized by
> hams as a parts source than as a conversion project. The low cost of
> today's ham gear makes the point moot - you're not going to find the
> equivalent of, say, a Ten Tec Omni 6 in surplus at anything like the
> price you can be a clean used TT with all the filters.

Today it might depend on the gummint agency dumping surplus gear, ya
might be surprised, we dunno what some of 'em are up to or have been
up to except for MARS and the CAP. Ham gear is *very* versatile. And
cheap.

> The amateur solder slingers are too busy homebrewing or building kits.
> More bang fer the buck than fooling with surplus.

Helluva lot easier faster more sensible.

> > > If some ham with more bucks than brains gives me a hard time about the
> > > T2FD/WBFD, I don't argue anymore.
> >
> > Especially when they're firmly established village idiots whose real
> > hobby is trolling RRAP.
> >
> Well, that leaves me and a few others out...

I think so.

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

1333. Re: Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, FCC, Cronkite, ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-31 17:23:37 UTC
From: LRod@removethispartpobox.com
Message-ID: <3e3aa5a4.1345429266@netnews.att.net>
Source record: 60415
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

On Fri, 31 Jan 2003 12:59:47 GMT, "Paul Vanasse" <pvanasse@cox.net>
wrote:

>Ditto Paul!
>
>> Paul Jennings, (and yes, I am a lawyer ;)
>
>A fortiori. Suffolk U. Law 93'

Further answered my question.

LRod

Master Woodbutcher and seasoned termite

Shamelessly whoring my website since 1999

http://www.woodbutcher.net

1334. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-31 17:40:18 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0301310940.40c452ea@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60416

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<b1cgb2$6it$2@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>...

(N2EY wrote):

> > Carl made a point of ARRL membership numbers and percentages. He also
> > claimed
> > that the procodetest opinion was a minority view.
>
> I have every belief that IF a valid "survey" was taken today, pro-code test
> would be a minority viewpoint.

I have every belief that if a valid "survey" was taken today, pro-code
test
would be a majority viewpoint.

Not that it matters. FCC has made their position on the issue quite
clear.

> It was not much of a majority within
> the ARRL when ARRL did a survey some time about 1996 or so.

A very flawed survey, whose faults we discussed in great detail.

Note that when it really mattered (comments to the FCC in regard to
98-143), code testing was the majority opinion by a slight but
significant margin. And that majority not only wanted code testing,
but code testing at at least two speeds.
>
> > >> >ARRL claims to be "THE National Society for Amateur Radio" ...
> > >>
> > >> Is there another national society for amateur radio?
> > >>
> > >> NCI cannot claim to be one, because
> > >>
> > >> a) it is "international"
> > >> b) its sole stated purpose is to end stand-alone Morse code testing.
> > >>
> > >> What other "national society for amateur radio" exists in the USA?
> > >
> > >As before...what difference does all this make?
> >
> > Carl and others have made an issue out of ARRL being "THE national
> > society...".
> > But there is no other "national society for amateur radio" in the USA, so
> > ARRL's claim is perfectly accurate.

>
> Still seems to have no impact in the FCC.

That depends on the issue.

Note that FCC took ARRL's restructuring proposal and went "one more"
in most categories. ARRL BoD suggested 4 classes of license, FCC went
with three. ARRL BoD suggested eliminating one code test speed (20
wpm), FCC eliminated two (13 and 20 wpm).

About the only place where ARRL's proposal struck out was the "instant
upgrade" of all Novices and Tech Pluses to General, and the related
Novice band "refarming".
>
> > >> >they
> > >> >most certainly claim to speak for all when they file comments with the
> > >> >FCC etc.
> > >>
> > >> How?
> > >>
> > >> >Not directly in so many words, but it is CLEARLY implied.
> > >>
> > >> Where? Where does ARRL claim to speak for all?
> > >>
> > >> ARRL's membership number is clearly stated. Not a secret in any way.
> > >>
> > >> What is NCI's current membership, give or take 1%? Why has that number
> > >> been
> > >> such a closely guarded secret?
> > >>
> > Well? If NCI's Executive Director can make a point of ARRL member numbers
> > and
> > percentages, the same rules of discussion should apply to NCI member
> > numbers
> > and percentages.
>
> Fair point.

Which is why those numbers and percentages should be made public.
Remember, it was NCI's Executive Director who made an issue of ARRL
membership numbers and percentages, not I. Let's see - 25% of US hams
vs. less than 0.5% of US hams - which group is more representative?
>
> > >> Anyone who comments to the FCC is, by definition, telling the FCC that
> > >> their
> > >> ideas represent what is best. Of course "best for whom?" is a different
> > >> question. Some comments, like one that demanded an age limit of 14
> years
> > >> for
> > >> any class of amateur license, do not represent what is best for the
> ARS.

> > >>
> > >> Is there another amateur radio society in the USA that provides even 1%
> of
> > >> the
> > >> services ARRl provides to the amateur radio community?
> > >
> > Answer: NO.
> >
> > >I am both an ARRL member and a volunteer in ARRL field activities (LGL).
> > >I am also a director of NCI.
> >
> > No problem belonging to both, either.
> >
> > >Frankly, I don't see any value to this
> > >discussion
> > >since it is meaningless in the ongoing policy discussions and has been
> for
> > >some time.
> >
> > Then why did NCI's Executive Director bring up ARRL membership figures as
> > a
> > discussion point - not just now, but several times in the past? What's
> > good for
> > the ARRL goose should be equally good for the NCI gander.
> > >
> > >Turns out the FCC listens to ARRL, NCI and anyone else that has anything
> > >credible to say...and in the end the FCC decides what to do.
> >
> > Yup - been that way a long long time.
> >
> > Anyone else know who the "National Amateur Radio Council" and the "Society
> > of
> > American Radio Amateurs" were, and what they accomplished? Quite
> > interesting,
> > really.
> >
Funny - nobody has yet identified these groups. They were once quite
influential.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1335. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-31 18:02:02 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0301311002.27cfb6eb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60417

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030130211736.08181.00000271@mb-cq.aol.com>...
>
> I support honoring the laws we have. I don't like the idea that code
> testing is going away, but , as I have said repeatedly (and within the last 48
> hours) that I accept it's demise.

Same here. We're basically in a holding pattern until S25.5 is
changed, and the changed treaty (yes, it really is a treaty) is
ratified by the US.

However, note this simple fact: Hams today still use Morse. In fact,
it's the second most popular mode on the HF/MF ham bands. Keys,
keyers, Morse software, and CW transceivers are being made, bought,
sold and USED today in large numbers. In fact, there are probably more
hams on the air today using Morse code than at any time in the past.

Hardly "clinging to the past".
>
> I'm also sorry they stopped making 65 Mustangs...But got over that too.

Remember how the "New Coke" flopped?
>
> >Some think it is needed regardless of the ITU requirement. A
> >particularly large club began rejecting changes in the code as early
> >as 1975 when forward thinking hams begans questioning it relavence.
>
> A "particularly large club" in the 70's.
>
> Now there's timeliness and relevence for ya.

The fact of the matter is that FCC proposed a complex, "two ladder"
license system in 1975, with seven license classes. One of those
classes (Communicator?) would have had no code test, and very limited
VHF/UHF privileges.

But most hams (not just members of any club) opposed such a system,
and FCC eventually gave up on the proposal.

This was almost simultaneous with the idea of taking 220 from hams and
creating a new "Class E" cb band. Lotta weird ideas back then. Musta
been the bell bottoms and platform shoes.
>
> >You are wrong.
>
> Not until you provide some specific cite I'm not. Sorry you "think"

> otherwise.
>
> >January is about tube radios.

Is that a bad thing?
>
> And I SPECIFICALLY said with the exception of items of historical
> relevence...That article is about history and nostalgia...NOT about excluding
> new technology.
>
> >Tube technology, Steve, tube technology.

Are tubes no longer used by hams?

> > Clinging to the past, Steve, clinging to the past.
>
> "Clinging to the past" would be publishing stories on tube technology TO
> THE EXCLUSION of all other technologies.

Exactly.

Would it be better if car magazines no longer printed articles about
'65 Mustangs, because that would be "clinging to the past"? How about
listening to "oldies", or classical music - all "clinging to the
past", right? Would it be better if all vintage airplanes were
grounded and antique cars removed from the road, because those things
are all examples of "clinging to the past?

I don't think so!
>
> The January QST ALSO includes items on: A 222mHz transverter, computer
> interface with the TRX-Manager program, orientation to test equipment for new
> hams, product reviews on new HT's and weather station, plus the usual operating
> articles, ads and other "human interest" items.
>
> Within the first 12 pages of QST are ads for all sorts of new technology,
> INCLUDING I-Link soft and hardware. Not a single tube in sight.
>
> Whew.

There ya go, Steve, confusing the issue with facts.

Here's a question: Should QST refuse paid advertisements for things
like telegraph keys, because some folks consider such things to be
"clinging to the past"?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1336. Re: The coders embarrass themselves on 14.275 MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-31 18:46:16 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3E3AC478.2010804@psu.edu>
Source record: 60419

N2EY wrote:

> From actual observation I can say that violations such as jamming,
> obscenity/profanity, and failure to identify are uncommon in amateur
> radio as a whole, and extremely rare in the CW/digital parts of the HF
> bands. In the past 35 years of operating amateur radio CW I don't
> recall a single instance where I heard obscenity/profanity on CW in
> the CW/digital bands. Can you say that about the 'phone bands?

Only once have I heard "strong" language on a digital mode. Someone was giving out a tongue lashing to another on PSK31. Okay-maybe a keyboard lashing. It was deserved though, the guy was running waaay too much power and way overdriving his audio, and taking up half the frequency. That's it. One case.!

OTOH give me 30 seconds on phone and I'll give you swearing, malicious interference, poor operating practice and a host of other unpleasantness.

> FCC enforcement actions today are largely complaint-driven. Somebody
> sends a credible complaint (such as audio tapes with
> time/date/frequency clearly marked) to the FCC, and FCC follows up
> with their own investigation. Why are there so many complaints about
> 'phone but so few about CW and digital?

> If the use of a certain mode results in far fewer violations by those
> using the mode, doesn't that make the mode somewhat better?

No Jim, it doesn't make the mode better. What it means is that the people who partake of that mode are more gentlemanly or gentlewomanly. They also "play nice".

- mike -

1337. Re: Russian troops seen in Mexico (..oh my!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-31 18:48:45 UTC
From: Lord Haw-Haw <killingjoke@juno.com>
Message-ID: <3e3ac4ff@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 60418
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

"K1MAN Man" <Lloyd@blo.spoomm> wrote in message
news:425258776.239550@taranews.net...
> The 3860 net that met at 8pm est had several callins who have seen
> Russian troops near the Mexican border getting reaidy to cross over
> into the US. Our own govenment doesn't tell us, but people like these
> and also people like K1MAN keep an eye out to protectify us.

You mean they "protectify us" like the Dalkon Shield prevents
unwanted pregenancies and fuel tanks in the Ford Pinto and
saddle-mounted GMC Pickup were "100% Safe" in the
event of a car crash?

Oh boy whoop-diddle-dee-doos I feel much better already!

> Be glad for them and tune in to 3860 LSB every night at 8pm to find
> out the real truth from these great Americans.

...more like Glad-baggie wrapped AmeriKKKans - grin.

The night before last "Orange Blossom" came up on 3.860 LSB
[without the benefit of a proper FCC issued callsign I may add]
and informed the assembled bib-overalls wearing masses
that the USAF was in a "live fire aerial dogfight" over Mexican
and USA (Texas) airspace with Russian and Cuban MIG's.

This all had something to do with illegal
aliens [...from the planet Remulac ?] allegedly
crossing the border to pick or pack lettuce and
cucumbers in crates for Texas growers...I think.....
it was a rather surreal moment you see.

Guess what, these nitwits on 3.860 believed it!
But then again what do you expect from a pack
of fools who thinks that Alex Jones and Jeff Rense are
accurate sources of news and information? I bet they
really miss Art Bell too - grin

Oh well, enjoy these RF militialoon clowns on 3.860 now before
their each hoisted up by their own pitard from paranoid
stupidity, thus ensuring by their own from their actions
when they go the way of David "boylover" Koresh, Tim "OKC"
McVeigh, William "pale of horseshyte" Cooper, Steve
"Col nutcase" Andersen and shoebomber Richard Reid.

Yup, 3.860 LSB from 8-9 PM! It draws em in
just like rednecks flock to an NASCAR

or Earnhardt #3 memorbilia show. Plus more
bootleggers too using fake callsigns - just like that
KB8--- what checks in nightly
and don't appear on qrz.com or the FCC database....

Hmmmmmmmmm..... (*ring* Hello...FCC..?)

1338. Re: Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, FCC, Cronkite, ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-31 20:09:12 UTC
From: drakeswl@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <c0588492.0301311209.5f01007c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60420
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Paul Vanasse" wrote
> Ditto Paul!
> A fortiori. Suffolk U. Law 93'

Okay Mr. V., see if you concur,

Ab initio, the K1MAN bulletin was predicated on a faulty definition. A bulletin is not a broadcast. Ab extra, the bulletin sounds like a broadcast. The argument could go on ad infinitum. As an amicus curiae, I find his arguments specious and ei incumbit probatio qui. If the program were a bona fide bulletin, then by consensus, cadit quaestio. After researching some of the output of that station, I certainly find some of the statements made by him to be contra bonos mores. However, coram non judice, it is up to the ALJ, in its jurisprudence to decide de lege lata de intego. De jure, Riley Hollingsworth should be able to effectively communicate that as the representive of the de facto corpus. Ex facie W1AW and K1MAN are both probably ex cathedra non, barring faciendum. After studying the facts, I find them both in delicto. Inter alia, I find them both redundant, in the sense that print and internet supercede any need to disseminate their material on the ham bands. Apparently the locus in quo is about to shift to 14.275 on Saturday, probably indicating mens rea. Although, that move is non constat, vis a vis its permanence. I still think K1MAN bears the onus probandi if he wants to continue his "bulletin." Although prima facie, prima impressionis, I think he would lose, and ergo, begin the process of winding up, if he ever appeared in front of an ALJ. On the other hand, I would probably defend either Baxter or ARRL pro bono, if they asked, just because the FCC definitions of broadcast and bulletin are just so much bovine scatology, and deserve to be shot down, so they could be replaced with meaningful definitions.

Paul J., (Harvard Law '87)

1339. Re: Why Dave has such a p*ss poor attitude

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-31 20:24:53 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030131152453.03820.00000301@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 60424

In article <f45722ac.0301302004.13ad8bff@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3E399DF7.3B212EE8@earthlink.net>...
>> Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >
>> > In article <3E37CDF7.3663EABD@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> > writes:
>> >
>> > >> In article <3E3676F7.7C44606B@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
>> <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> > >> writes:
>> > >>
>> > >> >"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>> > >> >>
>> > >> >> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>> > >> >> news:3E3432E5.8266EB56@earthlink.net...
>> >>
>> > >> >Nobody works 24/7, much less 24/7/365--not even Leonard H.
>> >>
>> > >Being on call is not working 24/7. Military members are given
>> > >opportunities to sleep. None of the people described work round the
>> > >clock for a week--none of them.
>> > >
>> > Oh, my, pedantry strikes again... :-(
>> >
>> > "24/7" is a common coloquialism for "continuous operation."
>> >
>> > Herr Robust is running out of ammunition for his tireless
>> > tirade throwing.
>> >
>> > UNITS work 24/7. Organizations work 24/7. Police and
>> > fire and medical public safety units work 24/7. Some
>> > supermarkets even work 24/7.
>>
>> Ohhhhhhh! So you are now a UNIT! You told us that YOU worked 2/47.
>
>Steve, I'd like to work 2 on 47 off. I'm jealous.

The colonel done got in the Egg Foo Dong for the third day...

[of course now the robust has to search Google endlessly,
looking for "where I said what he said" so he can say what

he said "correctly" and then say it again and again and again until the universe ceases expanding... :-)]

One CAN confuse the colonel and his dill sergeant! They are both pedantic prissy prussian types. :-)

1340. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-31 20:24:54 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030131152454.03820.00000302@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 60421

In article <f45722ac.0301301530.198cb3a3@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>Tube technology, Steve, tube technology. Clinging to the past, Steve,
>clinging to the past.

Go easy, Brian, it's probably all he knows. :-)

Several years ago I was in a discussion of RF circuits and
mentioned a "2N918."

A long-time ham overheard that and asked, with a straight
face, "What country is that? A little island?"

Another turned to him and explained it was a transistor,
one of the first to have a transition frequency (f-sub-t)
close to microwave region, first appearing in the early
1960s. [about three decades before that discussion]
The 2N918 and its cousin the 2N2222 are still on the
market and available today. :-)

<signature here as required in the Allied catalog>

1341. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-31 20:24:55 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030131152455.03820.00000303@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 60423

In article <3E39A342.59208604@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> Just how did you communicate out of Helsinki without any
>> radio set, boy? MilSpec Nokia cell-phones? :-)
>
>Why do you want to know? Are you beginning a new series of lies?
>Shall I reproduce N2EY's insightful quote?

Reproduce anything you want. Create hordes of bastard
Truthspeak statements. Go forth and populate the
newsgroups as revealed in the Good Book of the Church
of St. Hiram. Strike down dissenters. All for the glory of
your personal Honor.

It seems Very Important to the colonel to attempt intimidation
of individuals who do not agree with him...whether licensed in
amateur radio or not. He seems to be one of the Holy Men
to an Inquisition to preserve and protect the Old Ways and,
more importantly, his visible honor.

Amateur radio policy matters are well down on the list.
What matters most is PCTA "personal honors" at stake,
that their Truthspeak is true when it is not.

<signature here as required in the 1934 Handbook>

1342. Re: Out Of The Box?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-31 20:24:55 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030131152455.03820.00000304@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 60426

In article <f45722ac.0301301951.11b4988b@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
>news:<d22b54c3.0301301554.3a534333@posting.google.com>...
>
>> I agree. Those of us who get involved in the scratchings of the gas
>> bags apparently either have too much time on our hands
>
>Boink
>
> or we have a
>> problem with priority-setting.
>
>Boink
>
>> Which needs fixing.
>
>Boink
>
> I suggest that we
>> stick to ham radio and let The Pointless Duo babble at each other.
>
>RV, did I do good on the "Boinks?" I'm still not sure how they're used.
>
>And good luck sticking to ham radio.

Kellie can't. Like all severely-injured-in-the-ego PCTAs, he
has, like the colonel and the reverend and Putzieboy in TN,
got to keep on, keep on, keep on their attacks on NCTAs
who have caused them to lose their Face.

They alone are "defending the 'honor and virtue' of ham
radio because They ARE ham radio. [they are only
defending themselves but have to rationalize it somehow]

You can imagine how that trio (and pet misery mule) would
fare in a community meeting over, say, antenna erection
with their non-ham community people NOT agreeing with
them. They would LOSE IT big time and thereby do a
negative for ham radio after they stopped sputtering, name-
calling, and general self-propelled-self-promotions. :-)

<signature here, verified by homeland security dept.>

1343. Re: Out Of The Box?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-31 20:24:57 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030131152457.03820.00000305@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 60425

In article <3E399979.C9DD45C9@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <20030128194825.12173.00000228@mb-mr.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>> writes:
>>
>> >In article <20030128112728.02295.00000280@mb-bk.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>> >Robeson K4YZ) writes:
>
>> >
>> >RESUME QUOTE:
>> >
>> >I'm going for Amateur Extra "out of the box." Maybe I'll
>> >make it, maybe not. The personal point is irrelevant.
>> >
>> >PAUSE QUOTE
>> >
>> >Well, there you have it. Nothing ambiguous or qualified about it at all.
>Not a
>> >claim of what could be done, or might be done, but of what he was going to
>do.
>>
>> Bullshit, boy. Take that into the entire context of the
>> message...and then go "interpret" your buddie Kellie's
>> message text the same way you "interpreted" mine.
>>
>> You can't do it, boy. You're a PCTA and so is Kellie.
>
>I take it that "Bullshit" means "I wrote it; they found it; they
>re-posted the quote". What interpretation is necessary, Leonard? You
>wrote the statement.
>You haven't taken a single step toward bringing it to reality.

Bringing WHAT "to reality," Herr Robust?

Following your Orders of the Day?

Ich nicht bin ein Berliner you sour kraut mit mini-weenie.

>Sure you did. Nice attempt a dodge. It fails, but nice attempt.

I drive a Chevrolet, not a Chrysler product. I dodge all
vehicles that are errant.

>Just take the heat coming to you and suck it up, Len.

Another Order of The Day from the colonel.

Go such an 807 plate cap...with the HV on.

>When you go into
>your capital letters mode, you simply appear frantic.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. That must be a capital crime.

>That isn't clear at all, Len. You did write what had long been
>attributed to you. That says it all.

No problem here except that the prissy pedanticists
love to take statements out of context when it suits
their purpose.

The sour kraut better strike for making this an exclusive,
moderated newsgroup to ease his discomfort. Poor baby,
doesn't realize that Preparation H is not a relief and the
"H" doesn't stand for 'ham.'

>Why should you be believed now? Your first statement to that effect
>proved to be a crock.

Most of the colonel's Orders Of The Day in here fit into a
crock. A very big crock. And the crock doesn't like it.

>I'd have thought that you'd have had enough twisting in the wind for a while.
>Your often-repeated statements that I claimed origination of the idea
>for use of a CW order wire aren't borne out by a google search.

They were borne out by a DejaNews search, boy. Lots of
your output were seen by many.

Like all officious PCTAs you want to live in Google, rehashing
your old outrages until everyone capitulates and you claim
"victory!" Let us take the claim EITHER way...

Using manual CW as an "order-wire" on an RTTY circuit
DOESN'T MAKE ANY SENSE. It isn't logical. It is a
nonsense idea whether done be some embassy staffer
in a third-world country or anyone else.

Just take the heat coming to you and suck it up.

>It has been a bad week for you, Len.

Go back to your remedial arithmetic exercise, colonel.

24 x 7 = 168. Get it?

<signature here as required by the right reverend jimmie>

1344. Re: Claims Of Dishonesty

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-31 20:25:01 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030131152501.03820.00000306@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 60422

In article <c2356669.0301301624.6e8e5d71@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>> >Wanna-be pediatrics expert Jimmie Miccolis seems to think
>> > that ALL six-year-olds have full comprehension of reading
>> > along with full judgement of responsibility at that age.
>>
>> It's not about wether or not these kids did or did not have
>comprehension
>> of the material.
>>
>> It's wether or not you said what you said.
>
>Exactly. The issue is whether Mr. Anderson accused the ARRL of
>"dishonesty". He claims not to have done that. My earlier post showed
>that he accused the ARRL of "very mild fraud", which by any rational
>definition means he accused them of dishonesty. (Anybody ever see
>fraud committed honestly?)

Reverend Jimmie has begun another SERMON on the
antenna mount... :-)

It's curious that these Holy Men spend so much time
castigating others who do not Believe as they do...and
totally overlook true matters of policy. The reason might
be that they do not want any policy to change. Ever.

>Note how Mr. Anderson attempts to evade the actual issue and attacks
>the messenger.

Not a problem. It is in keeping with this newsgroup's
behavior patterns as set by the PCTAs...the first of
those holy men being KH2D well before the "Time of
Abomination" (R&O 99-412).

>> You have not answered why you made an accusation you ahve not backed up
>> with evidence.
>
>Actually, Steve, that should be self-evident. Mr. Anderson thinks that
>his own personal observations of six-year-olds proves that the two
>children could not have passed the tests honestly. As Dee, N8UZE,
>points out, there is no requirement that a person be able to read and
>write in order to pass the exam. The testing of blind persons comes to
>mind (Braille exams may not be universally available).

Ah! Another thread misdirection started, away from six-year-olds
to sightless persons. Lost are the many, many times another
extra has closed messages with ethnic-middle-European
pejoratives to earn his title of "Sgt Putz." That's an on-going
double-standard wherein 1x2s are allowed to hit others with 2x4s
and be cheered for acting like progeny of Huns.

>> >I would assume that nearly all parents of THEIR children
>> > would claim that...(SNIP)
>>
>> Quick, Lennie...remind us how many children YOU have sired and raised?
>
>That's irrelevant, Steve. The issue is whether Mr. Anderson accused
>ARRL of dishonesty. The answer is YES. Is there any credible evidence
>to back up such a claim? The answer is NO.

It should be VERY relevant to certain 1x2s that sexual potency
and capability is a major factor in demonstration of their ability
as expert morsemen. No doubt Ghenghis Kahn's mother was
very fond of her son and his barbarians, the few, the strong, the
proud... :-)

>> >I still don't "present any proof" because any trip to a large
>> > market with kids in tow of mamas or any visit to a first-grade
>> > classroom will demonstrate to ANY observer that first-graders
>> > do NOT have adult or even teen-age reading ability OR
>> > comprehension of difficult subjects involving science and law.
>>
>> The "proof" is you delivering the hard evidence of YOUR allegations of
>> dishonesty.
>
>Note again how Mr. Anderson uses his own personal observations as if
>they were universal.

I don't work for Universal Studios but Universal City is somewhat
near my residence. The Sheraton Universal Hotel is tall and has
a number of antennas on its top, ideal for covering the eastern and
middle portions of San Fernando Valley. We all live in the same
Universe. [open for discussion on some PCTAs who may not...]

While the above is a blatant Chamber of Commerce plug, it makes
as much sense as some schloomph prissy PCTA-er who is
bitter at not being Universally Acclaimed as THE guru on US
amateur radio.

Shall we all adopt Reverend Jimmie's personal observations as a
Universal truth? Of course. He can accept none other.

>I have known six-year-olds whose reading ability was so advanced that
>their parent would give them the shopping list and the child would
>read help out with the shopping by reading the list aloud and finding
>some items on the shelves. (No, the parent did not let the child run
>loose in the store).

Well, there we have it. Reverend Jimmie KNOWS once again.

More misdirection from amateur radio matters, even away from
all radio into Universal Pediatrics and Words of Wisdom from
the Universal Guru Resident.

>> I for one have no doubt the kids did not use a "cheat sheet" or other
>> unethical aid, and I have no doubt the examiners made no effort to "prompt"
>> them or "fudge" the grading process.
>
>How do you know, Steve? I don't think you were there. I wasn't there,
>Mr. Anderson wasn't there. All we can say for sure is that there has
>been NO evidence presented of any rules violations or dishonesty at
>that VE session.

Very important. ARRL *MUST* be kept inviolate of all transgressions
and suspicions of transgressions lest they defy their own
propaganda. That is Universal to Believers. ARRL does no wrong.
Ever.

>The issue is whether Mr. Anderson accused ARRL of dishonesty. The
>answer is YES. Is there any credible evidence to back up such a claim?
>The answer is NO.

High Crimes Against the State! Kill the Infidels who DARE
suggest the Church of St. Hiram speaks unholy things!

[Reverend Jimmie is warming up, gripping the lectern with
a white-knuckled grip...]

>> Does this mean the kids "knew" the material? That's irrelevent. If
an
>> adult can read and re-read a "study guide" to the point of recognizing the
>> questions, so what if a 6 year old does it? A 60 year old?
>
>Or a 70 year old? FCC doesn't care - and they're the "expert agency",
>right? FCC makes the rules - not me, not you, and certainly not Mr.
>Anderson.

Oh my, the Pediatrician is double-degreed as a Geriatrician?
There is NO end to the expertise of the Holy Men.

>For more than 42 years, FCC has used only multiple-choice questions on
>the amateur radio written exams. Answer enough questions right without
>prohibited assistance (cheat sheets, etc.) and the test is passed. FCC
>sees no problem with that system, and also has no problem with young
>people getting amateur radio licenses. And FCC is the "expert
>agency"....

"As it was then as it is now, so shall it be Forever. Amen."

Ahem. The FCC is a legal regulatory agency bound by law to
regulate all USA civil radio. While they have intelligent radio
and electronics professionals in their employ they are not
necessarily "expert" as indicated in the sermon.

The FCC did not develop the US black-and-white television
standards but approved the NTSC (a US industry group) prior
to WW2...did not develop the US compatible color television
standards but approved the re-formed NTSC recommendation
after WW2. The FCC did not develop the Digital Television
standards (formerly called HDTV) but approved the industry
"Grand Alliance" system. The FCC did develop a workable
TV channel frequency reassignment plan (quite complex) to
allow both simultaneous TV carrier transmission and to free
up spectrum for other radio services (ARRL did not petition
for that available space, apparently not consider it
worthwhile for their membership).

>> >>Also never mentioned is the fact that most people taking the test would
>> >>probably have seen the questions and answers before, with plenty of time
to
>> >>learn unfamiliar words and phrases.
>>
>> > "Most people!" Jimmie KNOWS "most people."
>>
>> Complete the sentence, Your Lameness.
>
>Now Steve - why the name-calling? You're giving Mr. Anderson exactly
>what he wants - an excuse to continue his behavior.

Yes..."bad behavior"...refusal to accept all rulings by the
Church of St. Hiram as gospel, ordained by God.

"Bad behavior"...daring to challenge the all-holy traditionalists
with SUSPICIONS of transgressions.

"Bad behavior"...failing to accept the Words of the holy men
who rule what they perceive to be Their Territory.

"Bad behavior"...not marching in lock-step to the morse beat
nor acknowledging the holiness of the holy men carrying the
Mark of the 1x2.

<snip>

>Steve, Mr. Anderson has been posting here under various screen names
>for at least 5 years. Do you really think his behavior will change
>just because he is presented with facts and logical arguments?

Reverend Jimmie thinks it "improper" to use anything but an
amateur radio callsign on the USA's largest Internet ISP. :-)

Reverend Jimmie thinks it is proper (at least he did not disparage
it) that the rabid Sgt Putz adopted (briefly) the screen name of
"NeverTrustLennie" in a short-lived attempt at public-evidence
LIBEL on AOL. Curious...direct LIBEL is approved, yet screen
names having NO direct newsgroup connection is not approved.
Evidenciary of the extra double-standard at work.

The Reverend thinks it "improper" to NOT "sign" a newsgroup
message...something that is impossible with an all-text
medium.

>> >>Note that Mr. Anderson acts as prosecutor, judge and jury, yet presents
>> >>absolutely no proof whatsoever to support his claims.
>> >
>> > Oooo! A Supreme Judge has Spoken!
>>
>> Nope. Absolue fact. You made accusations you cannot or will not
>> substantiate.
>>
>> You got caught lying...
>>
>> Again.
>
>Only Mr. Anderson really knows if he is "lying", Steve. That is, if we
>define "lying" as "saying that which is known to be untrue, with the
>intention of deceiving others". Perhaps Mr. Anderson simply made a
>mistake when he said he never accused the ARRL of "dishonesty".

I said long ago that certain ARRL activities are SUSPICIOUS.

Others have voiced the same suspicions.

But this newsgroup is polulated by some Orwellian followers (as
depicted in the novel "1984") who live by a credo of Truthspeak.
The "truth" is what They define as truth...whenver it suits their
little purposes. The Church of St. Hiram does Truthspeak as do
some of their holy followers. Reverend Jimmie is one of them.

>Perhaps he forgot what he wrote. This newsgroup has provided us with
>many examples of Mr. Anderson's memory lapses about what he and others
>have written, as well as examples of his errors in logic and
>historical facts.

Reverend Jimmie is now pounding the lecturn, shaking a pointing
finger of Blame in the air, beginning to salivate.

He is on a roll. Let's hope he does not slip on the butter.

Reverend Jimmie seems to think amazon.com is a "bankrupt"
corporation. He has said so at least three times in here. He
insists on that even though last week's business news (as
printed in major US newspapers) told of amazon.com's SECOND
SUCCESSIVE QUARTER OF PROFIT. Another example of
Truthspeak by Reverend Jimmie.

Note: Amazon.com shipping policy is still liberal, offering buyers
much better prices on ARRL publications while ARRL demands
extra for shipping charges ordered directly from Newington. For
the SAME publications.

>> >"Mistakes" again. Sigh. The Right Reverend has wound up his
>> > Sermon on the Antenna Mount...hopefully.
>>
>> I am sure you ARE hopeful...Hopeful that you successfully obfuscated
>the
>> context of Jim's post and hopeful that you can blow enough smoke as to
>avoid
>> the truth that you are caught lying again.
>
>Why not just say he made a mistake, Steve? That has been proven
>conclusively here.

Sgt Putz, a "veteran of seven hostile actions," cannot accept
anything but CAPITULATION. That seems to be true for the right
Reverend Jimmie and the use of Truthspeak.

>Mr. Anderson does not admit to such mistakes, of course, because he
>cannot tolerate, let alone accept, the idea that someone he considers
>an inferior (that would be me) could actually find a mistake in his
>writing. Thus he fills his posts with name-calling, personal insults,
>infantile behavior, claims of being misunderstood, etc., in a failed
>attempt to anger those who disagree with him and deflect attention
>from the actual issue.

Reverend Jimmie seems to be entering a religious trance,
repeating more Truthspeak mantra.

>The issue is whether Mr. Anderson accused ARRL of dishonesty. The
>answer is YES. Is there any credible evidence to back up such a claim?
>The answer is NO.

Ah...the fraternal form of the Spanish Inquisition! :-)

Apparently the job of Chief Inquisitor is open and Reverend
Jimmie is striking for that rating. Doing good, boy, keep on
with the Big Lie technique.

Focus on individuals who don't agree with you. Make them
a prime suspect. Amateur radio matters are far down on
the list. Intimidate individuals who don't agree with you in
any manner possible, keep after them, silence them so
that all in front of the pulpit meekly agree to your
Truthspeak. That way lies Serenity and Nirvana...all
Believing in the tenets of the Church of St. Hiram.

Brook no dissent! Quash, destroy the heretics!

Way to go, Jimmie!

>Note how Mr. ANderson never does tell us his motivations.

Good phrase! The Chief Inquisitor's job is practically
a shoo-in for Jimmie.

EVERYONE *CONFIRM* THEIR MOTIVATIONS!!!!

Reverend Jimmie DEMANDS motivation. All supply them or ye shall be tied to the stake and the burning bush applied at the feet. Those who are "truly speaking" will not be harmed. Those who "lie" will of course die for they "lied before God" and He did not intervene.

Neato way to go, Inquisitors, a built-in confirmation of your "holy actions" so that ya'all "speak only the words of 'truth'" about the Church of St. Hiram.

<signature here as required in the sermon>

1345. Re: Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, FCC, Cronkite, ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-31 20:52:02 UTC
From: skuld-chan <skuld@mail.ru>
Message-ID: <SIB_9.114495$AV4.3150@sccrnsc01>
Source record: 60427
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Maybe that he's a fruitloop? Not only that he attracts lids like fly's to flypaper.

Ask yourself this - would we any better or worse off without k1man? Personally I say good riddance.

sc

"Paul" <drakeswl@hotmail.com> wrote in message news:c0588492.0301310546.7251aac2@posting.google.com...
> The FCC CAN use character issues in enforcement. People have said
> there are character issues to consider in K1MAN's operation. My
> question was, what are they?

1346. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-31 21:33:14 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0301311333.ec2ea77@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60428

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0301310612.59fff774@posting.google.com>...
> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0301300752.42e75297@posting.google.com>...
> > kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0301291913.6de98ea0@posting.google.com>...
>
>
> > > > 'specially if fed enough suds. If the thing is only 10% efficient, it
> > > > just brings the 1500 W boys down to barefoot-and-a-dipole level.
> > >
> > > That's physically possible but it's an extremely improbable scenario.
> > > Anybody in their right minds who can get an antenna up at 100 feet is
> > > not about to waste that kind of precious height on a lousy antenna.
> >
> > Note the cautionary phrase "in their right minds"...
>
> Actually anybody who can put up a 100ft tower has to be in their right
> mind.

I dunno about that! I'd word it:

"Anybody who can put up a 100ft tower safely has to be in their right
mind."
>
> > > I'll stick, he was not using a
> > > wideband, lossy antenna like a t2fd or anything like it and the
> > > chances are that he was running suds too.
> >
> > Thanks to his informative post, we know that what he was using closely
> > matches what you predicted. Why am I not surprised?
>
> Odd phenomenon there. I've noticed that the signals from the guys who
> run serious power into serious antennas are laced with what I call
> "high power signatures". Take two signals which tickle the S-meter to
> the same level. One is using a big station like Hans has. The other
> guy is running let's say a K2 into a dipole like you do. Which happens
> all the time depending on the condx & distances involved. It's subtle
> and hard to describe but I can usually pick out the sigs from the big
> station vs. the little guys. I figger it might be that the big guns'
> signals are coming in from more directions and I'm hearing the effects
> of the delays via multipath reception. Or something. But whatever it
> is about the "high power signatures" I can sense Hans' signal reeked
> of it that nite.

The multipath theory is quite plausible. There's also the possibility
that the 30 over big gun is being heard predominantly via low-angle
propagation, while the 30 over little guy is much closer and being
heard via a high-angle path. Or some such variation, needs more
research, will hafta run some power next SS for research purposes.

> > I'm not talking about equipment per se, though there has been some
> > ranting about SINGCARS equipment. (How SINGCARS would ever relate to
> > amateur comms has not been explained). And endless recounts of high
> > power point-to-point transpacific military RTTY comms of a
> > half-century ago.
>
> Oh, that worn out old crap.

TWOOC.

> The eternal search for relevance, zzzzz .
> . .
>
> > > Makes no sense,
> > > certainly military radio gear with maybe an exception or two simply
> > > doesn't meet the average ham's operating & technolgy implementation
> > > needs.
> > >
> > The needs and resources are entirely different. Plus the new stuff is
> > too costly for almost all hams anyway.
>
> There are hams out there who can afford the stuff.

A few, yeah, but why would they go for it, particularly considering
that many of the features are useless to hams?

> The Mil stuff just
> doesn't *work* the way hams use HF. How do ya hit the KV4 10m FM
> repeater with standard-issue military gear? Then turn around and get
> on 75m AM with the same piece of equipment? Where da hell do ya plug
> in the paddles??
>
'zactly.

I recall when multi-knob synthesis was all the rage. No dial - rig had
a row of knobs calibrated from 0 to 10 and you just set the freq
desired. There's a common surplus rx (R-1051) out there which uses the
scheme. There was also a trx version. QST and other ham mags had
articles on such synthesizers, and B&W put out the 6100 transmitter. I
actually owned the original W3QLV homebrew "xtal vfo" unit for a
number of years. Just set the knobs to any integral kHz in the 80 m
band, and zero with the 1 kHz vernier.

Only thing was, those setups were the pits for the way hams actually
operate.
>
> > With a few exceptions, most WW2-vintage surplus was better utilized by

> > hams as a parts source than as a conversion project. The low cost of
> > today's ham gear makes the point moot - you're not going to find the
> > equivalent of, say, a Ten Tec Omni 6 in surplus at anything like the
> > price you can be a clean used TT with all the filters.
>
> Today it might depend on the gummint agency dumping surplus gear, ya
> might be surprised, we dunno what some of 'em are up to or have been
> up to except for MARS and the CAP. Ham gear is *very* versatile. And
> cheap.
>

True to a point, but also it's not ruggedized to the extent needed.

There's an old tale about how the Hallicrafters HT-4 tx went to war as
the BC-610. It's "true" in that the BC-610 was directly derived from
the HT-4. But there were a LOT of changes needed to make the
derivation! Most of them were mechanical and environmental things
needed to keep the rig working in a combat environment. Just one
example: They bounced an unpowered HT-4 around in the back of a 6x6
for a while, and when they opened it up found the final tuning cap
plates all over the inside of the rig (those variables were bolted
together rather than brazed or soldered).

> > The amateur solder slingers are too busy homebrewing or building kits.
> > More bang fer the buck than fooling with surplus.
>
> Helluva lot easier faster more sensible.

When they start making ham rigs like computers, watch out!

> > > > If some ham with more bucks than brains gives me a hard time about the
> > > > T2FD/WBFD, I don't argue anymore.
> > >
> > > Especially when they're firmly established village idiots whose real
> > > hobby is trolling RRAP.
> > >
> > Well, that leaves me and a few others out...
>
> I think so.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1347. Re: Why Dave has such a p*ss poor attitude

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-31 21:51:26 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E3AEFC4.4ACF4723@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60429

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <f45722ac.0301302004.13ad8bff@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >news:<3E399DF7.3B212EE8@earthlink.net>...
> >> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >> >
> >> > In article <3E37CDF7.3663EABD@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> > writes:

> >> > Herr Robust is running out of ammunition for his tireless
> >> > tirade throwing.
> >> >
> >> > UNITS work 24/7. Organizations work 24/7. Police and
> >> > fire and medical public safety units work 24/7. Some
> >> > supermarkets even work 24/7.
> >>
> >> Ohhhhhhh! So you are now a UNIT! You told us that YOU worked 2/47.
> >>
> >Steve, I'd like to work 2 on 47 off. I'm jealous.
>
> The colonel done got in the Egg Foo Dong for the third day...

How so, Leonard? Does my typo equal your claim to be an entire military
organization working 'round the clock?
>
> [of course now the robust has to search Google endlessly,
> looking for "where I said what he said" so he can say what
> he said "correctly" and then say it again and again and
> again until the universe ceases expanding... :-)]

Yeah. In this case, endless turned out to be about five or six minutes.
In my particular case, the searches also determined that I did not write
what you've repeatedly attributed to me.

> One CAN confuse the colonel and his dill sergeant! They
> are both pedantic prissy prussian types. :-)

...and you are a unit one one. You've never worked 24/7 in your life.

Dave K8MN

1348. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-31 21:59:11 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E3AF193.B187CE47@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60430

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E39A342.59208604@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >> Just how did you communicate out of Helsinki without any
> >> radio set, boy? MilSpec Nokia cell-phones? :-)
> > >
> > >Why do you want to know? Are you beginning a new series of lies?
> > >Shall I reproduce N2EY's insightful quote?
>
> Reproduce anything you want. Create hordes of bastard
> Truthspeak statements.

None were bastard statements. The statements I reposted were archives of what I actually wrote as compared to what you've repeatedly and incorrectly said I wrote. You've told told quite a number of times that your statements were incorrect. I've offered proof.

> Go forth and populate the
> newsgroups as revealed in the Good Book of the Church
> of St. Hiram. Strike down dissenters. All for the glory of
> your personal Honor.

Why should I allow you to attribute statements to me which are not truthful?

> It seems Very Important to the colonel to attempt intimidation
> of individuals who do not agree with him...whether licensed in
> amateur radio or not. He seems to be one of the Holy Men
> to an Inquisition to preserve and protect the Old Ways and,
> more importantly, his visible honor.

Incorrect, Foghorn Lenhorn. Your current predicament came about as a result of one too many of your deliberate falsehoods. Twist in the wind.

> Amateur radio policy matters are well down on the list.
> What matters most is PCTA "personal honors" at stake,
> that their Truthspeak is true when it is not.

That isn't what happened at all. You are the individual responsible for bringing up any of this. You were silly to do so.

Dave K8MN

1349. Re: Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, FCC, Cronkite, ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-31 22:02:25 UTC
From: Paul Vanasse <pvanasse@cox.net>
Message-ID: <RnC_9.130994$ui1.2847783@news1.east.cox.net>
Source record: 60431
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Ahh, the old "cut and run" when the cold hard facts cloud the argument. Typical response from a no-name newsgroup bandito.....Sometimes the truth hurts woody.

Just like the ARRL's consistant rhetoric of heinous hyperbole, your response fits the mold perfectly. Suggestion: Instead of paying your $39 for ARRL dues this year, drive yourself over to Woodworkers Warehouse or Home Depot and buy yourself a power tool. At least you'll get something for the $39.

1350. Re: Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, FCC, Cronkite, ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-31 22:02:25 UTC
From: Paul Vanasse <pvanasse@cox.net>
Message-ID: <RnC_9.130995$ui1.2847783@news1.east.cox.net>
Source record: 60432
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

<Chuckling>

Excellent post Paul.

> Ab initio, the K1MAN bulletin was predicated on a faulty definition. A
> bulletin is not a broadcast. Ab extra, the bulletin sounds like a
> broadcast. The argument could go on ad infinitum.

Agreed. I believe the real test here will be whether the presence of any previous equitable enforcement of (or lack thereof) by the government on the part of W1AW et als will be cited a presidence. Lets face it, this statute was originally written with W1AW in mind and W1AW has never really been challenged. Res judicata not withstanding, the matter will be one the outcome of which could cause inter alia kaos (from an organizational and futher enforcement POV). Having stated this, an ALJ will have to take into consideration whether K1MAN was in fact culpable by not subscribing to any of the acceptable relevance criteria and his actions were those of a blatent scienter. Personally, I think they both need exemplary damages per curiam.

> I would probably defend either Baxter or ARRL pro bono, if they
> asked,

Pro Bono!!!! I would think that after 16 years hence your Harvard exit that you still don't have the bill for your AmJur's paid off ;)

1351. More Young Hams - Then And Now

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-31 22:27:16 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0301311427.33709033@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60433

http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2003/01/31/4/?nc=1

73 de Jim, N2EY

1352. Re: Out Of The Box?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-31 22:27:25 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E3AF832.F59E09BE@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60434

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E399979.C9DD45C9@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <20030128194825.12173.00000228@mb-mr.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
> >(N2EY)
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >In article <20030128112728.02295.00000280@mb-bk.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> >(Steve
> >> >Robeson K4YZ) writes:
> >>
> >> >
> >> >RESUME QUOTE:
> >> >
> >> >I'm going for Amateur Extra "out of the box." Maybe I'll
> >> >make it, maybe not. The personal point is irrelevant.
> >> >
> >> >PAUSE QUOTE
> >> >
> >> >Well, there you have it. Nothing ambiguous or qualified about it at all.
> >Not a
> >> >claim of what could be done, or might be done, but of what he was going to
> >do.
> >>
> >> Bullshit, boy. Take that into the entire context of the
> >> message...and then go "interpret" your buddie Kellie's
> >> message text the same way you "interpreted" mine.
> >>
> >> You can't do it, boy. You're a PCTA and so is Kellie.
> >>
> >I take it that "Bullshit" means "I wrote it; they found it; they
> >re-posted the quote". What interpretation is necessary, Leonard? You
> >wrote the statement.
> >You haven't taken a single step toward bringing it to reality.
>
> Bringing WHAT "to reality," Herr Robust?

...that elusive Amateur Extra ticket, Leonard--the one you wrote of in
the statement you made here several years ago.

> Following your Orders of the Day?
>
> Ich nicht bin ein Berliner you sour kraut mit mini-weenie.

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

> >Sure you did. Nice attempt a dodge. It fails, but nice attempt.
>
> I drive a Chevrolet, not a Chrysler product. I dodge all
> vehicles that are errant.

Drivel. You made the statement and you attempt your usual tap dancing
to get around the obstacle presented by the presence of your archived
statement.

> >Just take the heat coming to you and suck it up, Len.
>
> Another Order of The Day from the colonel.
>
> Go such an 807 plate cap...with the HV on.

I'm not the party just forced to eat his own words.

> >When you go into
> >your capital letters mode, you simply appear frantic.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. That must be a capital crime.

No, it just indicates when you're getting desperate.

> >That isn't clear at all, Len. You did write what had long been
> >attributed to you. That says it all.
>
> No problem here except that the prissy pedanticists
> love to take statements out of context when it suits
> their purpose.

Show us how it was taken out of context, Leonard.

> The sour kraut better strike for making this an exclusive,
> moderated newsgroup to ease his discomfort. Poor baby,
> doesn't realize that Preparation H is not a relief and the
> "H" doesn't stand for 'ham.'

Seeing you twist in the wind over a number of issues cause me no
discomfort at all.

> >Why should you be believed now? Your first statement to that effect
> >proved to be a crock.

>
> Most of the colonel's Orders Of The Day in here fit into a
> crock. A very big crock. And the crock doesn't like it.

No defense of your action, just more tap dancing.

> >I'd have thought that you'd have had enough twisting in the wind for a while.
> >Your often-repeated statements that I claimed origination of the idea
> >for use of a CW order wire aren't borne out by a google search.
>
> They were borne out by a DejaNews search, boy. Lots of
> your output were seen by many.

Where are those results, Leonard? Google has all the DejaNews material.
I've resposted what was stated. It was not as you claimed.

> Like all officious PCTAs you want to live in Google, rehashing
> your old outrages until everyone capitulates and you claim
> "victory!" Let us take the claim EITHER way...

Please demonstrate that anyone wants to "live in Google". I went to
Google after I got fed up with your repeated, deliberate false
statements. Jim went to Google after you repeatedly denied writing that
you were going for an "Extra out of the box". You were bitten in the
ass by both of those as surely as you were bitten by your stupid
statement about "Key Officers lists". Go ahead, keep up the tap
dancing. I'll be happy to keep this stuff going as long as it
entertains me.

> Using manual CW as an "order-wire" on an RTTY circuit
> DOESN'T MAKE ANY SENSE. It isn't logical. It is a
> nonsense idea whether done be some embassy staffer
> in a third-world country or anyone else.

Face it--some people never understand a concept. It has been explained
often enough for you to have understood it if you were ever going to.

> Just take the heat coming to you and suck it up.

Which particular heat would that be, Len?

> >It has been a bad week for you, Len.
>
> Go back to your remedial arithmetic exercise, colonel.
>
> 24 x 7 = 168. Get it?

Go "such" an 807 plate cap. Get it?

Dave K8MN

1353. Re: Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, FCC, Cronkite, ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-31 23:01:19 UTC
From: LRod@removethispartpobox.com
Message-ID: <3e3af283.1365111414@netnews.att.net>
Source record: 60435
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

On Fri, 31 Jan 2003 22:02:25 GMT, "Paul Vanasse" <pvanasse@cox.net>
wrote:

>Ahh, the old "cut and run" when the cold hard facts cloud the argument.
>Typical response from a no-name newsgroup bandito.....Sometimes the
>truth hurts woody.

No name? My name is clealy available, even if you're not satisfied
with my legitimate nickname, LRod. Just follow the link, and all will
become clear.

I'd say "no-call newsgroup bandito" on the other hand might just fit
you to a "T". Mine's available at the link above.

>Just like the ARRL's consistant rhetoric of heinous hyperbole, your response
>fits the mold perfectly.

Yep. Lawyer. "Heinous hyperbole" indeed. Ha, ha, ha...

>Suggestion: Instead of paying your $39 for ARRL dues this year...

Life Member since 1977. Nice try though. Thanks for playing.

LRod

Master Woodbutcher and seasoned termite

Shamelessly whoring my website since 1999

http://www.woodbutcher.net

1354. Re: Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, FCC, Cronkite, ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-31 23:17:17 UTC
From: LRod@removethispartpobox.com
Message-ID: <3e3af482.1365622142@netnews.att.net>
Source record: 60436
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

On Fri, 31 Jan 2003 22:02:25 GMT, "Paul Vanasse" <pvanasse@cox.net>
wrote:

><Chuckling>
>
>Excellent post Paul.

>Agreed. I believe the real test here will be whether the presence of any
>previous equitable enforcement of (or lack thereof) by the government on the
>part of W1AW et als will be cited a presidence. Lets face it, this statute
>was originally written with W1AW in mind and W1AW has never really been
>challenged. Res judicata not withstanding, the matter will be one the
>outcome of which could cause inter alia kaos (from an organizational and
>futher enforcement POV). Having stated this, an ALJ will have to take into
>consideration whether K1MAN was in fact culpable by not subscribing to any
>of the acceptable relevance criteria and his actions were those of a blatent
>scienter. Personally, I think they both need exemplary damages per curiam.

If you spent less time trying to convince people you're bright or
knowledgable with the overuse of arcane Latin esoterica and more time
spellchecking your English you might come off as more credible.

E.g.: precedence, notwithstanding (one word), blatant.

<Chuckling>

LRod

Master Woodbutcher and seasoned termite

Shamelessly whoring my website since 1999

http://www.woodbutcher.net

1355. Re: Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, FCC, Cronkite, ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-31 23:27:07 UTC
From: Paul Vanasse <pvanasse@cox.net>
Message-ID: <fDD_9.131005$ui1.2874856@news1.east.cox.net>
Source record: 60437
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

> If you spent less time trying to convince people you're bright or
> knowledgable with the overuse of arcane Latin esoterica and more time
> spellchecking your English you might come off as more credible.
>
> E.g.: precedence, notwithstanding (one word), blatant

Ahh Woody, what are we to do with the likes of you??? Your obviously one of those "last word" kinda guys so Ill let you have at it because I know you'll nickel and dime us all to death.

PS: Spell checkers are for whimps and 8th grade dropouts. Go ahead and try it, live dangerously.

1356. Re: Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, FCC, Cronkite, ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-31 23:28:06 UTC
From: wf3h@ptnospam.com
Message-ID: <3e3b03dc.600810@news.ptdprolog.net>
Source record: 60438
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

On 30 Jan 2003 08:04:02 -0800, drakeswl@hotmail.com (Paul) wrote:

>I'm new to this topic so don't flame me, but if W1AW has a bulletin,
>why can't Baxter have one? What is Baxter doing that is so bad that
>the FCC would want to shut him down? He has been on a long time and
>they haven't done anything... so doesn't that mean he is perfectly
>legal as far as the FCC goes? Last question. If Cronkite gave Baxter
>that announcement he uses, why should Baxter have to stop using it
>now? I heard Baxter used to call people and the government names and
>sent out some felony complaints, but isn't interfering with Baxter's
>show illegal?
>
>I know I'm new and I'm not a ham, but I started to listen to Baxter's
>show this month, and it just sounds like he is trying to help minority
>kids and some kind of peace corp, plus he is putting other people's
>material on, like newsline and arrl and rain and the like. So where's
>the beef?
>
>Please, no flames, I'm just trying to learn and keep an open mind.
>
>Paul

The FCC long ago gave the ARRL permission to broadcast messages of
benefit to the ham community. This permission is not given to
everyone for obvious reasons...pretty soon the ham bands would be just
another BCB.

Baxter is generally not listened to by anyone. His broadcasts are done
just to aggravate the small group of politicos who don't care about
ham radio, but are anal retentive when it comes to the ARRL.

---
check my blog at:
http://www.bobview.blogspot.com/
updated 1/8/03

1357. Re: Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, FCC, Cronkite, ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-31 23:29:32 UTC
From: wf3h@ptnospam.com
Message-ID: <3e3b0470.748671@news.ptdprolog.net>
Source record: 60439
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

On Thu, 30 Jan 2003 21:44:11 GMT, "Paul Vanasse" <pvanasse@cox.net>
wrote:

>
>> W1AW is the station of the ARRL, which is the sole effective
>> representative of amateur radio to Congress, the FCC, and other
>> governing entities.
>
>The ARRL doesnt speak for all amateurs. That's the problem here. They
>actually think they do.
>
>>The bulletins that it transmits meet every
>> standard of permissible transmissions set forth by the FCC.
>
>WHOA! Hold on a minute buddy. Im no fan of K1MAN or his antics but the W1AW
>station isnt conforming to Part 97 or Good Amateur Practice either.
>
>Try holding a CW QSO on any of the W1AW Bulletin frequencies right before
>the ARRL CW bulletin commences. What you'll find is that the bulletin will
>begin REGARDLESS of the existing QSO which means that the W1AW station is
>either

like i said, there is a small group of amateurs who are anal retentive
and don't particularly care about the hobby, the ARRL or anything else

this guy is a prime example.

---
check my blog at:
http://www.bobview.blogspot.com/
updated 1/8/03

1358. Re: Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, FCC, Cronkite, ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-31 23:31:13 UTC
From: Paul Vanasse <pvanasse@cox.net>
Message-ID: <5HD_9.131008$ui1.2875886@news1.east.cox.net>
Source record: 60440
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

>Your obviously one of
> those "last word" kinda guys so Ill let you have at it because I know
you'll
> nickel and dime us all to death.

See!!! I did it again Woodman. The word is supposed to be "You're"

Let YOUR inhibitions go.....show us your imperfect side........get wild.

1359. Re: Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, FCC, Cronkite, ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-31 23:47:19 UTC
From: David Robbins <k1ttt@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <95ydnUJzS_yflqajXTWcpQ@crocker.com>
Source record: 60441
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

<wf3h@ptnospam.com> wrote in message
news:3e3b03dc.600810@news.ptdprolog.net...
> The FCC long ago gave the ARRL permission to broadcast messages of
> benefit to the ham community. This permission is not given to
> everyone for obvious reasons...pretty soon the ham bands would be just
> another BCB.
>

actually they gave it to everyone a long ago in 97.111(b)(6)

1360. Re: Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, FCC, Cronkite, ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-31 23:49:19 UTC
From: Paul Vanasse <pvanasse@cox.net>
Message-ID: <3YD_9.131010$ui1.2881615@news1.east.cox.net>
Source record: 60442
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

>Just follow the link, and all will
> become clear.

No thanks, Im *really* not interested. You're previous comments say it all.

> Life Member since 1977. Nice try though. Thanks for playing.

That explains it! I bet when you ponied up that $300 to be a Life Member you didn't have a clue that you'd be the one outliving the league eh? It sounds like you're somewhat bitter because you just don't want to admit you hooked a gaffer.

1361. Re: Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, FCC, Cronkite, ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-01-31 23:55:35 UTC
From: jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu
Message-ID: <b1f2dn$a4u$1@news.hawaii.edu>
Source record: 60486
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Paul Vanasse <pvanasse@cox.net> wrote:

Someone wrote:
>> W1AW is the station of the ARRL, which is the sole effective
>> representative of amateur radio to Congress, the FCC, and other
>> governing entities.

>The ARRL doesnt speak for all amateurs.

That's not what he said. Read the sentence from start to finish;
your only conclusion is that it's completely true and it's been
true since about 1916. It would be even more true if he had
included the U.S. Armed Forces.

You're looking at it from the ARRL's perspective to others, but he
wrote it from the perspective of others to the ARRL.

>Out of 636,000 U.S. hams, only 157,000 are league members.

Doesn't matter. Only a small minority of gun owners are NRA
members, but the government et al see the NRA as representing
all owners and the industry. We see the same situation with
the AAA -- not all drivers are members but AAA is considered as
the representative for all drivers.

73, Jeff KH6O

--
Operations Specialist Mathematics Lecturer
U.S. Coast Guard Kapiolani College
Dept. of Homeland Security University of Hawaii System

1362. Re: Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, FCC, Cronkite, ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-01 00:03:40 UTC
From: jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu
Message-ID: <b1f2ssafi1@news.hawaii.edu>
Source record: 60487
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

In article <b1cioafic0@pita.alt.net>, Bruce <Apply@anon.com> wrote:
>ARRL? K1MAN? Who cares? By your count there are 479,000 of us out here that
>do NOT belong to either. And why bother? Why waste the money on either one?
>They do not speak for me.

You might honestly believe that the ARRL doesn't speak for you, but
amateur radio exists today *only* because of the ARRL. One of dozens
of examples: There would not have been any ham radio after WWI if it
hadn't been for the ARRL's efforts fighting the Navy's desire for all
radio to be under military control.

73, Jeff KH6O

--
Operations Specialist Mathematics Lecturer
U.S. Coast Guard Kapiolani College
Dept. of Homeland Security University of Hawaii System

1363. Re: Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, FCC, Cronkite, ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-01 00:07:47 UTC
From: jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu
Message-ID: <b1f34jagl1@news.hawaii.edu>
Source record: 60488
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

> I'm new to this topic so don't flame me, but if W1AW has a bulletin,
> why can't Baxter have one?

0 2 4 6 8 10
/
/
/
/
/
/
/
/
TROLL-O-METER

Jeff KH6O

--
Operations Specialist Mathematics Lecturer
U.S. Coast Guard Kapiolani College
Dept. of Homeland Security University of Hawaii System

1364. Re: Russian troops seen in Mexico (..oh my!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-01 00:18:38 UTC
From: di540@FreeNet.Carleton.CA
Message-ID: <b1f3ou$rc3$1@freenet9.carleton.ca>
Source record: 60443
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Lord Haw-Haw" (killingjoke@juno.com) writes:
> "K1MAN Man" <Lloyd@blo.spoomm> wrote in message
>> The 3860 net that met at 8pm est had several callins who have seen
>> Russian troops near the Mexican border getting reaidy to cross over
>> into the US. Our own govenment doesn't tell us, but people like these
>> and also people like K1MAN keep an eye out to protectify us.
>
> You mean they "protectify us" like the Dalkon Shield prevents
> unwanted pregenancies and fuel tanks in the Ford Pinto and
> saddle-mounted GMC Pickup were "100% Safe" in the
> event of a car crash?

You forgot keeping the world safe for democracy, by supporting dictators
all over the world.

> that the USAF was in a "live fire aerial dogfight" over Mexican
> and USA (Texas) airspace with Russian and Cuban MIG's.
>
> Oh well, enjoy these RF militialoon clowns on 3.860 now before
> their each hoisted up by their own pitard from paranoid
> stupidity, thus ensuring by their own from their actions
> when they go the way of David "boylover" Koresh, Tim "OKC"
> McVeigh, William "pale of horseshyte" Cooper, Steve
> "Col nutcase" Andersen and shoebomber Richard Reid.

Only in Yankeedom could Yankee-trained psychopaths have such a large
following. The other side also has a large following: Janet "girllover"
Reno and esp. Hillary "vayest raght waing conspirahcy" Clinton. Janet
was no doubt jealous of the Davidians. Either side is worthy of self-
-destruction by their own paranoia, lust, envy, and hate.

1365. Re: More Young Hams - Then And Now

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-01 02:05:13 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <v3mas5f50ec48f@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 60444

Certainly makes it tough to blame the 'danged Morse code' for being too difficult, doesn't it? Thanks for the URL.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0301311427.33709033@posting.google.com...
> http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2003/01/31/4/?nc=1
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.449 / Virus Database: 251 - Release Date: 1/27/03

1366. Re: Claims Of Dishonesty

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-01 02:13:20 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030131211320.27873.00000375@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 60445

In article <3E3A019D.737290D7@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <f45722ac.0301300603.26f915b@posting.google.com>,
>> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>>
>> >> Careful, Brian, Reverend Jimmie might be Out To Getcha!
>> >>
>> >> Check for tatoos on his knuckles if you see him... :-)
>> >
>> >Len, give it up! He nailed you good on the Extra out of the box (no
>> >time limit stipulated, however). I think I told Bruce I was going to
>> >get Extra, also.
>>
>> Reverend Jimmie rode into town, found an old message
>> under an old stack of messages, yanked it out and...
>
> ...posted it for all to see. There is was in black and white.
>
> Googled again.

That's really what it comes down to, Dave. But Mr. Anderson becomes quite
agitated when he is shown to be in error. Note the above comparisons to an old
movie character.
>
>> He was livid with fury and righteousness and took time
>> from working DX on HF with CW (and his family?)
>
>He works DX on HF with his family? Really? No wonder he's upset.
>
Actually, Dave, I'm not much of a DXer at all. I much prefer domestic contests
(FD, SS, CX, SKN, QRP sprints, etc.), ragchewing, and homebrewing/kit building.
To each his own. I did work ZA8AV on 40 CW one evening about 5 years ago by
being the first one on freq when he fired up.

As for family, I don't think I've ever mentioned anything about that subject
here. Nor do I intend to.
>
>> He can't take things in context but must take them out of
>> context, highlight them, separate them to Illuminate The
>> Transgressions of The Ungodly.
>
>What was the context, Leonard. How was your statement used out of

>context.
>I don't recall you prefacing your statement with, "I'm only kidding
>but..."

We've been all through this before, Dave. The context is whatever Mr. Anderson says it is.
>
>> "Extra out of the box" should not be difficult...except for
>> the needless morsemanship test in the year 2003...107
>> years after radio was first proved as a comm medium...
>> 94 years after the first USA organization (Radio Club of
>> America) was formed...58 years after the end of World
>> War 2 (also the end of using morse behind enemy lines).*
>
>...and 137 years after the end of the Civil War, 104 years after the end
>of the Spanish-American War and 937 years after the Battle of Hastings.

More than 2000 years after Julius Caesar crossed the Rubicon, too. 2500 or so years since the battle on the plain of Marathon. Humans still run marathons, by the way - guess we runners are "clinging to the past".

>"Extra out of the box" isn't difficult, even with the incredibly slow 5
>wpm morse test.

Mr. Anderson has said he "knows morse" in another post, but perhaps that was another error, since anyone who "knows morse" in the context of amateur radio should be able to pass the 5 wpm test.
>
>> US radio amateurs MUST revere and venerate beloved
>> morse code and worship at the Church of St. Hiram or be
>> virtually burned at the stake, forbidden the Rights of the
>> US Constitution and petitioning their government for the
>> redress of grievances.
>
>Uh...you've petitioned your government. Your government just didn't get
>around to doing what you wanted.
>
>> >So what are we going to do about it?
>>
>> Dunno, Brian. Seeing what the Extra does to former human
>> beans...along with the Mark of the 1x2...and the neverending
>> fantasy stories...plus the marching in ranks to the drum
>> beat of morse, morse, morse in the "service" of their nation
>> doesn't sound all that attractive to rational social persons.
>
>Enough about the rational, social persons. What are you and Brian going
>to do about it?

Is it not obvious? Nothing.
>
>> I once
>> worked HF "DX" circuits trans-Pacific on a 24/7 basis (meaning

>> continuously)...
>
>You did not work trans-Pacific DX continuously. Do try and get it
>right.
>You worked shifts at a place which was in operation 'round the clock.

Dave, Mr. Anderson obviously suffers from poor language comprehension. He does not understand your radio operations for the State Department. Such misunderstandings and misquotes are common for Mr. Anderson.

For example, in an ARRL-bashing post some time back he described Amazon as a "profitable" company. I responded by referencing Amazon financial numbers on Yahoo that showed Amazon was heavily in debt and losing money like mad. At the time, it had had just one profitable quarter in the the preceding year. Still, Mr. Anderson insisted that Amazon was "profitable" because it had not gone out of business.

Somehow Mr. Anderson twisted my characterization of Amazon. Instead of not being "profitable", he claims I have said Amazon was "bankrupt". But I do not recall ever saying Amazon.com was "bankrupt" - just not profitable at the time I wrote the posts.

Now, do you think Mr. Anderson will be able to back up his claims about what I said about Amazon? Of course not, because no evidence exists. Mr. Anderson has confused "not profitable" with "bankrupt" and will not admit his error.

Mr. Anderson projects his own behavior and feelings onto others. Note how angry, upset and abusive he gets over my calm, reasoned, well-documented posts pointing out his errors.

>> Maybe it's from an interest in technology? No, that can't be
>> it for the Prussian Oberst has commanded that "interest in
>> radio" ONLY happens when one has an amateur license.
>
>Nope. You can't get anything right this week. You've stated that
>you've had an interest in amateur radio for some decades. It can't be
>much of an interest if you've never acted upon it.

Interest levels vary, Dave. Mr. Anderson's interest level has not reached the point of being licensed in the amateur radio service. Is that a bad thing?

Perhaps we should have a nice ragchew on 80 or 40 CW some evening. It would be good to hear tales of Helsinki, Dar-es-Salaam, and other exotic locales from someone who lived there for years, while serving our country's diplomatic mission.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1367. Re: Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, FCC, Cronkite, ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-01 02:26:07 UTC
From: LRod@removethispartpobox.com
Message-ID: <3e3b23f4.1377770388@netnews.att.net>
Source record: 60446
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

On Fri, 31 Jan 2003 23:49:19 GMT, "Paul Vanasse" <pvanasse@cox.net>
wrote:

And you thought I was a "last word guy." Here you are, 20 minutes
later...

What a surprise.

Go ahead, you can finish.

LRod

Master Woodbutcher and seasoned termite

Shamelessly whoring my website since 1999

http://www.woodbutcher.net

1368. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-01 02:58:00 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <YIG_9.2383$N5.1386493@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 60447

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030128083623.05048.00000263@mb-cs.aol.com...
> In article <OulZ9.1420$N5.819411@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20030126215637.20835.00000270@mb-fy.aol.com...
> >>>
> >> Are there more than 3400 current NCI members?
> >
> >Yes ...
>
> How many?

Lots ... (you might as well stop asking ... I am not going to give you a
number, but it grows by about 50 or more per month in an average month
if that satisfies any of your curiosity ...)

> And since there are no dues nor membership expirations, how do you know if
a
> "current member" still exists?

Occasionally e-mail bulletins are sent to the membership ... we have a few
former
members who are now, unfortunately, SKs ... generally a family member
responds
to the e-mail with the sad news ... they are listed "in memorium" in our
member
database as SKs ... sort of like retiring a sports player's jersey/number as
an honor.
However, there are only a few ... like a handfull, literally.

> Where? Where does ARRL claim to speak for all?

Read their filings with the FCC ... they imply that they are
the sole/primary voice of US amateurs ... even though their
membership is less than 25% ...

> ARRL's membership number is clearly stated. Not a secret in any way.
>
> What is NCI's current membership, give or take 1%? Why has that number
been
> such a closely guarded secret?

Because, frankly, we respect our members' privacy and it's not really your
business.

> Is there another amateur radio society in the USA that provides even 1% of
the
> services ARRl provides to the amateur radio community?

I have not faulted the ARRL for services provided ... I have faulted them
for
some bad policies in the past. Remember, I've been a member of ARRL for
over 25 years ... I have the right to complain if I don't like some policy.
I also have the right to oppose ARRL policies I don't like ... and I do.

Carl - wk3c

1369. Re: The coders embarrass themselves on 14.275 MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-01 03:00:10 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9314DFCC38367elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 60448

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in news:3E3AC478.2010804@psu.edu:

>
>
> N2EY wrote:
>
>> From actual observation I can say that violations such as jamming,
>> obscenity/profanity, and failure to identify are uncommon in amateur
>> radio as a whole, and extremely rare in the CW/digital parts of the HF
>> bands. In the past 35 years of operating amateur radio CW I don't
>> recall a single instance where I heard obscenity/profanity on CW in
>> the CW/digital bands. Can you say that about the 'phone bands?
>
> Only once have I heard "strong" language on a digital mode.
> Someone was
> giving out a tongue lashing to another on PSK31. Okay-maybe a keyboard
> lashing. It was deserved though, the guy was running waaay too much
> power and way overdriving his audio, and taking up half the frequency.
> That's it. One case.!
>
> OTOH give me 30 seconds on phone and I'll give you swearing,
> malicious
> interference, poor operating practice and a host of other
> unpleasantness.

Only on certain frequencies (certain spots on 80m and 20m and a few
renegade repeaters), and only at certain times. Does giving you 30 seconds
on phone mean on 14.275?

>
>
>> FCC enforcement actions today are largely complaint-driven. Somebody
>> sends a credible complaint (such as audio tapes with
>> time/date/frequency clearly marked) to the FCC, and FCC follows up
>> with their own investigation. Why are there so many complaints about
>> 'phone but so few about CW and digital?
>
>
>
>> If the use of a certain mode results in far fewer violations by those
>> using the mode, doesn't that make the mode somewhat better?
>
> No Jim, it doesn't make the mode better. What it means is that the
> people who partake of that mode are more gentlemanly or gentlewomanly.
> They also "play nice".

>
> - mike -
>
>

1370. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-01 03:03:23 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <%NG_9.2384$N5.1384836@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 60450

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030129204547.27873.00000300@mb-mj.aol.com...
> Well? If NCI's Executive Director can make a point of ARRL member numbers
and
> percentages, the same rules of discussion should apply to NCI member
numbers
> and percentages.

NCI doesn't claim to be THE National Society for Amateur Radio ...
we only claim to represent our members.

The fact that our comments and recommendations to the FCC were
credible and that we were quite sucessful in "restructuring" really seems
to irk you ... if the ARRL's policies and recommendations had been more
in line with the realities of today and the Commission's legitimate
regulatory
objectives, they might have gotten more traction ... ours were ... we got
the traction ... live with it.

Carl - wk3c

1371. Re: Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, FCC, Cronkite, ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-01 03:26:10 UTC
From: drakeswl@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <c0588492.0301311926.60061d9f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60449
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Paul Vanasse" wrote in message > <Chuckling>
> Pro Bono!!!! I would think that after 16 years hence your Harvard exit that
> you still don't have the bill for your AmJur's paid off ;)

Thanks Mr. V. and I concur with your analysis as well. Debts paid
since '95 courtesy of DoD; quid pro quo.

-Paul J.

1372. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-01 03:28:09 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.h9lt5es.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 60451

On Sat, 01 Feb 2003 02:58:00 GMT, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

>I have not faulted the ARRL for services provided ... I have faulted
>them for some bad policies in the past. Remember, I've been a member
>of ARRL for over 25 years ... I have the right to complain if I don't
>like some policy. I also have the right to oppose ARRL policies I
>don't like ... and I do.

So do I. On target 100% May it always be so.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
ARRL Volunteer Counsel
ARRL Life Member
ARRL Critic When Necessary

1373. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-01 03:43:46 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030131224346.12173.00000308@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 60453

In article <YIG_9.2383$N5.1386493@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030128083623.05048.00000263@mb-cs.aol.com...
>> In article <OulZ9.1420$N5.819411@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>>
>> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> >news:20030126215637.20835.00000270@mb-fy.aol.com...
>> >>>
>> >> Are there more than 3400 current NCI members?
>> >
>> >Yes ...
>>
>> How many?
>
>Lots ...

Ten is "lots" in some contexts.

>(you might as well stop asking ... I am not going to give you a
>number,

Why not? Are you ashamed of the actual number?

>but it grows by about 50 or more per month in an average month
>if that satisfies any of your curiosity ...)
>
50 per month is 600 per year. That means a growth of 1800 since restructuring,
out of 685,000 hams.

>> And since there are no dues nor membership expirations, how do you know if
>> a
>> "current member" still exists?
>
>Occasionally e-mail bulletins are sent to the membership ... we have a few
>former
>members who are now, unfortunately, SKs ... generally a family member
>responds
>to the e-mail with the sad news ... they are listed "in memorium" in our
>member
>database as SKs ... sort of like retiring a sports player's jersey/number as
>an honor.
>However, there are only a few ... like a handfull, literally.

It is sad when we lose a fellow amateur. Like N0BK, gone so soon.

But there is also the case of members who have lost interest in your cause. Unless they take the action to request removal from your membership, they will be counted forever.
>
>> Where? Where does ARRL claim to speak for all?
>
>Read their filings with the FCC ...

I have.

>they imply that they are
>the sole/primary voice of US amateurs ...

No, they don't. They simply state their position as the largest amateur radio group in the USA. FCC knows how big ARRL is, anyway.

>even though their membership is less than 25% ...

And NCI's is less than 0.5%.
>
>> ARRL's membership number is clearly stated. Not a secret in any way.
>>
>> What is NCI's current membership, give or take 1%? Why has that number
>>been
>> such a closely guarded secret?
>
>Because, frankly, we respect our members' privacy

I'm not asking for any information about who is or is not a member. Not asking for calls, names, addresses, or anything like that, so "members' privacy" is a strawman argument.

> and it's not really your business.

No? When an organization petitions the government to change laws and rules, it's "not really my business" to know how big that organization is? Particularly when that organization claims to know what is best for all of amateur radio, including me?

I say it is my business, and the business of anyone else who cares. And remember, it was you who made an issue of ARRL's member numbers. Why does one set of rules apply to ARRL and another to NCI?
>
>> Is there another amateur radio society in the USA that provides even 1% of
>> the
>> services ARRl provides to the amateur radio community?
>
>I have not faulted the ARRL for services provided ...

Is that a yes or a no?

> I have faulted them
>for

>some bad policies in the past.

Like what, besides code testing?

>Remember, I've been a member of ARRL for
>over 25 years ...

And I've been one for 35 years. Big deal.

> I have the right to complain if I don't like some policy.
>I also have the right to oppose ARRL policies I don't like ... and I do.
>
Nobody denies that right - least of all, me. But that right extends to all of us, and includes supporting policies we do agree with.

Seems to me there is no good reason to keep the NCI membership number a secret. If the organization is large, why keep it a secret? And if it's small, one would think you'd be proud of what a small group can accomplish.

--

Ever hear of the "National Amateur Radio Council" and the "Society of American Radio Amateurs", and what they accomplished? Quite interesting, really.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1374. Re: The coders embarrass themselves on 14.275 MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-01 03:43:47 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030131224347.12173.00000309@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 60452

In article <Xns9314DFCC38367elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
<elektros@yahoo.com> writes:

>Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in news:3E3AC478.2010804@psu.edu:
>
>>
>>
>> N2EY wrote:
>>
>>> From actual observation I can say that violations such as jamming,
>>> obscenity/profanity, and failure to identify are uncommon in amateur
>>> radio as a whole, and extremely rare in the CW/digital parts of the HF
>>> bands. In the past 35 years of operating amateur radio CW I don't
>>> recall a single instance where I heard obscenity/profanity on CW in
>>> the CW/digital bands. Can you say that about the 'phone bands?
>>
>> Only once have I heard "strong" language on a digital mode.
>> Someone was
>> giving out a tongue lashing to another on PSK31. Okay-maybe a keyboard
>> lashing. It was deserved though, the guy was running waaay too much
>> power and way overdriving his audio, and taking up half the frequency.
>> That's it. One case.!
>>
>> OTOH give me 30 seconds on phone and I'll give you swearing,
>> malicious
>> interference, poor operating practice and a host of other
>> unpleasantness.
>
>Only on certain frequencies (certain spots on 80m and 20m and a few
>renegade repeaters), and only at certain times.

Perhaps. Still a lot compared to the lack of such behavior on CW/digital.

> Does giving you 30 seconds
>on phone mean on 14.275?

3.950, 14.313.....
>>
>>
>>> FCC enforcement actions today are largely complaint-driven. Somebody
>>> sends a credible complaint (such as audio tapes with
>>> time/date/frequency clearly marked) to the FCC, and FCC follows up
>>> with their own investigation. Why are there so many complaints about
>>> 'phone but so few about CW and digital?
>>

>>
>>> If the use of a certain mode results in far fewer violations by those
>>> using the mode, doesn't that make the mode somewhat better?
>>
>> No Jim, it doesn't make the mode better. What it means is that the
>> people who partake of that mode are more gentlemanly or gentlewomanly.
>> They also "play nice".

The let me rephrase:

If the use of a certain mode results in far fewer violations by those
using the mode, isn't that a good reason to support use of the mode?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1375. Do You Think It's Time?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-01 04:18:08 UTC
From: RG <nospam@nospam.com>
Message-ID: <b1fhtgrha1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 60454

Do you think it's time to drop LSB for the lower bands and switch to USB exclusively (like commercial/military) for all amateur bands?

Surely, it was warranted for technical reasons 50 years ago to have selectable sidebands but now it's somewhat silly---and a technically backward practice.

RG

1376. More Of How KB1HMW "Supports" Amateur Radio...NOT!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-01 04:24:03 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030131232403.23275.00000020@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 60455

Vipul,

At first I was willing to just accept that you are from a different culture
and perhaps didnt' understand what Amateur Radio was about.

I have changed my mind. I think you understand perfectly, but are just a
non-hacking, selfish little punk with gross anti-social behaviours that will
never been redeemed.

The following is shameful. Not one bit of redeeming, "pro Amateur Radio"
support here.

Just the whinings and snivvilings of a third world punk who think's
America should just stop where it is and change for them.

Read through the following for my comments.

>Subject: Re: arrl article on echolink - impress a non ham
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 1/30/03 5:36 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030130183652.14205.00000229@mb-fx.aol.com>

>>From: "shortwave dingalings" boinkboobies3@aol.com
>>>pss: saw one guy at a ham club meeting here last week.
>>>3 HT's on his belt....belt/waistline being what looked
>>>like a size-58. (he actually had to *turn sideways* to
>>>go thru a standard 30 by 76 inch door frame) Great image
>>>for ham radio eh?

I guess we don't know WHY this person is obese, eh? Are we to jsut
automatically assume that he's just a glutton, or was there some mitigating
physiological reason? Or was it just a chance for you to make another abusive
comment on Amateur Radio, Vipul?

We'll never know.

>>Someone should videotape him trying
>>>to get into a phone booth at the next hamfest and send it in
>>>to America's Funniest Home Videos before he drops dead
>>>of a massive cornary and they bury him in a piano crate.

>To be fair, all those HT's on his belt must have made it more difficult to get
>through the door.

This was cute, Vipul...real cute. Where'd you go to sensitivity training?

"Herb" <Herbie@KingOftheJammers.net> wrote in message
news:b1bb9j$1t2$0@pita.alt.net...

>> Impress a non ham even more. Take them to a ham radio club
>> meeting or better yet, a hamfest.

>Yes, invite a non-Ham to a club meeting or a Hamfest. There one can see the
>typical Ham. The non-Ham will see that Hams are weird.

Yeah...real wierd. So wierd they choose to not hang out with so cool a
dude like Vipul the Virtuous...?!?! Geeze that IS wierd...

>"Herb" <Herbie@KingOftheJammers.net> wrote
>> View the assortment of ex-cons, wife beaters, alcoholics, druggies,
>> nut cases, slobs, fruits, and societal misfits who make up the crowd that
>> attends hamfests and ham club meetings today.

>Hams are mostly good people. Most of this stuff isn't true. Societal misfits
>seems to hold true.

Not from what you posted up above, Vipul ! ! ! You have a bit of that
Lenniesque two-faced thing going on...

>"Herb" <Herbie@KingOftheJammers.net> wrote
Then view the obese
>> slobs in wrinkled filthy clothing who haven't bathed in months, as they
>> charge the food table and stuff a dozen donuts in their mouths while
>> talking at the same time, soda spilling all over their clothes.

>True, most Hams are fat. The really obese tend to stand out. This is just
more
>confirmation of that.

"MOST" is indicative of a majority. From what assessment do you obtain
this information in order to draw to this conclusion?

>"Herb" <Herbie@KingOftheJammers.net> wrote
>>Oh, and
>> be sure not to miss the guys with five HTs on their belt with microphone
>> cords wrapped around them and several microphones clipped to their
>> shirts. They'll be wearing four or five badges with their ham call sign,
>a
>> belt buckle with ham call, a shirt with a call sign, and a hat with their
>> call
>> sign in six places on the hat!

>Obsessed, cult like.

You are really sick, Vipul. What's with you and obsessions of
"cults"..?!?!

I get the feeling you and some friends were the extras for the movie
"Indiana Jones and the Temple of Doom", and you've never been the same since.

Or is this just your way of "washing your hands" of people who have washed
their hands of YOU?

>"Herb" <Herbie@KingOftheJammers.net> wrote
>>Hams will tell you they are war heroes,
>> former Navy SEALs, Green Berets, and the president of their own high
>> tech company, making millions a year. Or they work for a large high
>> tech company, just got a big pay raise and make $100,000 a year. Oh,
>> and last but not least, check out the cars hams drive. The vehicles will
>> have at least five antennas on it, call signs plastered all over the
>> windows,
>> ham call letter license tags on the front and back and bald tires.

>The achievements of a few are made to represent the hobby. These are not the
>typical Hams. Attend a Hamfest to see a typical Ham.

"Typical Ham"....Hmmmmmmmmm...Let's see...housewives, college
students...members of the Armed Forces...engineers (except Lennie)...gas
station attendants...insurance salesmen...high school kids...members of
government...heads-of-state...music stars...Vipul Shaw, KB1HMW...

yep...REALLY WIERD!

>"Herb" <Herbie@KingOftheJammers.net> wrote
YES,
>> DO impress a non ham friend with today's ham radio hobby!
>>
>> Herb

>Exactly. I have been saying this, but you have expressed it in more detail
and
>more eloquently than I have. One just has to go to a Hamfest and/or club
>meeting and non-Hams will see the typical Ham. Societal misfits, fat,
obsessed,
>cult-like, and a fantasy of importance.

I am really tempted to e mail this to every ham within 100 miles of you,
Vipul, and see just how many hamfests you are welcomed at in the future.

THAT would be interesting to see!

Steve, K4YZ

1377. Re: Out Of The Box?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-01 04:30:13 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030131233013.23275.00000023@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 60456

>Subject: Re: Out Of The Box?
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 1/31/03 2:24 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030131152457.03820.00000305@mb-fr.aol.com>

>No problem here except that the prissy pedanticists
> love to take statements out of context when it suits
> their purpose.

Nothing was taken "out of context".

Jim's post quoted your post exactly.

You got caught lying once again, and were nailed to teh wall by your own words.

Leonard H. Anderson is a pathological liar. Period.

Steve Robeson, K4YZ

1378. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-01 04:34:24 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030131233424.23275.00000024@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 60457

>Subject: Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 1/31/03 2:24 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030131152455.03820.00000303@mb-fr.aol.com>

>Reproduce anything you want. Create hordes of bastard
> Truthspeak statements. Go forth and populate the
> newsgroups as revealed in the Good Book of the Church
> of St. Hiram. Strike down dissenters. All for the glory of
> your personal Honor.

Nothing was misquoted. Your posts were cited by Jim Miccolis exactly,
with headers, and in thier entirety.

Leonard H. Anderson is a pathological liar. Period

>It seems Very Important to the colonel to attempt intimidation
> of individuals who do not agree with him...whether licensed in
> amateur radio or not.

The only thing intimidating is that you were busted by your own
words...That has GOT to be HUMILIATING, but you seem to enjoy it.

>Amateur radio policy matters are well down on the list.
> What matters most is PCTA "personal honors" at stake,
> that their Truthspeak is true when it is not.

At least we have some honor, Lennie. You...well...You're just a liar. A
poor one at that.

Leonard H. Anderson is a pathological liar. Period

Steve Robeson, K4YZ

1379. Re: Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, FCC, Cronkite, ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-01 06:53:21 UTC
From: jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu
Message-ID: <b1fqt1$or8$1@news.hawaii.edu>
Source record: 60489
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Tom Sevart <n2uhcNOSPAM@yahoo.com> wrote:
>I have been interfered with by W1AW in the past. I was engaged in a
>legitimate QSO on the freq, not knowing it was a W1AW bulletin time/freq.

I remember a judge telling a young 15-year-old (me) that "...ignorance
of the law is no excuse..." (riding a motorcycle without a license...)

The times and frequencies of the ARRL bulletins are published and
publicly available. Ignorance of them is no excuse.

>It's not my responsibility to stay clear of the freqs they use, since I'm
>licensed to use them too.

It *is* your responsibility and if you continue your QSO during their
bulletin, *you're* the one in violation of intentional interference.

Their bulletins have been aired daily for over three-quarters of a
century; how long have you been on the air?

>So if I wanted to transmit a CW bulletin on several different bands whenever
>I want, I can go ahead and do it because it's "impractical" to check for
>people already using the frequencies?

The FCC regulations specify the exact procedures for doing just that.

73, Jeff KH6O

--
Operations Specialist Mathematics Lecturer
U.S. Coast Guard Kapiolani College
Dept. of Homeland Security University of Hawaii System

1380. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-01 07:46:30 UTC
From: jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu
Message-ID: <b1fu0mqja1@news.hawaii.edu>
Source record: 60490

Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> wrote:
> ARRL has been around since 1914.

But only as a division and "under the thumb" of the
Radio Club of Hartford. In January 1915 it gained
independence and became the organization that we
know of today. To be exact, on January 29, 1915,
the Connecticut Secretary of State recorded the
incorporation of the League.

> I think it is rather well-known that ARRL can't get as much as a
> whole quarter of US amateur licensees. Since it has never had
> a much greater fraction for 89 years that ought to demonstrate
> something.

In 1916, League members were the only one's permitted on the air
between the hours of 2100 and 0700 (in order to do trans-continental
relaying of traffic and not be bothered by local rag-chewers). That
shot League membership up to 4,000, about 40% of those licensed at
the time.

Jeff KH6O
--
Operations Specialist Mathematics Lecturer
U.S. Coast Guard Kapiolani College
Dept. of Homeland Security University of Hawaii System

1381. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-01 09:37:05 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030201043705.14527.00000044@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 60458

In article <%NG_9.2384$N5.1384836@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030129204547.27873.00000300@mb-mj.aol.com...
>> Well? If NCI's Executive Director can make a point of ARRL member numbers
>and
>> percentages, the same rules of discussion should apply to NCI member
>numbers
>> and percentages.
>
>NCI doesn't claim to be THE National Society for Amateur Radio ...
>we only claim to represent our members.

Who amount to less than 0.5% of US amateur radio. Yet NCI claims to know what
is best for amateur radio.

ARRL IS "the national society for amateur radio" - simply because there is no
other. Doesn't mean they represent all US hams. But when ARRL does something
that benefits US amateur radio, all US hams benefit.
>
>The fact that our comments and recommendations to the FCC were
>credible and that we were quite sucessful in "restructuring" really seems
>to irk you ...

I don't agree with some of FCC's decisions. Is that wrong? Must I agree with
YOUR vision of the future? That's what "...bring amateur radio into the 21st
century" is saying.

>if the ARRL's policies and recommendations had been more
>in line with the realities of today and the Commission's legitimate
>regulatory
>objectives, they might have gotten more traction ... ours were ... we got
>the traction ... live with it.

Sounds like the rooster taking credit for the dawn. If someone says what FCC
wants to hear, they're going to have a high success rate.

Note that FCC also reduced written testing, despite many suggestions on how to
improve it.

Fact is, FCC wants out of code testing for a number of reasons that have little
to do with the good of amateur radio. Examples:

- FCC doesn't want all the admin work of medical waivers.
- FCC doesn't want more petitions for or against code testing
- FCC thinks that if code testing is removed and written testing reduced,

people who formerly went to cb or freebanding will become hams, thereby reducing enforcement headaches.
- FCC thinks eliminating code testing will somehow cause hams to become "more technical", even though the dropping of the code test from the Tech a dozen years ago shows that doesn't happen.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1382. Re: Do You Think It's Time?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-01 11:56:35 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0302010356.29c131e1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60459

"RG" <nospam@nospam.com> wrote in message news:<b1fhtgrha1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>...
> Do you think it's time to drop LSB for the lower bands and switch to USB
> exclusively (like commercial/military) for all amateur bands?
>
> Surely, it was warranted for technical reasons 50 years ago to have
> selectable sidebands but now it's somewhat silly
>---and a technically
> backward practice.

To what avail? What benefits would accrue the service, the hobby or
Joe Ham if we all went to USB?? The commercials and military don't
have the LSB/USB option, we do. Strikes me that they're the
technically backward in this game.

>
> RG

w3rv

1383. Re: Out Of The Box?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-01 12:17:10 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302010417.5f34288b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60460

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030131152455.03820.00000304@mb-fr.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0301301951.11b4988b@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
> >news:<d22b54c3.0301301554.3a534333@posting.google.com>...
> >
> >> I agree. Those of us who get involved in the scratchings of the gas
> >> bags apparently either have too much time on our hands
> >
> >Boink
> >
> > or we have a
> >> problem with priority-setting.
> >
> >Boink
> >
> >> Which needs fixing.
> >
> >Boink
> >
> > I suggest that we
> >> stick to ham radio and let The Pointless Duo babble at each other.
> >
> >RV, did I do good on the "Boinks?" I'm still not sure how they're used.
> >
> >And good luck sticking to ham radio.
>
> Kellie can't. Like all severely-injured-in-the-ego PCTAs, he
> has, like the colonel and the reverend and Putzieboy in TN,
> got to keep on, keep on, keep on their attacks on NCTAs
> who have caused them to lose their Face.
>
> They alone are "defending the 'honor and virtue' of ham
> radio because They ARE ham radio. [they are only
> defending themselves but have to rationalize it somehow]
>
> You can imagine how that trio (and pet misery mule) would
> fare in a community meeting over, say, antenna erection
> with their non-ham community people NOT agreeing with
> them. They would LOSE IT big time and thereby do a
> negative for ham radio after they stopped sputtering, name-
> calling, and general self-propelled-self-promotions. :-)

>
>
> <signature here, verified by homeland security dept.>

It was particularly satisfying seeing Jims message about VE exams not being monitored. Where have we heard that before?

And then Dave had to go back into the annals of amateur history to "prove" that a ttfd MUST be tilted, regardless of what Cebik and the manufacturer says.

And Steve says they don't cling to the past.

1384. Re: Do You Think It's Time?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-01 12:20:18 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302010420.5d7d445a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60461

"RG" <nospam@nospam.com> wrote in message news:<b1fhtgrha1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>...
> Do you think it's time to drop LSB for the lower bands and switch to USB
> exclusively (like commercial/military) for all amateur bands?
>
> Surely, it was warranted for technical reasons 50 years ago to have
> selectable sidebands but now it's somewhat silly---and a technically
> backward practice.
>
> RG

It shouldn't affect the CW Stonewall crowd, so I don't see why not.

1385. Re: Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, FCC, Cronkite, ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-01 12:47:49 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302010447.713a2cf1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60462

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message news:<20030131065026.25403.00000063@mb-fm.aol.com>...
> In article <L0h_9.127667$ui1.2464306@news1.east.cox.net>, "Paul Vanasse"
> <pvanasse@cox.net> writes:
>
> >> W1AW is the station of the ARRL, which is the sole effective
> >> representative of amateur radio to Congress, the FCC, and other
> >> governing entities.
> >
> >The ARRL doesnt speak for all amateurs. That's the problem here. They
> >actually think they do.
>
> ARRL speaks for their membership. FCC knows this, and how big that membership
> is. The ARRL staff/directors don;t think they speak for all hams, or even all
> US hams.
>
> However, when ARRL does something that benefits ham radio, all hams benefit.

Could the converse be true?

"...when ARRL does something that stifles ham radio..."

1386. Re: Do You Think It's Time?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-01 12:49:33 UTC
From: David Robbins <k1ttt@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <nNudnTArZPDKX6ajXTWc3w@crocker.com>
Source record: 60463

"RG" <nospam@nospam.com> wrote in message
news:b1fhtgrha1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
> Do you think it's time to drop LSB for the lower bands and switch to USB
> exclusively (like commercial/military) for all amateur bands?
>
> Surely, it was warranted for technical reasons 50 years ago to have
> selectable sidebands but now it's somewhat silly---and a technically
> backward practice.
>
> RG
>
its been a few years, but i do believe that the radios i had in my radio room when i was in the navy had lsb on them. cb's have both usb and lsb and they use them interchangeably, for those cb'ers that use the 40 assigned channels using both sides can essentially double the number of channels as you can use usb and lsb on the same channel and not interfere with each other (much).

as far as 50 years ago, the original reason for lsb on the 'lower' bands and usb on the 'upper' bands was not 'selectability' but lack thereof. it was easier to build a radio with an IF in the 10mhz range and only use one filter... the result was that you heard a different sideband when mixing up to 10mhz than mixing down to 10mhz... adding selectability is a more advanced feature and adds flexibility to our operations. using even more advanced dsp techniques it is even easier to generate all the various modes with only a change in software.. it would be a technical step backwards to remove the capability to generate and receive lsb. to paraphrase the gun lobby... make lsb criminal and only criminals will have lsb. you would serve us all better if we could get quicker access to high tech hopping equipment so we can figure out who some of these hopping intruders are rather than trying to remove capabilities that are perfectly good the way they are.

for us hams i would think that mixing sidebands on a band is not so good, so a convention for each band is a good idea... and since we already have one that everyone already knows and there is no good technical reason to change it, its probably best to leave it alone... after all in a few years digital voice will replace it all and the current sideband allocations will become an ancient artifact anyway.

1387. Re: Do You Think It's Time?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-01 14:13:23 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <7CQ_9.864$4y4.544523@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 60464

"RG" <nospam@nospam.com> wrote in message
news:b1fhtgrha1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
> Do you think it's time to drop LSB for the lower bands and switch to USB
> exclusively (like commercial/military) for all amateur bands?
>
> Surely, it was warranted for technical reasons 50 years ago to have
> selectable sidebands but now it's somewhat silly---and a technically
> backward practice.
>
> RG

Well there's no requirement that we continue with this practice but it would be difficult to change longstanding habits and customs.

I think the radios should to have this choice available though even if people were to switch.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

1388. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-01 14:27:40 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <wPQ_9.2440$N5.1446067@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 60465

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030201043705.14527.00000044@mb-cc.aol.com...
> In article <%NG_9.2384$N5.1384836@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> ARRL IS "the national society for amateur radio" - simply because there is
no
> other.

If they said "A National Society ..." I wouldn't have a gripe ... it's the arrogance of attempting to project that they are "the only game in town" in terms of a voice for (all is clearly implied) hams that gripes me.

> Doesn't mean they represent all US hams.

They sure bend over backwards to imply it ...

> But when ARRL does something
> that benefits US amateur radio, all US hams benefit.

I agree ... and when they do, I acknowledge it and complement them for it ... when I think they're screwing up, I say that, too ...

Note that NCI has gone beyond its normal topic on a couple of occasions (like the ARRL's Petition for Reconsideration on extending PRB-1) and filed comments wholly endorsing and supporting ARRL's position ... because it was "the right thing to do" ... and having done that, we got flamed big-time here for having done so ...

I/we are not "anti-ARRL" ... we simply oppose some of their policies that we think are bad for ham radio (with the focus, of course, on the Morse test issue).

> >The fact that our comments and recommendations to the FCC were
> >credible and that we were quite sucessful in "restructuring" really seems
> >to irk you ...
>
> I don't agree with some of FCC's decisions. Is that wrong?

Of course not ... you have every right to your opinion. However, there are people who, what? 50 years later, are still pissing and moaning about when Generals lost some privs when the extra class was created and every couple of years someone seems to file a petition with the FCC asking that they (however few of them are left who haven't upgraded) be "grandfathered."

The FCC has consistently said "No."

The FCC said "No" on more than 3 classes of license and more than the
5 wpm code test that they judged necessary to remain in compliance with
the ITU Radio Regulations ... several people petitioned for reconsideration
and were denied. What part of "No." don't you people understand? And
are you going to grouse about "restructuring" for the next 50 years? If so,
I can always put you in my "kill file" ... but I'd rather NOT do that
because
when you're not grousing or looking for ways to attack NCI, you often
have some intelligent, worthwhile things to say.

73,
Carl - wk3c

1389. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-01 14:37:36 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <QYQ_9.2443$N5.1448485@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 60466

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030131224346.12173.00000308@mb-mr.aol.com...
> No? When an organization petitions the government to change laws and
rules,
> it's "not really my business" to know how big that organization is?
> Particularly when that organization claims to know what is best for all of
> amateur radio, including me?

Any individual has the right to petition the FCC for changes in the rules.
A lot do ... many of them are stupid ideas and the FCC rejects them,
either out of hand, or based on opposition in filed comments.
So "How many members do you have?" is not a determining factor
in whether a petition/comments/or other filing "gets traction" ... at the
end of the day, it's "Does this make sense? Is it within the Commission's
authority and policy objectives? etc." Once again, making FCC rules
is NOT a "popularity contest" ... it's a fact/logic/public interest-based
process.

As a closing note on the subject of the precise size of NCI's membership.
1) I have no intention of telling you
2) It grows almost daily, certainly monthly
3) The size is, as I have stated above, irrelevant, it's the quality of its
policies
and arguments before regulators that counts.

73,
Carl - wk3c

1390. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-01 15:36:47 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030201103647.29016.00000066@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 60468

In article <3E375A24.5030108@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

>Brian wrote:
>
>> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<c2356669.0301270942.1cbde93d@posting.google.com>...
>>
>>
>>>But since the WBFD is at least the size of a G5RV or trap dipole, and
>>>costs at least as much as a conventional dipole plus a tuner, it is a
>>>mystery why any ham would use a WBFD.
>>>
>>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>> Jim, mystery solved. Imagine an amateur that is also a MARS or CAP
>> affiliate, or a maritime station.

>> Imagine the convenience of one
>> antenna for all or nearly all amateur bands, MARS frequency
>> assignments, and maritime frequencies.
>
> I got one too! It's a general dipole with a tuner.

Efficiency much better than the WBFD, simpler and lighter. Much more bang for
the buck.

> Not as convenient.

Takes some smarts to work the tuner.

>I
>take about ten seconds to change the tuner when I change bands.

Been there, done that. Made up a card with tuner settings one day when the
bands were quiet so I didn't have to find the settings from scratch each time.
Quick 'n' easy - but it takes a tiny bit of skill.

>I don't
>understand why anyone would use one either. But some do.
>
Lack of experience, lack of knowledge and lack of skill are three reasons.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1391. Re: Do You Think It's Time?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-01 15:36:48 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030201103648.29016.00000067@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 60467

In article <nNudnTArZPDKX6ajXTWc3w@crocker.com>, "David Robbins"
<k1ttt@arrl.net> writes:

>as far as 50 years ago, the original reason for lsb on the 'lower' bands and
>usb on the 'upper' bands was not 'selectability' but lack thereof. it was
>easier to build a radio with an IF in the 10mhz range and only use one
>filter... the result was that you heard a different sideband when mixing up
>to 10mhz than mixing down to 10mhz...

Except that it doesn't work out that way.

It's true that if you use a 9 MHz filter or phasing-type SSB generator and a
5-5.5 MHz VFO, you can cover both the 80/75 and 20 meter bands by using either
the subtractive or additive mix. (9-5=4, 9+5=14). A very convenient and
inexpensive way to cover the two most-popular HF phone bands with a single
mixer and VFO range.

But the sidebands are not inverted by that mixing combination. For sideband
inversion to occur, the heterodyne oscillator must be higher in frequency than
both the input and output frequencies.

The old SSB rigs that used this mixing scheme had sideband select switches.
Many of them were phasing type, and sideband selection was a matter of a phase
reversal in one of the audio channels.

If you use a 5.25 MHz filter or phasing-type SSB generator and an 8.75-9.25 MHz
VFO, you can cover both the 80/75 and 20 meter bands by using either the
subtractive or additive mix, and the sideband will invert on 80/75 meters. A
few rigs used this method (National NCX-3 and 200, most Swans) but they didn't
appear until long after the amateur USB/LSB convention was well established.

>adding selectability is a more
>advanced feature and adds flexibility to our operations.

Agreed! The added complexity is minimal.

>for us hams i would think that mixing sidebands on a band is not so good, so
>a convention for each band is a good idea... and since we already have one
>that everyone already knows and there is no good technical reason to change
>it, its probably best to leave it alone... after all in a few years digital
>voice will replace it all and the current sideband allocations will become
>an ancient artifact anyway.
>
Makes a lot of sense.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1392. Re: Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, FCC, Cronkite, ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-01 15:42:42 UTC
From: drakeswl@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <c0588492.0302010742.48c5ec1d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60469
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

This has turned into a pretty interesting thread. After doing a lot of reading, it looks like the majority of folks on this NG don't like K1MAN, but some people like W1AW, and think W1AW's bulletin service is worth preserving. So how would the FCC prosecute K1MAN while leaving W1AW intact?

Regarding 97.111(b)(6).

The FCC didn't give "anyone" the "right" to "broadcast."

Licensees (not anyone) are accorded the privilege (not a right) to use the amateur bands by the administrative body (FCC) pursuant to obtaining a license and following the rules set down by the FCC. One of the privileges licensees may avail themselves of, is the dissemination of certain types of bulletins (which are specifically NOT broadcasts).

When W1AW and K1MAN begin their bulletins on top of other licensees using the frequency, is that legal? In Riley Hollingsworth's opinion, no. "No station has exclusive use of any frequency." See his January '02 letter to Glenn Baxter.

Do I think W1AW and K1MAN should be prosecuted for that apparent rules violation? No I don't. W1AW has a long history of helping hams learn code. It's a real service to the community. Most hams move when W1AW fires up over top of them, probably in deference to tradition, and in recognition of W1AW's long service. So, I'd like to see the FCC look the other way on that issue.

The FCC should not pursue a broadcasting complaint either, because that shotgun would hit RAIN and ARnewsline, and other programs that sound like broadcasts. I like RAIN. ARnewsline has some interesting stuff once in awhile. Therefore, I'd like to see the FCC look the other way on the alleged broadcasting violation too.

The FCC should really just clean up the language in Part 97. That would prevent future problems like this from popping up again. However, if the FCC wants to prosecute K1MAN, they should go after some OTHER infraction(s). The question remains; if the FCC prosecuted K1MAN, what violation(s) should they target, assuming they'd like to remove the chaff, while preserving the wheat?

-PJ

1393. Re: Shuttle, Saddam (standby all shortwave KOOKS!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-01 16:11:43 UTC
From: David C <blooghooge@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3e3bf20b@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 60470
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

"Burr" <pitzpho@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3E3BF09E.10700@earthlink.net...
> Maybe Saddam shot or prayed it down to get the Jew!!!
>

CAN YOU IMAGINE THE HAY THAT SHORTWAVE
RADIO BULL SHIT ARTISTS LIKE ALEX JONES AND
JOYCE REILY AND JAMES LLOYD ARE GOING TO MAKE
FROM ALL OF THIS.....??????????????????

I CAN SEE ALEX "HORSESHIT" JONES COMMING OUT
WITH TWO NEW VIDEOTAPES LINKING THIS TO
BOHEMIAN GROVE OR SOMETHING ELSE KOOKY
AND ARCANE.......BOY IS SHORTWAVE GONNA BE HOT
TONITE...!!!

(don't forget the Liberty Net on 3.947 tonite also - should be real fun
tonite too!)

1394. Re: Shuttle, Saddam (standby all shortwave KOOKS!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-01 16:34:15 UTC
From: Burr <pitzpho@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E3BF6FF.9010508@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60471
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

I hate to think what is going to be said as fact.

Looks like the part that feel off at takeoff and hit the wing did something.

Home Ridgecrest:
W117.4157
N35.3582
LongWire

Burr

1395. Re: Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, FCC, Cronkite, ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-01 16:44:49 UTC
From: David Robbins <k1ttt@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <HKCcnUtCLZ7hZKajXTWcpQ@crocker.com>
Source record: 60472
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Paul" <drakeswl@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:c0588492.0302010742.48c5ec1d@posting.google.com...
> This has turned into a pretty interesting thread. After doing a lot of
> reading, it looks like the majority of folks on this NG don't like
> K1MAN, but some people like W1AW, and think W1AW's bulletin service is
> worth preserving. So how would the FCC prosecute K1MAN while leaving
> W1AW intact?
>
>
> Regarding 97.111(b)(6).
>
> The FCC didn't give "anyone" the "right" to "broadcast."
>

true, in fact they specifically prohibit 'broadcasting' in 97.113(b).
97.111(b)(6) specifically allows the transmission of 'information
bulletins'. you must go back to 97.3 to understand the definitions of
'broadcasting' and 'information bulletins'. so on this matter the only
quetion is if k1man's transmission is 'of direct interest to the amateur
service'. this part is of course open to much discussion, some of k1man's
stuff obviously is of direct interest and so is probably ok. but some of
the stuff he does like editorializing against the fcc and other individuals
could arguably be catagorized as being of interest only to individuals and
not the 'amateur service' as a whole... but that is probably such a gray
area that he could tie up the fcc in court for a long time.

on the automatic startup... i seem to remember there was an fcc ruling or
opinion many years ago about bulletin stations starting up on top of
existing qso's. as i remember it the statement essentially allowed the
stations to start up without notice as long as it was a well published
schedule. this makes sense for well published and frequent operations like
w1aw, especially when they occur on multiple bands at the same time....
should it extend to k1man? probably, he has been doing it for a while, and
i assume he has a published schedule somewhere even if i have never seen it.

the one point where the fcc would seem to have a case against k1man is the
purely technical one of station control. according to published reports
they paid a visit to his station while a bulletin was being transmitted and
could not find a control op. this is an obvious violation of station
control rules. that the transmissions are not monitored all the time is
also obvious to listeners at times when the tape breaks or something else
happens and you get dead air, i haven't heard this recently but in the past
this seemed to happen fairly frequently. on this point there can also be no
backlash against w1aw as they have the paid operator there to run the

station.

1396. Re: Shuttle, Saddam (standby all shortwave KOOKS!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-01 17:12:38 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <aeT_9.2455$N5.1464280@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 60474
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

I don't see how anyone with any sense of humanity could
find ANYTHING connnected to this tragedy "funny" in any
manner whatsoever ...

Carl - wk3c

"David C" <blooghooge@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:3e3bf20b@snipnews.snip.net...
>
> "Burr" <pitzpho@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3E3BF09E.10700@earthlink.net...
> > Maybe Saddam shot or prayed it down to get the Jew!!!
> >
>
> CAN YOU IMAGINE THE HAY THAT SHORTWAVE
> RADIO BULL SHIT ARTISTS LIKE ALEX JONES AND
> JOYCE REILY AND JAMES LLOYD ARE GOING TO MAKE
> FROM ALL OF THIS.....??????????????????
>
> I CAN SEE ALEX "HORSESHIT" JONES COMMING OUT
> WITH TWO NEW VIDEOTAPES LINKING THIS TO
> BOHEMIAN GROVE OR SOMETHING ELSE KOOKY
> AND ARCANE.......BOY IS SHORTWAVE GONNA BE HOT
> TONITE...!!!
>
> (don't forget the Liberty Net on 3.947 tonite also - should be real fun
> tonite too!)
>
>

1397. Re: More Of How KB1HMW "Supports" Amateur Radio...NOT!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-01 17:12:49 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030201121249.01669.00000190@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 60473

From K4YZ:
>>True, most Hams are fat. The really obese tend to stand out. This is just
>more
>>confirmation of that.
>
> "MOST" is indicative of a majority. From what assessment do you obtain
>this information in order to draw to this conclusion?

Most implies greater than 50%. Most is incorrect. What I meant is a high percentage of Hams are fat. Also, it is a greater percentage than the general population. I drew this conclusion from seeing Hams at a few clubs and at Hamfests. Also, a survey supports this conclusion.

> I guess we don't know WHY this person is obese, eh? Are we to jsut
>automatically assume that he's just a glutton, or was there some mitigating
>physiological reason? Or was it just a chance for you to make another abusive
>comment on Amateur Radio, Vipul?

There is a high percentage of overweight people in Ham radio. Therefore there must be some behavioral reason. Perhaps lack of physical activity due to amateur radio aspects such as contesting or Worked All States.

>>Yes, invite a non-Ham to a club meeting or a Hamfest. There one can see the
>>typical Ham. The non-Ham will see that Hams are weird.
>
> Yeah...real wierd. So wierd they choose to not hang out with so cool a
>dude like Vipul the Virtuous...?!?! Geeze that IS wierd...

It's not just me, there are many others that believe Hams are weird.

>>"Herb" <Herbie@KingOftheJammers.net> wrote
>>> View the assortment of ex-cons, wife beaters, alcoholics, druggies,
>>> nut cases, slobs, fruits, and societal misfits who make up the crowd that
>>> attends hamfests and ham club meetings today.
>
>>Hams are mostly good people. Most of this stuff isn't true. Societal misfits
>>seems to hold true.
>
> Not from what you posted up above, Vipul ! ! ! You have a bit of that
>Lenniesque two-faced thing going on...

No, I said that Hams are not: ex-cons, wife beaters, alcoholics, druggies, nut cases, slobs, fruits. But, many are societal (or social) misfits.

>>Obsessed, cult like.
>
> You are really sick, Vipul. What's with you and obsessions of

>"cults"..?!?!

Pointing it out does not make me one. The Ham radio hobby is very much like a cult. The word "Ham", the use of strange Q codewords, hatred of CBers, Morse code sub cult.*

> "Typical Ham"....Hmmmmmmmmm...Let's see...housewives, college
>students...members of the Armed Forces...engineers (except Lennie)...gas
>station attendants...insurance salesmen...high school kids...members of
>government...heads-of-state...music stars...Vipul Shaw, KB1HMW...
>
> yep...REALLY WIERD!

True, these are the typical Hams. Seems like a normal group. But, when they get together in cult-like activities, then it becomes weird.

VS

---
*The more extreme cult-ers are in: the Wouff Hong sub-sub cult. Its a sub-sub cult because its a sub cult of the Morse code sub cult. Not all Morse coders are Morse code cult-ists, but it is hard to tell the difference. Also the (HT/old radio/morse-code keyers) fetishists, sorry I mean collectors. Please note that these are extreme cases and are NOT typical.

1398. Re: Shuttle, Saddam (standby all shortwave KOOKS!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-01 17:20:09 UTC
From: di540@FreeNet.Carleton.CA
Message-ID: <b1gvk9tb1@freenet9.carleton.ca>
Source record: 60475
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"David C" (blooghooge@yahoo.com) writes:
> "Burr" <pitzpho@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>> Maybe Saddam shot or prayed it down to get the Jew!!!

1st of all, he is not religious at all, which is why Al-Qaida hates him, and would like to see him dead, since Iraq is the most westernised country in the Arab world. 2nd, Saddam gives Jews & Christians more tolerance than in any other Arab country. But Zionists, esp. those who claim to be Christians but are not, he hates, esp. Bubya. Even the National Council of Churches condemns Bubya for being a Christian hypocrite, and the message is delivered by Bishop Talvert from Bubya's own denomination in the Methodist church. Tune into KTBN or WWCR, and you'll probably hear those spots.

> CAN YOU IMAGINE THE HAY THAT SHORTWAVE
> RADIO BULL SHIT ARTISTS LIKE ALEX JONES AND
> JOYCE REILY AND JAMES LLOYD ARE GOING TO MAKE
> FROM ALL OF THIS.....??????????????????

Gov't trained kooks are bad enough. On VOR there was a report read from Pravda that a UFO was spotted over Iraq during the last Gulf War, and had to make a forced landing. They speculate that Saddam has alien weapons. No doubt the NASA-trained kook Dr Richard Hoaxland will be on Coast to Coast 1st thing next week to flog an even bigger magic bullet theory.

> I CAN SEE ALEX "HORSESHIT" JONES COMMING OUT
> WITH TWO NEW VIDEOTAPES LINKING THIS TO
> BOHEMIAN GROVE OR SOMETHING ELSE KOOKY
> AND ARCANE.......

As usual, the people who scream the most have the least intelligent things to say. Why don't you put up some big bucks to match your big mouth and make bets that he'll produce even one such tape?

1399. Re: Shuttle, Saddam (standby all shortwave KOOKS!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-01 17:26:18 UTC
From: Walter Treftz <penguino@atlantic.net>
Message-ID: <3E3C0338.3DFE7CA8@atlantic.net>
Source record: 60476
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

What time is the Liberty Net????????
N4GL --- penguino@xxx.net (change the x's to "atlantic")

David C wrote:

> "Burr" <pitzpho@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3E3BF09E.10700@earthlink.net...
> > Maybe Saddam shot or prayed it down to get the Jew!!!
> >
>
> CAN YOU IMAGINE THE HAY THAT SHORTWAVE
> RADIO BULL SHIT ARTISTS LIKE ALEX JONES AND
> JOYCE REILY AND JAMES LLOYD ARE GOING TO MAKE
> FROM ALL OF THIS.....??????????????????
>
> I CAN SEE ALEX "HORSESHIT" JONES COMMING OUT
> WITH TWO NEW VIDEOTAPES LINKING THIS TO
> BOHEMIAN GROVE OR SOMETHING ELSE KOOKY
> AND ARCANE.......BOY IS SHORTWAVE GONNA BE HOT
> TONITE...!!!
>
> (don't forget the Liberty Net on 3.947 tonite also - should be real fun
> tonite too!)

1400. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-01 17:36:57 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030201123657.05048.00000382@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 60477

In article <wPQ_9.2440$N5.1446067@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> ARRL IS "the national society for amateur radio" - simply because there is
>no
>> other.
>
>If they said "A National Society ..." I wouldn't have a gripe ... it's the
>arrogance of attempting to project that they are "the only game in town"
>in terms of a voice for (all is clearly implied) hams that gripes me.

You are inferring what is not implied. If there were more than one national
society for amateur radio in the USA, then I'd agree with you about the phrase
being misleading. But there is no other "national society for amateur radio".
So ARRL's description of itself is accurate.

I give FCC credit for being intelligent enough to know that the ARRL does not
speak for all hams.
>
>> Doesn't mean they represent all US hams.
>
>They sure bend over backwards to imply it ...
>
I don't see that at all. You infer what is not implied.

>> But when ARRL does something
>> that benefits US amateur radio, all US hams benefit.
>
>I agree ... and when they do, I acknowledge it and complement them for
>it ... when I think they're screwing up, I say that, too ...

So do I. But the point I was making is that ALL hams benefit, even if ALL hams
aren't ARRL members.

Here's an example: Remember ARRL/W1RFI's work with the wireless Part 15 devices
that were chewing up the 80 meter band? That effort eliminated a big source of
harmful interference to some hams on an important HF band. Perhaps more
important, it set a precedent that Part 15 devices could cause harmful
interference to hams, and that such interference must be dealt with by the Part
15 folks - including the manufacturers. Win-win all around, even for hams who
don;t use 80, because next time a mfr. will pick a different band.

Sure, the mfrs, should know better than to put a Part 15 device in a ham band.
But they don't know better, as that example proves.

Now, who is it that goes to bat for Amateur Radio in a case like this? It's not W5YI Group, K1MAN, Worldradio, or even NCI. It's ARRL staffers, paid for by the membership and publication sales. .
>
>Note that NCI has gone beyond its normal topic on a couple of
>occasions (like the ARRL's Petition for Reconsideration on extending
>PRB-1) and filed comments wholly endorsing and supporting ARRL's
>position ... because it was "the right thing to do" ... and having done
>that, we got flamed big-time here for having done so ...

Hold on a sec - I don't recall any "flaming" on that issue.

What I DO recall is a petition to reserve a tiny slice (300 kHz, I think) of some VHF/UHF bands for narrow band modes. The idea was that these segements would be used for CW, SSB, FSK, PSK, etc., not AM or FM. I thought it was a very good idea even though it would have eliminated the only CW-only segments in the ham bands.

Despite the poor choice of name, "No-Code International" was founded as a one-issue organization whose one-and-only purpose was the total elimination of all mandatory code testing for any class of amateur radio license. And at the time of the above petition, NCI was still presenting itself that way. So when NCI came out against the above petition, some of us rightfully criticized NCI for its involvement in an issue that has NOTHING whatsoever to do with code testing. As I recall, the rallying cry was "no setasides for legacy modes" or some such.

The criticism was justified because NCI was getting into areas that are otuside its stated purpose and objectives.
>
>I/we are not "anti-ARRL" ... we simply oppose some of their policies
>that we think are bad for ham radio (with the focus, of course, on the
>Morse test issue).

But NCI's sole stated purpose is the elimination of code testing - nothing else. In fact, Bruce Perens has stated that his intent is/was for NCI to vanish when that goal is accomplished. Which will probably be very soon.
>
>> >The fact that our comments and recommendations to the FCC were
>> >credible and that we were quite sucessful in "restructuring" really seems
>> >to irk you ...
>>
>> I don't agree with some of FCC's decisions. Is that wrong?
>
>Of course not ... you have every right to your opinion.

Gee, thanks...;-)

>However, there
>are people who, what? 50 years later, are still pissing and moaning about
>when Generals lost some privs when the extra class was created

Whoa there! If you're gonna discuss policy, at least get the facts right!

The modern Amateur Extra class license was created as part of the 1951 restructuring, along with the Novice and Technician. The rest of the license classes were renamed. Although that restructuring was the result of years of debate and planning, in late 1952 FCC suddenly changed its mind and gave all operating privs to all hams except Novices and Techs.

Generals/conditionals and Advanceds lost some privs in 1968 and again in 1969 (35 years ago) as part of the "incentive licensing" changes.

If you think the code test debate is something, you shoulda been around back in the '60s. Ten proposals with RM numbers, 6000+ comments received by FCC, lotta bad feelings. Restructuring 2000 was nothing by comaprison.

>and
>every couple of years someone seems to file a petition with the FCC asking
>that they (however few of them are left who haven't upgraded) be
>"grandfathered."

I know of only one or two such petitions in the past 35 years. Can you name the others?
>
>The FCC has consistently said "No."

How many times? How many petitions?
>
>The FCC said "No" on more than 3 classes of license

Hold on!

The NPRM issued by FCC said 4 classes of license. It laid out specifics for the written tests for those licenses, but not for code tests for those licenses. The R&O was very different than the NPRM. If 3 classes of license was a good idea, why didn't the NPRM say so?

> and more than the
>5 wpm code test that they judged necessary to remain in compliance with
>the ITU Radio Regulations ...

Yup. Eliminated all those medical waiver headaches and simplified the admin work.

>several people petitioned for reconsideration
>and were denied.

Is that wrong? Are citizens supposed to take whatever FCC puts out and say "thank you sir" while tugging their forelocks and bowing?

Suppose - just suppose - FCC had done it my way and had gone to four classes of license with code test speeds of 0/5/12/20 wpm. Would NCI have taken that response as a "no" and walked away with no petition for reconsideration? I doubt it very much.

> What part of "No." don't you people understand?

Who is "you people"? Us dirty unwashed masses of hams who use Morse code? ;-)

>And
>are you going to grouse about "restructuring" for the next 50 years?

Not me. But isn't it the right of all Americans to complain about their government and petition for changes? Or is that right reserved only for those who agree with NCI's opinions?

>If so,
>I can always put you in my "kill file" ... but I'd rather NOT do that
>because
>when you're not grousing or looking for ways to attack NCI,

Is criticism of NCI forbidden? Seems to me the same rules that apply to ARRL criticism should apply to NCI criticism.

>you often
>have some intelligent, worthwhile things to say.

Thanks - same to you!

73 de Jim, N2EY

1401. Re: Shuttle, Saddam (standby all shortwave KOOKS!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-01 17:58:09 UTC
From: David C <blooghooge@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3e3c0b36@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 60478
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

"Walter Treftz" <penguino@atlantic.net> wrote in message
news:3E3C0338.3DFE7CA8@atlantic.net...
> What time is the Liberty Net????????
> N4GL --- penguino@xxx.net (change the x's to "atlantic")
>

10:00 PM Eastern Time
Saturday Night on or about
3.947 mHz LSB (could be anywhere
between 3.940 and 3.960 as they
have had to "hunt" fer a freq as of late)

1402. Re: Shuttle, Saddam (standby all shortwave KOOKS!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-01 18:22:56 UTC
From: David C <blooghooge@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3e3c11e8@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 60479
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

Your right Carl.
There is an awful lot of sickness out there!
It makes me wanna PUKE

Just check out:

"SPACE SHUTTLE COLUMBIA DEBRIS" on E-Bay now!

http://cgi.ebay.com/ws/eBayISAPI.dll?ViewItem&item=2909705555&category=1468

Plus other "valuable Columbia collectables" now being huckstered like:

http://cgi.ebay.com/ws/eBayISAPI.dll?ViewItem&item=3205182333&category=13904

http://cgi.ebay.com/ws/eBayISAPI.dll?ViewItem&item=2156914118&category=4150

http://cgi.ebay.com/ws/eBayISAPI.dll?ViewItem&item=3112168639&category=19184

HURRY and get those bids IN before prices go up!

(not to mention that carnival sideshow now takeing place as
I type this on 14.275 with Baxter grandstanding as usual.....)

And you can be sure that all the
kooks on WWCR, WWRB, WHRI
will make more of this than you can believe.
(....their already doin it FREAKIN BIG TIME with the conspiracy fun
in alt.fan.art-bell like you cannot imagine - sit back, watch em spin and
roll Carl! it's the greatest show on earth - not only on 14.275 Ho-Ho!)

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:aeT_9.2455$N5.1464280@nnrp1.ptd.net...
> I don't see how anyone with any sense of humanity could
> find ANYTHING connnected to this tragedy "funny" in any
> manner whatsoever ...
>
> Carl - wk3c
>
> "David C" <blooghooge@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:3e3bf20b@snipnews.snip.net...
> >
> > "Burr" <pitzpho@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3E3BF09E.10700@earthlink.net...
> > > Maybe Saddam shot or prayed it down to get the Jew!!!
> > >
> >
> > CAN YOU IMAGINE THE HAY THAT SHORTWAVE

> > RADIO BULL SHIT ARTISTS LIKE ALEX JONES AND
> > JOYCE REILY AND JAMES LLOYD ARE GOING TO MAKE
> > FROM ALL OF THIS.....??????????????????
> >
> > I CAN SEE ALEX "HORSESHIT" JONES COMMING OUT
> > WITH TWO NEW VIDEOTAPES LINKING THIS TO
> > BOHEMIAN GROVE OR SOMETHING ELSE KOOKY
> > AND ARCANE.......BOY IS SHORTWAVE GONNA BE HOT
> > TONITE...!!!
> >
> > (don't forget the Liberty Net on 3.947 tonite also - should be real fun
> > tonite too!)
> >
> >
>

1403. Re: Shuttle, Saddam (standby all shortwave KOOKS!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-01 18:30:34 UTC
From: Roland Stiner <nk2u@1stconnect.com>
Message-ID: <AfU_9.6776$yU6.2794@fe01>
Source record: 60480
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

> I don't see how anyone with any sense of humanity could
> find ANYTHING connected to this tragedy "funny" in any
> manner whatsoever ...

I can see all Muslims all around the world rejoicing over this-very sad.

Roland

1404. Re: Shuttle Lost, Paranoid Shortwave hosts surely to be foaming at the mouth.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-01 18:49:17 UTC
From: shortwave woowoo <greenfields@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3e3c16fb@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 60481
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

<Him Again@anonymous.com (Sew Lil a Kwe)> wrote in message
news:v3o4cu7s8dam66@corp.supernews.com...

> This Shuttle was destroyed over the State of Texas, George Bush's home
state.
>
> In summary, I would be interested in hearing from others about the
paranoid
> reactions that we will hear from Alex Jones et al,
>
> Alex will make the points as follows.
> 1. The first Israeli Astronaut.
> 2. The presence of an Indian Woman (PhD), a country that we are currently
> courting favor with in our "war" against Iraq, and the possibility of
> incensing this country into a high degree of cooperation if they feel that
> Iraq was somehow involved.
> 3. The coincidence in time (the Jan 28 versus Feb 01) and of the memorial.
> 4. The coincidence of the crash area (over Texas, Bush's own)
> 5. He will probably play the New World Order angle, suggesting that
"elements"
> in the U.S. government arranged for this to promote the Iraq war.

Wanna see something VERY curious...?

Go to www.ebay.com and do an Item Search
on the words "space shuttle Columbia"

In just the past hour not less than 100 auctions for
Columbia memoribilia have gone up...

I ain't seen anything like in since Dale Earnhardt
crashed and every redneck in the Southeastrn USA
suddenly put up every bit of Earnhardt Memorbilia they had
in their tacky collections for immediate auction.....

Glub bless human psychology and capatalism eh?

Be sure to check ont 14.275 also! there's a radio
war going on *right now as I type this* btwn k1man's
coverage of the 'Columbia disaster' and the usual
bunch of refugees from the old 14.313 and 75 Meter
wars -

1405. Shortwave KOOKS comment on Shuttle 12.160

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-01 19:21:39 UTC
From: shortwave woowoo <greenfields@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3e3c1e8f@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 60482
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

<Him Again@anonymous.com (Sew Lil a Kwe)> wrote in message
news:v3o4cu7s8dam66@corp.supernews.com...

FLASH!!!!!!!

ALEX JONES AND JOHN STADTMELLER - TWO VETERAN SHORTWAVE
KOOKS COMMENTING ON COLUMBIA LOSS AS ALL BEING PART
OF A MASSIVE CONSPIRACY TO BOOST BUSH'S RATINGS INTHE
POLLS AS A PRELUDE TO THE IRAQ WAR !

BROADCASTING LIVE RIGHT NOW ON 12.160 TOOOON IN TO
THESE TWO FUC-ING SCREWBALLS ON A PSYCHOTIC RANT !!

***** I AM NOT KIDDING YOU FOLKS********

THESE TWO GOLD PLATED SHORTWAVE KOOKS JUST SAYING THIS
RIGHT NOW ON 12.160 MHZ AS I AM TYPING THIS !

HW FUC-ING PREDICTABLE!!!!!

SEND IN THE PAY-TRIOT KOOKS!!!!!

> This Shuttle was destroyed over the State of Texas, George Bush's home
state.
>
> In summary, I would be interested in hearing from others about the
paranoid
> reactions that we will hear from Alex Jones et al,
>
> Alex will make the points as follows.
> 1. The first Israeli Astronaut.
> 2. The presence of an Indian Woman (PhD), a country that we are currently
> courting favor with in our "war" against Iraq, and the possibility of
> incensing this country into a high degree of cooperation if they feel that
> Iraq was somehow involved.
> 3. The coincidence in time (the Jan 28 versus Feb 01) and of the memorial.
> 4. The coincidence of the crash area (over Texas, Bush's own)
> 5. He will probably play the New World Order angle, suggesting that
"elements"
> in the U.S. government arranged for this to promote the Iraq war.
>
> As an afterthought, remember that people in Islamic countries will likely
be
> seen celebrating this disaster for the U.S. and Israel. The mere act of
idiots
> celebrating a disaster is not justification to begin a war or other acts

of
> aggression.
>
> God Bless.
>
> Never say never.
> Nothing is absolute.

1406. Ironic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-01 19:21:50 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <b1h6e80t2d@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 60484
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

This article is just too creepy. It was in *yesterday's* San Francisco Chronicle.

http://sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2003/01/31/MN90087.DTL

1407. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-01 19:29:20 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <keV_9.2605$N5.1476932@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 60483

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030201123657.05048.00000382@mb-cs.aol.com...
> In article <wPQ_9.2440$N5.1446067@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
> >Note that NCI has gone beyond its normal topic on a couple of
> >occasions (like the ARRL's Petition for Reconsideration on extending
> >PRB-1) and filed comments wholly endorsing and supporting ARRL's
> >position ... because it was "the right thing to do" ... and having done
> >that, we got flamed big-time here for having done so ...
>
> Hold on a sec - I don't recall any "flaming" on that issue.

Check the history ... Jon Bloom of ARRL was one who flamed NCI
for "going beyond its charter" ... our *members* had no problem with
us "doing the right thing." Apparently, Jon thought we were treading on
ARRL's "turf" (as if they have an exclusive right or something ...)

> >And
> >are you going to grouse about "restructuring" for the next 50 years?
>
> Not me. But isn't it the right of all Americans to complain about their
> government and petition for changes?

Yes ... of course ...

> Or is that right reserved only for those who agree with NCI's opinions?

Of course not, but at *some* point, folks in the minority should take "No."
for an answer and get on with life ...

> >If so,
> >I can always put you in my "kill file" ... but I'd rather NOT do that
> >because
> >when you're not grousing or looking for ways to attack NCI,
>
> Is criticism of NCI forbidden?

Of course not ... but I don't think you have any legitimate grounds to
criticize
NCI ... despite your best efforts ...

> >you often
> >have some intelligent, worthwhile things to say.
>
> Thanks - same to you!

You're welcome ... and thanks to you ...

Carl - wk3c

1408. Re: Shortwave KOOKS comment on Shuttle 12.160

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-01 19:38:30 UTC
From: ArcticCat <arcticcat@NOSPAMcomcast.net>
Message-ID: <SzOdneSn47_uv6GjXTWcow@comcast.com>
Source record: 60485
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

They said people are being contaminated by all the biological stuff they had on the shuttle. What a bunch of kooks. I can't believe they give broadcasting licenses to these wack jobs.

"shortwave woowoo" <greenfields@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:3e3c1e8f@snipnews.snip.net...
>
> <Him Again@anonymous.com (Sew Lil a Kwe)> wrote in message
> news:v3o4cu7s8dam66@corp.supernews.com...
>
>
> FLASH!!!!!!!
>
> ALEX JONES AND JOHN STADTMELLER - TWO VETERAN SHORTWAVE
> KOOKS COMMENTING ON COLUMBIA LOSS AS ALL BEING PART
> OF A MASSIVE CONSPIRACY TO BOOST BUSH'S RATINGS INTHE
> POLLS AS A PRELUDE TO THE IRAQ WAR !
>
>
> BROADCASTING LIVE RIGHT NOW ON 12.160 TOOOON IN TO
> THESE TWO FUC-ING SCREWBALLS ON A PSYCHOTIC RANT !!
>
> ***** I AM NOT KIDDING YOU FOLKS********
>
> THESE TWO GOLD PLATED SHORTWAVE KOOKS JUST SAYING THIS
> RIGHT NOW ON 12.160 MHZ AS I AM TYPING THIS !
>
> HW FUC-ING PREDICTABLE!!!!!
>
> SEND IN THE PAY-TRIOT KOOKS!!!!!
>
>
>
> > This Shuttle was destroyed over the State of Texas, George Bush's home
> state.
> >
> > In summary, I would be interested in hearing from others about the
> paranoid
> > reactions that we will hear from Alex Jones et al,
> >
> > Alex will make the points as follows.
> > 1. The first Israeli Astronaut.
> > 2. The presence of an Indian Woman (PhD), a country that we are

currently
> > courting favor with in our "war" against Iraq, and the possibility of
> > incensing this country into a high degree of cooperation if they feel
that
> > Iraq was somehow involved.
> > 3. The coincidence in time (the Jan 28 versus Feb 01) and of the
memorial.
> > 4. The coincidence of the crash area (over Texas, Bush's own)
> > 5. He will probably play the New World Order angle, suggesting that
> "elements"
> > in the U.S. government arranged for this to promote the Iraq war.
> >
> > As an afterthought, remember that people in Islamic countries will
likely
> be
> > seen celebrating this disaster for the U.S. and Israel. The mere act of
> idiots
> > celebrating a disaster is not justification to begin a war or other acts
> of
> > aggression.
> >
> > God Bless.
> >
> > Never say never.
> > Nothing is absolute.
>
>

1409. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-01 21:36:53 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030201163653.12173.00000313@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 60491

In article <keV_9.2605$N5.1476932@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030201123657.05048.00000382@mb-cs.aol.com...
>> In article <wPQ_9.2440$N5.1446067@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>> >Note that NCI has gone beyond its normal topic on a couple of
>> >occasions (like the ARRL's Petition for Reconsideration on extending
>> >PRB-1) and filed comments wholly endorsing and supporting ARRL's
>> >position ... because it was "the right thing to do" ... and having done
>> >that, we got flamed big-time here for having done so ...
>>
>> Hold on a sec - I don't recall any "flaming" on that issue.
>
>Check the history ... Jon Bloom of ARRL was one who flamed NCI
>for "going beyond its charter" ...

How about some examples? I recall Jon's opposition, but I'd hardly call it
"flaming". Did he mount personal attacks, or simply discuss the issue?

>our *members* had no problem with
>us "doing the right thing."

That presumes what you did was "the right thing". Some of us disagree that it
was "the right thing".

>Apparently, Jon thought we were treading on
>ARRL's "turf" (as if they have an exclusive right or something ...)

Not at all. You again infer what is not stated or implied.

Here's the issue: NCI was founded as a one-issue organization that would
disband once all code testing was gone. The current mission statement for NCI
says:

"No-Code International TM is a organization dedicated to the abolition of the
Morse code testing requirement as a prerequisite for any class of Amateur Radio
license. NCI TM will continue as a lobbying organization as long as the manual
telegraphy testing requirement exists."

That's pretty clear. One issue only. And the last bit says that when the test
is gone there will be no reason for NCI to continue as a lobbying
organization.

So when NCI starts commenting on other issues, it IS exceeding its charter. By
definition.

Has that mission changed? If so, the website doesn't say so.

>> >And
>> >are you going to grouse about "restructuring" for the next 50 years?
>>
>> Not me. But isn't it the right of all Americans to complain about their
>> government and petition for changes?
>
>Yes ... of course ...

>> Or is that right reserved only for those who agree with NCI's opinions?
>
>Of course not, but at *some* point, folks in the minority should take "No."
>for an answer and get on with life ...

WHOA!

"at *some* point, folks in the minority should take "No." for an answer and get on with life ..."

When (fill in your favorite ethnic minority) people were/are repeatedly told "No" in response to questions about equal treatment in jobs, education, housing, voting rights and/or employment, should they simply "take "No." for an answer and get on with life ..."???

I don't think that's what you meant to say, but that's what the words say. And it sure looks awful.

Who is the minority you refer to? It can't be the procodetest folks.

>> >If so,
>> >I can always put you in my "kill file" ... but I'd rather NOT do that
>> >because
>> >when you're not grousing or looking for ways to attack NCI,
>>
>> Is criticism of NCI forbidden?
>
>Of course not ... but I don't think you have any legitimate grounds to
>criticize
>NCI ... despite your best efforts ...

See above. Has the mission of NCI changed since I checked the website ten minutes ago?
>
>> >you often
>> >have some intelligent, worthwhile things to say.
>>
>> Thanks - same to you!
>
>You're welcome ... and thanks to you ...
>
73 de Jim, N2EY

1410. Re: Do You Think It's Time?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-01 22:27:08 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302011427.2537c493@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60492

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<7CQ_9.864$4y4.544523@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> "RG" <nospam@nospam.com> wrote in message
> news:b1fhtgrha1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
> > Do you think it's time to drop LSB for the lower bands and switch to USB
> > exclusively (like commercial/military) for all amateur bands?
> >
> > Surely, it was warranted for technical reasons 50 years ago to have
> > selectable sidebands but now it's somewhat silly---and a technically
> > backward practice.
> >
> > RG
>
>
> Well there's no requirement that we continue with this practice but it would
> be difficult to change longstanding habits and customs.

Its difficult to change anything in amateur radio because of longstanding hams.

1411. Re: The coders embarrass themselves on 14.275 MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-01 22:33:44 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9315B2A043C3Eelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 60493

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
news:20030131224347.12173.00000309@mb-mr.aol.com:

> In article <Xns9314DFCC38367elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>
>>Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in news:3E3AC478.2010804@psu.edu:
>>
>>>
>>>
>>> N2EY wrote:
>>>
>>>> From actual observation I can say that violations such as jamming,
>>>> obscenity/profanity, and failure to identify are uncommon in amateur
>>>> radio as a whole, and extremely rare in the CW/digital parts of the
>>>> HF bands. In the past 35 years of operating amateur radio CW I don't
>>>> recall a single instance where I heard obscenity/profanity on CW in
>>>> the CW/digital bands. Can you say that about the 'phone bands?
>>>
>>> Only once have I heard "strong" language on a digital mode.
>>> Someone was
>>> giving out a tongue lashing to another on PSK31. Okay-maybe a
>>> keyboard lashing. It was deserved though, the guy was running waaay
>>> too much power and way overdriving his audio, and taking up half the
>>> frequency. That's it. One case.!
>>>
>>> OTOH give me 30 seconds on phone and I'll give you swearing,
>>> malicious
>>> interference, poor operating practice and a host of other
>>> unpleasantness.
>>
>>Only on certain frequencies (certain spots on 80m and 20m and a few
>>renegade repeaters), and only at certain times.
>
> Perhaps. Still a lot compared to the lack of such behavior on
> CW/digital.
>
>> Does giving you 30 seconds on phone mean on 14.275?
>
> 3.950, 14.313.....
>>>
>>>
>>>> FCC enforcement actions today are largely complaint-driven. Somebody
>>>> sends a credible complaint (such as audio tapes with

>>>> time/date/frequency clearly marked) to the FCC, and FCC follows up
>>>> with their own investigation. Why are there so many complaints about
>>>> 'phone but so few about CW and digital?
>>>

Probably for the same reason that fewer people choose to make objectionable QRM on data modes, i.e. it doesn't get attention. If I tune a rig across a band I can immediately hear it if someone is being objectionable on 'phone, whereas I have to write CW down to read it unless it's very slow, and I don't have the means to decode other data modes. On the other hand, those who copy high speed CW by ear and those who have a computer hooked up to their rig can still (mostly) understand human speech.

>>>
>>>> If the use of a certain mode results in far fewer violations by
>>>> those using the mode, doesn't that make the mode somewhat better?
>>>
>>> No Jim, it doesn't make the mode better. What it means is that
>>> the
>>> people who partake of that mode are more gentlemanly or
>>> gentlewomanly. They also "play nice".
>
> The let me rephrase:
>
> If the use of a certain mode results in far fewer violations by those
> using the mode, isn't that a good reason to support use of the mode?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

1412. Re: More Of How KB1HMW "Supports" Amateur Radio...NOT!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-01 22:40:08 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v3oj63oorvfe31@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 60494

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030201121249.01669.00000190@mb-mk.aol.com...
> From K4YZ:

<SNIP>

> > I guess we don't know WHY this person is obese, eh? Are we to jsut
> >automatically assume that he's just a glutton, or was there some
mitigating
> >physiological reason? Or was it just a chance for you to make another
abusive
> >comment on Amateur Radio, Vipul?
>
> There is a high percentage of overweight people in Ham radio. Therefore
there
> must be some behavioral reason. Perhaps lack of physical activity due to
> amateur radio aspects such as contesting or Worked All States.
>

Vipal I was overweight LONG before I ever tried to be a ham.

> >>Yes, invite a non-Ham to a club meeting or a Hamfest. There one can see
the
> >>typical Ham. The non-Ham will see that Hams are weird.
> >
> > Yeah...real wierd. So wierd they choose to not hang out with so
cool a
> >dude like Vipul the Virtuous...?!?! Geeze that IS wierd...
>
> It's not just me, there are many others that believe Hams are weird.

I believe YOU are weird, a amateur op that HATES ham history,
ham jargon, and it seems hams in general!

>
> >>"Herb" <Herbie@KingOftheJammers.net> wrote
> >>> View the assortment of ex-cons, wife beaters, alcoholics, druggies,
> >>> nut cases, slobs, fruits, and societal misfits who make up the crowd
that
> >>> attends hamfests and ham club meetings today.
> >
> >>Hams are mostly good people. Most of this stuff isn't true. Societal
misfits
> >>seems to hold true.
> >
> > Not from what you posted up above, Vipul ! ! ! You have a bit of

that
> >Lenniesque two-faced thing going on...
>
> No, I said that Hams are not: ex-cons, wife beaters, alcoholics, druggies,
nut
> cases, slobs, fruits. But, many are societal (or social) misfits.

Include yourself in that one!

>
> >>Obsessed, cult like.
> >
> > You are really sick, Vipul. What's with you and obsessions of
> >"cults"..?!?!
>
> Pointing it out does not make me one. The Ham radio hobby is very much
like a
> cult. The word "Ham", the use of strange Q codewords, hatred of CBers,
Morse
> code sub cult.*

Then get out before it sucks you under and destroys your mind!

>
> > "Typical Ham"....Hmmmmmmmmm...Let's see...housewives, college
> >students...members of the Armed Forces...engineers (except Lennie)...gas
> >station attendants...insurance salesmen...high school kids...members of
> >government...heads-of-state...music stars...Vipul Shaw, KB1HMW...
> >
> > yep...REALLY WIERD!
>
> True, these are the typical Hams. Seems like a normal group. But, when
they get
> together in cult-like activities, then it becomes weird.

And what about the cult-like activities your into now? You're
posting on the NG using your computer on the internet like all the
other people in the cult of "online"! Think about it have you ever
been to a computer show? Seen all the fat people there who just
sit at their PC online playing games, doing work, surfing the internet.
What about all the code words they use like Hard Drive, CPU,
cache, ROM, RAM, pixels, burning CD's, IOs, USB, and all the
other "CODE WORDS" that are only in the cult of computers?

Look closely enough and you'll find any group of people with
their hobbie act like a "cult" when they get together in a "fest" of
their hobbie. Check out the next Star Trek convention if you
don't believe it. When was the last time you saw someone
walking down the street wearing a mask to make them look
like a Klingon?

>
> VS

Vipal why don't you just give up and send you license to
Riley Hollingsworth with "CANCEL" printed on it? Then
you won't be a part of our CULT. Just remember REAL
cults don't want it's members to leave their little group, we
on the other hand wouldn't mind at all if YOU LEFT!
--
KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx

<SNIP of a lot of band width wasting BS not needed for a reply>

1413. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-01 23:18:42 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b1hko9dug1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 60495

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030201043705.14527.00000044@mb-cc.aol.com...
> In article <%NG_9.2384$N5.1384836@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20030129204547.27873.00000300@mb-mj.aol.com...
> >> Well? If NCI's Executive Director can make a point of ARRL member
numbers
> >and
> >> percentages, the same rules of discussion should apply to NCI member
> >numbers
> >> and percentages.
> >
> >NCI doesn't claim to be THE National Society for Amateur Radio ...
> >we only claim to represent our members.
>
> Who amount to less than 0.5% of US amateur radio. Yet NCI claims to know
what
> is best for amateur radio.

All of us are free to voice our opinions. In doing so,
especially in comments to the FCC, each and every one of us is
thus claiming our own view to be that which is best for amateur radio.

......

> - FCC doesn't want all the admin work of medical waivers.

They don't have waivers anymore anyway.

> - FCC doesn't want more petitions for or against code testing

I missed that in any R&O from the FCC.

> - FCC thinks that if code testing is removed and written testing reduced,
> people who formerly went to cb or freebanding will become hams, thereby
> reducing enforcement headaches.

I missed that in any R&O from the FCC.

> - FCC thinks eliminating code testing will somehow cause hams to become
"more
> technical", even though the dropping of the code test from the Tech a
dozen
> years ago shows that doesn't happen.

I missed that in any R&O from the FCC.

Looks more like some pretty wild speculation than anything based
on facts or comments from the FCC or anyone in the FCC.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1414. Re: Shuttle, Saddam (standby all shortwave KOOKS!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-01 23:24:40 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b1hl3gkrm1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 60496
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

"Roland Stiner" <nk2u@1stconnect.com> wrote in message
news:AfU_9.6776$yU6.2794@fe01...
> > I don't see how anyone with any sense of humanity could
> > find ANYTHING connected to this tragedy "funny" in any
> > manner whatsoever ...
>
> I can see all Muslims all around the world rejoicing over this-very sad.
> Roland

I would hope that to be not true. I expect "some" Muslims (those
radical extremists that simply hate all and anything American)
to probably rejoice, but not "all". I pray I am right.

Bill K2UNK

1415. Re: Ironic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-01 23:27:57 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <1KY_9.24118$HG.4532802@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 60497
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:b1h6e80t2d@enews4.newsguy.com...
> This article is just too creepy. It was in *yesterday's* San Francisco
> Chronicle.
>
> http://sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2003/01/31/MN90087.DTL

What aspect was "creepy?"

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

1416. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-01 23:32:05 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b1hlhd$e7c$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 60498

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030125192919.03463.00000209@mb-cr.aol.com...
> In article <20030124212905.27873.00000176@mb-mj.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
(N2EY)

> N2EY writes:
....
> >Why are the writtens a sacred cow but the code a scapegoat?
....
Len replied:
> The FCC requires ALL US radio amateurs to be responsible for the
> technical and legal requirements of amateurs' operation. All.
> No exceptions.
>
> The FCC does NOT require any US amateur to operate OOK CW
> over and above any other mode. All modes are optional within
> allocated bands.

Nor does the FCC require anyone to operate at any particular
speed when using morse. It is perfectly legal for me to have
a morse QSO with someone at one wpm if we want.
Nor does the FCC care if I send erroneous morse characters by mistake.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1417. Re: Ironic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 00:09:37 UTC
From: B <b@bnobody.com>
Message-ID: <5lZ_9.81324$GX4.3398701@news2.east.cox.net>
Source record: 60500
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

This is just a regular news article. No big deal.

"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:b1h6e80t2d@enews4.newsguy.com...
> This article is just too creepy. It was in *yesterday's* San Francisco
> Chronicle.
>
> http://sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2003/01/31/MN90087.DTL
>
>

1418. Re: Shuttle, Saddam (standby all shortwave KOOKS!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 00:09:38 UTC
From: alanjgidd@yahoo.co.uk
Message-ID: <b20ddf9e.0302011609.21d42e6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60499
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

With stupid comments like yours no wonder you get bombed.

"Roland Stiner" <nk2u@1stconnect.com> wrote in message news:<AfU_9.6776$yU6.2794@fe01>...
> > I don't see how anyone with any sense of humanity could
> > find ANYTHING connected to this tragedy "funny" in any
> > manner whatsoever ...
>
> I can see all Muslims all around the world rejoicing over this-very sad.
>
> Roland

1419. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 00:42:36 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030201194236.14527.00000052@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 60501

In article <QYQ_9.2443$N5.1448485@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030131224346.12173.00000308@mb-mr.aol.com...
>> No? When an organization petitions the government to change laws and
>rules,
>> it's "not really my business" to know how big that organization is?
>> Particularly when that organization claims to know what is best for all of
>> amateur radio, including me?
>
>Any individual has the right to petition the FCC for changes in the rules.

I agree! And when an individual does so, it's obvious that it's one person
speaking their opinion.

But an organization is a different matter. That's why "lobbying organizations"
- which one of the ways NCI describes itself on its website - exist.

>A lot do ... many of them are stupid ideas and the FCC rejects them,
>either out of hand, or based on opposition in filed comments.

Why do you call them "stupid"?

>So "How many members do you have?" is not a determining factor
>in whether a petition/comments/or other filing "gets traction" ... at the
>end of the day, it's "Does this make sense? Is it within the Commission's
>authority and policy objectives? etc." Once again, making FCC rules
>is NOT a "popularity contest" ... it's a fact/logic/public interest-based
>process.

Then you should have absolutely no problem with letting the world know how many
members NCI has, right? After all, it's not a popularity contest, and "How
many members do you have?" is not a determining factor, right?

I understand that during the 98-143 comment period, there was a concerted
effort to have every NCI member submit individual comments. Nothing wrong with
that in any way, of course, but if the regulatory process is a
fact/logic/public interest-based process. then there's no need to have a lot of
comments all saying the same thing, right?.
>
>As a closing note on the subject of the precise size of NCI's membership.
>1) I have no intention of telling you
>2) It grows almost daily, certainly monthly
>3) The size is, as I have stated above, irrelevant, it's the quality of its
>policies and arguments before regulators that counts.

Sounds like you just don't want folks to know. That's fine, but the fact is that it hurts rather than helps credibility.

--

In any event, we're in a holding pattern until S25.5 changes. As I read the official pronouncements, FCC won't reduce code testing any more than it already has until S25.5 permits it. This leaves one of two possibilities:

1) If S25.5 somehow survives WRC 2003 intact (extremely unlikely, yes, but let's not count the nocodetest chickens just yet), we'll still be in the holding pattern for an indefinite future.

2) If S25.5 doesn't survive WRC 2003 intact (extremely likely that it will simply be removed), and the treaty is ratified, FCC will quickly receive at least one (probably several) proposals to dump Element 1. Which FCC would probably do even without a formal proposal.

So the question is: If/when 2) happens, what other changes should be made to the US license structure? Particularly the entry level license?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1420. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 01:03:25 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302011703.5f7b1e4a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60502

```
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0301300526.7c283077@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030129172410.08900.00000266@mb-mf.aol.com>...
> > >Subject: Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It
> > >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> > >Date: 1/29/03 1:08 PM Central Standard Time
> > >Message-id: <f45722ac.0301291108.3262fd42@posting.google.com>
>
> > >Example #1. Just Sunday, you lied when you said this:
> > >--------------
> > >Message 6 in thread
> > >From: Steve Robeson K4YZ (k4yz@aol.com)
> > >Subject: Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It
> > >
> > >View this article only
> > >Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> > >Date: 2003-01-26 20:18:44 PST
> > >
> > >>Subject: Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It
> > >>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> > >>Date: 1/26/03 9:16 PM Central Standard Time
> > >>Message-id: <f45722ac.0301261916.6b572c5d@posting.google.com>
> > >>I think Steve went to mental jump school as he's been limping along
> > >>for some time now.
> > >
> > > Perhaps...but I have two things on you and Lennie.
> > >
> > > (1) I don't lie.
> > >
> > > (2) I know the diffrence between an authorization to operate and
> > >validity
> > >for DXCC.
> > >-------------
> > >You have nothing "on" me.
> >
> > Yes, I do. Countless assertions by you that you were "authorized" to
> > operate from Somalia.
>
> > You have not provided it.
>
> I wasn't the provider, I was the recipient. My permission was not
> transferrable, therefore I cannot give it to you.
>
```

> > United Nations regulations on the subject are available from on-line
> > sources. You did not meet the criteria as an authorized operator.
>
> I had permission from my commander. It was enough.
>
> > >First, you do lie.
> >
> > OK...You have yet to provide that evidence too.
> >
> > Are you following Lennie the Lame's example of "Accuse then dodge"...?!?!
> >
> > >Second, I do know the difference between the FCC and the ARRL. I'm
> > >the one asking the others if they are confused by it.
> >
> > Screwed up again, Brian. No one said ANYTHING about teh FCC. Again, you
> > CANNOT keep your situational awareness straight.
>
> You lie again.
>
> > >You just posted that I have no expeditionary medals. Do you want me
> > >to dig that one out, too?
> >
> > No, I clearly said I DOUBT you have any. I did not say you didn't.
>
> Why would you doubt I had any? Do you doubt I was in Somalia? If you
> doubt I was in Somalia, then why do you accuse me of illegal operation
> from there?
>
> Your brain is squirming like a toads.
>
> What lie to come up with next.
>
> > >I also know the difference between a Commander and any other officer.
> > >Do you want me to dig that one out, too?
> >
> > Be my guest, Brain. You have nothing to show. As a matter of fact, I
> > DARE you to show a statement of fact or assertions saying anything to the
> > contrary.
> >
> > >Control your emotions and your "liar quotient" will go down.
> >
> > See a proctologist, Brian, and the likelyhood that you'll see the light is
> > exponentially increased.
> >
> > >Use the Force, Luke.
> >
> > Just the fact, ma'am. You made the allegations...Now prove them.
>
> Concensus.

Hey, dipstick. What else do you have???

1421. Re: Shuttle, Saddam (standby all shortwave KOOKS!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 01:15:43 UTC
From: Royce Dean <royce3245@ibm.net>
Message-ID: <3j__9.124185$6G4.14137@sccrnsc02>
Source record: 60503
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

I'll second that Carl.............100%

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:aeT_9.2455$N5.1464280@nnrp1.ptd.net...
> I don't see how anyone with any sense of humanity could
> find ANYTHING connnected to this tragedy "funny" in any
> manner whatsoever ...
>
> Carl - wk3c
>
> "David C" <blooghooge@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:3e3bf20b@snipnews.snip.net...
> >
> > "Burr" <pitzpho@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3E3BF09E.10700@earthlink.net...
> > > Maybe Saddam shot or prayed it down to get the Jew!!!
> > >
> >
> > CAN YOU IMAGINE THE HAY THAT SHORTWAVE
> > RADIO BULL SHIT ARTISTS LIKE ALEX JONES AND
> > JOYCE REILY AND JAMES LLOYD ARE GOING TO MAKE
> > FROM ALL OF THIS.....??????????????????
> >
> > I CAN SEE ALEX "HORSESHIT" JONES COMMING OUT
> > WITH TWO NEW VIDEOTAPES LINKING THIS TO
> > BOHEMIAN GROVE OR SOMETHING ELSE KOOKY
> > AND ARCANE.......BOY IS SHORTWAVE GONNA BE HOT
> > TONITE...!!!
> >
> > (don't forget the Liberty Net on 3.947 tonite also - should be real fun
> > tonite too!)
> >
> >
>

1422. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 01:17:58 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302011717.44b8f0c7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60504

```
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0301300526.7c283077@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030129172410.08900.00000266@mb-mf.aol.com>...
> > >Subject: Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It
> > >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> > >Date: 1/29/03 1:08 PM Central Standard Time
> > >Message-id: <f45722ac.0301291108.3262fd42@posting.google.com>
>
> > >Example #1. Just Sunday, you lied when you said this:
> > >--------------
> > >Message 6 in thread
> > >From: Steve Robeson K4YZ (k4yz@aol.com)
> > >Subject: Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It
> > >
> > >View this article only
> > >Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> > >Date: 2003-01-26 20:18:44 PST
> > >
> > >>Subject: Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It
> > >>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> > >>Date: 1/26/03 9:16 PM Central Standard Time
> > >>Message-id: <f45722ac.0301261916.6b572c5d@posting.google.com>
> > >>I think Steve went to mental jump school as he's been limping along
> > >>for some time now.
> > >
> > > Perhaps...but I have two things on you and Lennie.
> > >
> > > (1) I don't lie.
> > >
> > > (2) I know the diffrence between an authorization to operate and
> > >validity
> > >for DXCC.
> > >-------------
> > >You have nothing "on" me.
> >
> > Yes, I do. Countless assertions by you that you were "authorized" to
> > operate from Somalia.
>
> > You have not provided it.
>
> I wasn't the provider, I was the recipient. My permission was not
> transferrable, therefore I cannot give it to you.
>
```

> > United Nations regulations on the subject are available from on-line
> > sources. You did not meet the criteria as an authorized operator.
>
> I had permission from my commander. It was enough.
>
> > >First, you do lie.
> >
> > OK...You have yet to provide that evidence too.
> >
> > Are you following Lennie the Lame's example of "Accuse then dodge"...?!?!
> >
> > >Second, I do know the difference between the FCC and the ARRL. I'm
> > >the one asking the others if they are confused by it.
> >
> > Screwed up again, Brian. No one said ANYTHING about teh FCC. Again, you
> > CANNOT keep your situational awareness straight.
>
> You lie again.
>
> > >You just posted that I have no expeditionary medals. Do you want me
> > >to dig that one out, too?
> >
> > No, I clearly said I DOUBT you have any. I did not say you didn't.
>
> Why would you doubt I had any? Do you doubt I was in Somalia? If you
> doubt I was in Somalia, then why do you accuse me of illegal operation
> from there?
>
> Your brain is squirming like a toads.
>
> What lie to come up with next?
>
> > >I also know the difference between a Commander and any other officer.
> > >Do you want me to dig that one out, too?
> >
> > Be my guest, Brain. You have nothing to show. As a matter of fact, I
> > DARE you to show a statement of fact or assertions saying anything to the
> > contrary.
> >
> > >Control your emotions and your "liar quotient" will go down.
> >
> > See a proctologist, Brian, and the likelyhood that you'll see the light is
> > exponentially increased.
> >
> > >Use the Force, Luke.
> >
> > Just the fact, ma'am. You made the allegations...Now prove them.
>
> Concensus.

Yo! Hey! Steve? Where didja go?

We've got supposed attorneys on here. We've got supposed injuneers on here (pfffffffffffft! my buttttttttttt)

We've even got kit-builders on here (N2EY).

Now where are the pharmacy techs???

Can anyone tell me what kinds of meds might be accessible via the emergency room???

1423. Re: The coders embarrass themselves on 14.275 MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 01:19:41 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <Nm__9.123327$VU6.60686@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 60505

Hello all ....

I operate SSB for an hour or 2 at most per year and will not get into why I don't but I can honestly say that in 38 years of being on CW the worst I heard was Hey Buddy directed at me for an admitted fault. I will add however that I do not and will not subject myself to the lidfests that go by the name of pileups. CW to me is an escape from the day's frustrations where again admittedly ...I talk too much.

God Bless 73 Tom KI3R Port Vue Pa nr Pittsburgh

1424. Re: Do You Think It's Time?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 01:30:57 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030201203057.03532.00000090@mb-cp.aol.com>
Source record: 60506

In article <d22b54c3.0302010356.29c131e1@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>"RG" <nospam@nospam.com> wrote in message
>news:<b1fhtgrha1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>...
>> Do you think it's time to drop LSB for the lower bands and switch to USB
>> exclusively (like commercial/military) for all amateur bands?
>>
>> Surely, it was warranted for technical reasons 50 years ago to have
>> selectable sidebands but now it's somewhat silly
>>---and a technically
>> backward practice.
>
>To what avail? What benefits would accrue the service, the hobby or
>Joe Ham if we all went to USB?? The commercials and military don't
>have the LSB/USB option, we do. Strikes me that they're the
>technically backward in this game.

Kellie is technically ignorant there. "Commercials and military" have long had upper or lower sideband selectible operation except that their "sidebands" were 12 KHz wide with a pilot carrier in the middle (an extra tone used for locking early commercial-military SSB receivers).

Take a close look at the SGC 2020 transceiver. Stoner Goral Company in Washington sells as many or more of that little HF SSB voice transceiver for boats/ships as for radio amateurs. It is made in the USA.

The SINGLE CHANNEL SSB transceiver that began the "SSB revolution" in amateur radio owes much of its start to USAF development contracts for Stategic Air Command communications. If either USAF SAC or Collins Radio. are considered "technically backward," Kellie isn't catapulting from this universe's deck... :-)

<signature here in accord with FED-STD-188...>

1425. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 01:30:59 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030201203059.03532.00000091@mb-cp.aol.com>
Source record: 60507

In article <20030201123657.05048.00000382@mb-cs.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <wPQ_9.2440$N5.1446067@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
><wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
>>> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>>> ARRL IS "the national society for amateur radio" - simply because there is
>>no
>>> other.
>>
>>If they said "A National Society ..." I wouldn't have a gripe ... it's the
>>arrogance of attempting to project that they are "the only game in town"
>>in terms of a voice for (all is clearly implied) hams that gripes me.
>
>You are inferring what is not implied. If there were more than one national
>society for amateur radio in the USA, then I'd agree with you about the
>phrase
>being misleading. But there is no other "national society for amateur radio".
>So ARRL's description of itself is accurate.
>
>I give FCC credit for being intelligent enough to know that the ARRL does not
>speak for all hams.
>>
>>> Doesn't mean they represent all US hams.
>>
>>They sure bend over backwards to imply it ...
>>
>I don't see that at all. You infer what is not implied.

It *IS* implied. It *IS* there.

>>> But when ARRL does something
>>> that benefits US amateur radio, all US hams benefit.
>>
>>I agree ... and when they do, I acknowledge it and complement them for
>>it ... when I think they're screwing up, I say that, too ...
>
>So do I. But the point I was making is that ALL hams benefit, even if ALL
>hams aren't ARRL members.

That alone is so debateable it could be a whole new newsgroup.

ARRL is a tripartite organization. It is a publishing house
making a profit from books and periodicals. It is a member-
ship organization of a minority group of licensees acting in

a quasi-regulatory activity as if they had such regulatory
powers. It is a special-interest group represented by two
firms in DC, one a lobbying group and the other a legal firm
long on retainer to represent ARRL.

There is NO guarantee that ARRL "represents" anyone since
they are NOT bound by government rules applying to elected
public governmental positions. Most "decisions" are reached
by a limited group, called the Board of Directors, the ones who
do nearly all the "deciding" on what is good for the member-
ship.

The only "guarantee" of "democratic process" in "representation"
comes from the Word of ARRL that it does what it says.

>>Note that NCI has gone beyond its normal topic on a couple of
>>occasions (like the ARRL's Petition for Reconsideration on extending
>>PRB-1) and filed comments wholly endorsing and supporting ARRL's
>>position ... because it was "the right thing to do" ... and having done
>>that, we got flamed big-time here for having done so ...
>
>Hold on a sec - I don't recall any "flaming" on that issue.

More selective amnesia. There was much flaming here.

>Despite the poor choice of name, "No-Code International" was founded as a
>one-issue organization whose one-and-only purpose was the total elimination
>of all mandatory code testing for any class of amateur radio license.

"Poor choice of name?!?" What in the world does Reverend
Jimmie Callsign think that "ARRL" stands for?!?

American Radio Relay League...originally a kind of free
telegram service! Read the history of ARRL with at least
one unclouded eye. That was way back in 1914 when
amateurs used spark transmitters and galena crystal
receivers and Western Union telegrams cost a lot of money.
That organization history reads like a pre-WW1 "Napster."

ARRL was NOT the first nor the "foremost" national
organization for radio amateurs. The Radio Club of America
was formed five years prior to ARRL. ARRL did not become
prominent in amateur activity until well after WW1.

>The criticism was justified because NCI was getting into areas that are
>otuside its stated purpose and objectives.

Absolutely NO negative criticsm may done about ARRL.
Everyone knows that catechism.

>But NCI's sole stated purpose is the elimination of code testing - nothing
>else. In fact, Bruce Perens has stated that his intent is/was for NCI to
>vanish when that goal is accomplished. Which will probably be very soon.

Reverend Jimmie KNOWS things. "...probably soon..."

<shrug>

>Whoa there! If you're gonna discuss policy, at least get the facts right!

Absolutely, all must sing from the same hymnal.

>The NPRM issued by FCC said 4 classes of license. It laid out specifics for
>the
>written tests for those licenses, but not for code tests for those licenses.
>The R&O was very different than the NPRM. If 3 classes of license was a good
>idea, why didn't the NPRM say so?

Reports and Orders ("R&Os") do NOT have to be "identical"
or even "similar" to Notices of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRMs).

R&Os are written AFTER and BECAUSE OF comments
received after an NPRM is released.

>Yup. Eliminated all those medical waiver headaches and simplified the admin
>work.

Indicate, by references to FCC statements, all the "headaches"
caused by amateur radio medical waivers.

If Miccolis has headaches frequently, he should seek the
services of a licensed Medical Doctor. That could be the
sign of a more serious condition...

>Is that wrong? Are citizens supposed to take whatever FCC puts out and say
>"thank you sir" while tugging their forelocks and bowing?

Members of ARRL must "tug their forelocks and bow" to all
decisions of ARRL BoD. ARRL "represents all radio
amateurs."

Since the FCC is the ONLY federal agency regulating US
amateur radio, one had damn well obey the FCC in order
to be legal in amateur radio transmission.

>Not me. But isn't it the right of all Americans to complain about their
>government and petition for changes? Or is that right reserved only for those
>who agree with NCI's opinions?

No...all US amateurs must look to ARRL to complain to
their government for them, to hand over all administrative
representation to the organization "for all amateurs."

Also, no one dare state any negative criticism of ARRL
lest they be tagged unholy or something worse...

<signature here along with strict obediance to BoD decisions>

1426. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 01:31:00 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030201203100.03532.00000092@mb-cp.aol.com>
Source record: 60508

In article <20030201043705.14527.00000044@mb-cc.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <%NG_9.2384$N5.1384836@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
><wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>>news:20030129204547.27873.00000300@mb-mj.aol.com...
>>> Well? If NCI's Executive Director can make a point of ARRL member numbers
>>and
>>> percentages, the same rules of discussion should apply to NCI member
>>numbers
>>> and percentages.
>>
>>NCI doesn't claim to be THE National Society for Amateur Radio ...
>>we only claim to represent our members.
>
>Who amount to less than 0.5% of US amateur radio. Yet NCI claims to know what
>is best for amateur radio.

Has ARRL *ever* had as much as a quarter of all licensed
US radio amateurs?

ARRL is a MINORITY group who claim to "know what is best
for amateur radio."

>ARRL IS "the national society for amateur radio" - simply because there is no
>other. Doesn't mean they represent all US hams.

ARRL says it does. On the home page they, up top, say
that "amateur radio begins here!"

>But when ARRL does something
>that benefits US amateur radio, all US hams benefit.

Of course. Having to pay extra shipping charges on ARRL
publications ordered from Newington is a "help."

Europeans have had a LF band for their amateurs for years.
The USA doesn't, just 160 to 190 KHz license free if very
low power.

>I don't agree with some of FCC's decisions. Is that wrong? Must I agree with
>YOUR vision of the future? That's what "...bring amateur radio into the 21st
>century" is saying.

It's fairly obvious to any reader in here that Rev. Jimmie
Callsign tries to shove His opinions down everyone else's
mind every time somebody says the least negative thing
about ARRL.

>>if the ARRL's policies and recommendations had been more
>>in line with the realities of today and the Commission's legitimate
>>regulatory
>>objectives, they might have gotten more traction ... ours were ... we got
>>the traction ... live with it.
>
>Sounds like the rooster taking credit for the dawn. If someone says what FCC
>wants to hear, they're going to have a high success rate.

Sounds like several bushels of Sour Grapes...not to mention
selective amnesia about self-propaganda from ARRL for
years about "FCC acting on ARRL requests/petitioning."

ARRL just hasn't been getting What It Wants for a decade-plus.
That should demonstrate something to rational individuals.
Problem is, Believers aren't all that rational.

>Note that FCC also reduced written testing, despite many suggestions on how
>to improve it.

Truthspeak. FCC has fully privatized the Question and Answer
generation, yielding responsibility to the VEC Q&A Committee
(all but final approval by them). The FCC no longer requires a
specific number of topic questions on writtens.

>Fact is, FCC wants out of code testing for a number of reasons that have
>little to do with the good of amateur radio. Examples:

That statement is only valid if morsemanship is the epitome
of radio amateurism. It isn't, so the statement is invalid.
FCC does not mandate exclusive morse code modes over
and above all other modes; all allocated modes are optional
to use.

>- FCC doesn't want all the admin work of medical waivers.

Was that ever a problem? If so, to what extent? Please
show references or evidence to that effect.

>- FCC doesn't want more petitions for or against code testing

Was that ever a problem? Show your work. FCC is bound
by law to accept all comments, petitions, etc. from US
citizens.

Rev. Callsign never worked IN or for the FCC, cannot possibly
"know" their "motivations."

>- FCC thinks that if code testing is removed and written testing reduced,
>people who formerly went to cb or freebanding will become hams, thereby

>reducing enforcement headaches.

That's a Wild Supposition, unsupported by any evidence
in FCC statements.

Come back to reality.

>- FCC thinks eliminating code testing will somehow cause hams to become "more
>technical", even though the dropping of the code test from the Tech a dozen
>years ago shows that doesn't happen.

Another Wild Tale of Supposition, worse than the preceding.

The FCC is only a REGULATOR of US amateur radio (and all
other US civil radio), not a "sponsor" or "endorser" or
"promoter" of any radio service. FCC is not chartered to do
those things nor is it any academic institution giving tests on
"technical achievements" of individuals.

The FCC uses amateur licensing as another tool of its lawful
task of regulating US amateur radio.

<signature here as required by Title 18 USC or whateveer...>

1427. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 01:31:01 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030201203101.03532.00000093@mb-cp.aol.com>
Source record: 60510

In article <%NG_9.2384$N5.1384836@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030129204547.27873.00000300@mb-mj.aol.com...
>> Well? If NCI's Executive Director can make a point of ARRL member numbers
>and
>> percentages, the same rules of discussion should apply to NCI member
>numbers
>> and percentages.
>
>NCI doesn't claim to be THE National Society for Amateur Radio ...
>we only claim to represent our members.

And principally to remove the morse code test requirement
from any amateur radio license examination in any of the
world's administrations.

Further, NCI insists it will disband once that morse code test
requirement is removed from any ITU-R Recommendation.

There are NO "hidden motivations" in any of NCI's statements
or communications.

>The fact that our comments and recommendations to the FCC were
>credible and that we were quite sucessful in "restructuring" really seems
>to irk you ... if the ARRL's policies and recommendations had been more
>in line with the realities of today and the Commission's legitimate
>regulatory
>objectives, they might have gotten more traction ... ours were ... we got
>the traction ... live with it.

The last sentences are the most telling by observation.

ARRL failed to get what it wanted, despite a huge membership
by comparison to individual groups dedicated to a single cause.
ARRL failed despite a continuing retainer with a communications
oriented legal firm in DC.
ARRL has failed a number of different things for "the good of
amateur radio" (meaning its BoD's ideas of "what was good")
in the last decade and a half.

<signature here to avoid a capital crime charge>

1428. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 01:31:02 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030201203102.03532.00000094@mb-cp.aol.com>
Source record: 60511

In article <3E3AF193.B187CE47@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <3E39A342.59208604@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >> Just how did you communicate out of Helsinki without any
>> >> radio set, boy? MilSpec Nokia cell-phones? :-)
>> >
>> >Why do you want to know? Are you beginning a new series of lies?
>> >Shall I reproduce N2EY's insightful quote?
>>
>> Reproduce anything you want. Create hordes of bastard
>> Truthspeak statements.
>
>None were bastard statements. The statements I reposted were archives
>of what I actually wrote as compared to what you've repeatedly and
>incorrectly said I wrote. You've told told quite a number of times that
>your statements were incorrect. I've offered proof.

"...told told..."? :-)

I've remarked some of what transpired in here 1997 through 1998.
That isn't "incorrect" except in a universe centered on yourself.

>Why should I allow you to attribute statements to me which are not
>truthful?

You should not. Then again, what you've said is no more
"truth" than selective quoting, taking one message out of a
thread of many as stored in a privately-run "archival" site as
handled as if it were court documents.

There are several reality-based statements that I made some
long time ago that apparently outraged Heil. These were:

1. Guinea-Bisseau (a former colony) has a low rank among
3rd world middle African countries...its chief export in
world trade is reported to be cashew nuts. It seems to
remain in the same regard some years later.

2. The use of manual telegraphy on an otherwise RTTY circuit
for exchange of operating schedules and other comm data
is questionable. That is very uncommon procedure among

all other commercial or military or government HF radio
users, including localities close to the equator. That is
normally not done now nor was it done back before WW2.
If a TTY works at all on a radio circuit, then a TTY is used
for the "order-wire." If TTY will not work as an "order-wire"
then it makes no sense to use it for regular message traffic.

Add to this -

3. US State Department communications networks are much
smaller than any communications networks among the US
Army, US Navy, and US Air Force. USN and US Army
radio networks were running on HF prior to WW2 on a
24/7 basis (continuously, around the clock) using equipment
designed for the task. The US State Department radio
communications equipment, procedures, etc., have never
been considered "leading edge" nor always up to the state
of the radio art by anyone except the US State Department.

4. A small former colony with small population and small economy
and posing no real threat to anyone in middle Africa or the
rest of the world cannot logically be considered to be any
sort of "key post" ("key" as in important or meaningful or of
high rank). One can assume that US Embassy activities
would not be, nor have to be, in operation continuously around
the clock except for the USMC guard activities.

5. The US Department of State is engaged in US government
foreign relations in an overall diplomatic mission (as in work
assignment). It is not engaged in direct defense of the
USA nor is it tasked for direct offense from the USA...with
the possible exception of certain former employees who feel
superior to ordinary citizens IN the USA.

6. Activities of the US State Department do not solely involve
radio, certainly not amateur radio. The US military branches
all have MARS facilities which sometimes work with US
radio amateurs. The US State Department does not, nor
can it "rule" over communications activities of the US military
abroad (that is an NTIA and DoD liason activity enforced
within respective military commands).

7. All of the above can be researched by anyone else and
found to be correct...with the exception of certain newsgroup
regulars who demand others to follow their words explicitly
and without question...for they are superior.

>Incorrect, Foghorn Lenhorn.

Some creativity on Heil's part noted. AFTRA yields a grade
of D+ due to lack of respect for the late Kenny Delmar, the
voice of "Senator Claghorn" on the Fred Allen Show (radio).

>Your current predicament came about as a
>result of one too many of your deliberate falsehoods.

I have NO "predicament."

Heil has NOT discussed the validity of using manual CW on
a US government RTTY circuit, the original question raised
some years ago. Heil is thus ruled technically deficient.

>> Amateur radio policy matters are well down on the list.
>> What matters most is PCTA "personal honors" at stake,
>> that their Truthspeak is true when it is not.
>
>That isn't what happened at all. You are the individual responsible for
>bringing up any of this.

I was never involved in US State Department communications
and never stationed in any 3rd world middle African country at
any US embassy. I have been part of a much larger US Army
radio network working "24/7" (continuously, around the clock)
during a period of over 30 years. Heil insists that "no one"
operates 24/7 and forbids the expression "24/7" referring to
anyone being "on-call" at any time away from their scheduled
operating times.

Heil has continued to redefine colloquialisms and common
expressions to suit his purpose. That purpose is, seemingly,
to portray himself as a radio expert, an important guru within
US government...all because so few others have ever been
working in the same US government capacity.

He MUST reply to this message. His "honor" demands it. He
MUST be "right." QED.

<signature here to avoid being arrested by a department>

1429. Re: Out Of The Box?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 01:31:03 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030201203103.03532.00000095@mb-cp.aol.com>
Source record: 60509

In article <f45722ac.0302010417.5f34288b@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20030131152455.03820.00000304@mb-fr.aol.com>...
>> In article <f45722ac.0301301951.11b4988b@posting.google.com>,
>> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>>
>> >kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
>> >news:<d22b54c3.0301301554.3a534333@posting.google.com>...
>> >
>> >> I agree. Those of us who get involved in the scratchings of the gas
>> >> bags apparently either have too much time on our hands
>> >
>> >Boink
>> >
>> > or we have a
>> >> problem with priority-setting.
>> >
>> >Boink
>> >
>> >> Which needs fixing.
>> >
>> >Boink
>> >
>> > I suggest that we
>> >> stick to ham radio and let The Pointless Duo babble at each other.
>> >
>> >RV, did I do good on the "Boinks?" I'm still not sure how they're used.
>> >
>> >And good luck sticking to ham radio.
>>
>> Kellie can't. Like all severely-injured-in-the-ego PCTAs, he
>> has, like the colonel and the reverend and Putzieboy in TN,
>> got to keep on, keep on, keep on their attacks on NCTAs
>> who have caused them to lose their Face.
>>
>> They alone are "defending the 'honor and virtue' of ham
>> radio because They ARE ham radio. [they are only
>> defending themselves but have to rationalize it somehow]
>>
>> You can imagine how that trio (and pet misery mule) would
>> fare in a community meeting over, say, antenna erection
>> with their non-ham community people NOT agreeing with

>> them. They would LOSE IT big time and thereby do a
>> negative for ham radio after they stopped sputtering, name-
>> calling, and general self-propelled-self-promotions. :-)
>>
>>
>> <signature here, verified by homeland security dept.>
>
>It was particularly satisfying seeing Jims message about VE exams not
>being monitored. Where have we heard that before?

:-) [wasn't it on an old 16" vinyl transcription recording?]

>And then Dave had to go back into the annals of amateur history to
>"prove" that a ttfd MUST be tilted, regardless of what Cebik and the
>manufacturer says.

I find it amazing that those jolly boys can "prove" an antenna
efficiency solely by repeating old messages! No antenna
range, no measurement apparatus, not even an analysis
program involving the Method of Moments. Just text messages!

>And Steve says they don't cling to the past.

A "clingon" mentality. Something from outer space. :-)

<signature here as on an old subscription to Antennex>

1430. Re: Claims Of Dishonesty

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 01:31:05 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030201203105.03532.00000096@mb-cp.aol.com>
Source record: 60512

In article <20030131211320.27873.00000375@mb-mj.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <3E3A019D.737290D7@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>writes:
>
>>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>>
>>> In article <f45722ac.0301300603.26f915b@posting.google.com>,
>>> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>>>
>>> >> Careful, Brian, Reverend Jimmie might be Out To Getcha!
>>> >>
>>> >> Check for tatoos on his knuckles if you see him... :-)
>>> >
>>> >Len, give it up! He nailed you good on the Extra out of the box (no
>>> >time limit stipulated, however). I think I told Bruce I was going to
>>> >get Extra, also.
>>>
>>> Reverend Jimmie rode into town, found an old message
>>> under an old stack of messages, yanked it out and...
>>
>> ...posted it for all to see. There is was in black and white.
>>
>> Googled again.
>
>That's really what it comes down to, Dave. But Mr. Anderson becomes quite
>agitated when he is shown to be in error.

Reverend Jimmie Callsign seems to get prissy and pedantic
whenever his "honor" is perceived sullied...says anyone not
going along with his statements is "mistaken" or "in error."

>Note the above comparisons to an old movie character.

Note some others' use of old cartoon character names! :-)

>As for family, I don't think I've ever mentioned anything about that subject
>here. Nor do I intend to.

Out of fear? :-)

Reality can be fearful. Valid information may sully the shining
patina of fantasy and myth, the golden garment some long-
timers wear proudly. :-)

>We've been all through this before, Dave. The context is whatever Mr.
>Anderson says it is.

How so? I don't redefine common expressions. No human
individual can work continuously without rest or food, yet
tens of thousands of humans around the world are on call
outside of regular work hours. Heil disallows the expression
of "on call" in reference to the expression "24/7." Heil does
not want the "24/7" label to apply to units and organizations
(which they DO apply to), only to individuals. Illogical and
invalid demands.

>More than 2000 years after Julius Caesar crossed the Rubicon, too. 2500 or so
>years since the battle on the plain of Marathon. Humans still run marathons,
>by the way - guess we runners are "clinging to the past".

Ahem...the old Romans and old Greeks did NOT have radio.

How does elementary world history of ancient times apply to
amateur radio, let alone amateur radio policy?

>Mr. Anderson has said he "knows morse" in another post, but perhaps that was
>another error, since anyone who "knows morse" in the context of amateur radio
>should be able to pass the 5 wpm test.

Perhaps Reverend Jimmie Callsign confuses himself in an
effort to Correction Of The Heathen or to the Sacred NEED
To Take A Ticket Test?

Apparently this is another in a series of Redefinition Statements
wherein (the Heil case) "An Interest In Radio = Amateur Licensing."

According to Rev. J. Callsign, "Knowing Morse (code that is) =
Should Take An Amateur Test."

:-)

>Dave, Mr. Anderson obviously suffers from poor language comprehension. He
>does not understand your radio operations for the State Department. Such
>misunderstandings and misquotes are common for Mr. Anderson.

Ah, but Rev. Jimmie Callsign DOES! Amazing. Here's a holy
man who never served in any US military or US government
position in any sort of radio communications who KNOWS
all. The good reverend never worked any commercial HF
radio carrier's position yet he KNOWS all about procedures
and methods and equipment in the rest of the radio world.

>Mr. Anderson projects his own behavior and feelings onto others. Note how
>angry, upset and abusive he gets over my calm, reasoned, well-documented
>posts pointing out his errors.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. "Calm, reasoned, well-documented..." :-)

Has Callsign looked in a major newspaper's business section
about a week and a half or so as requested. Has he seen

that amazon.com posted a SECOND consecutive PROFIT
quarter? No? Try the Internet. Most major newspapers also
have websites and anyone can view recent stories they carried
in print.

What was interesting here was that I once had a thread going
on ARRL publications' ADDED shipping charges to on-line
or mailed-in orders. Amazon.com had this incentive of NO
shipping charges on minimum orders (about $25) and amazon
resells all ARRL books at the same retail price.

First of all, that was a Negative against ARRL. The Reverend
does NOT like ANY negative comment against ARRL. (they
are inviolate, all criticsms are to be battled against with fury,
scorn, derision, etc.). Next we have Jimmie trying to shoot
down a book reseller with charges of "unprofitable business!"

Misdirection. Knowing that Defense of ARRL won't work in
the long run, Rev. Callsign goes after a business and the
originator of the statements not heaping praise and kindness
on His membership organization. That takes the onus away
from ARRL...as (almost) designed. :-)

>Interest levels vary, Dave. Mr. Anderson's interest level has not reached the
>point of being licensed in the amateur radio service. Is that a bad thing?

Pssst, Reverend, Mr. Anderson got involved AND interested in
radio communications and all electronics beginning in 1952
while in the service of his country (the USA), actually working
HF communications beginning in 1953. Big-Time comm, lots
of messaging, stations working around the clock continuously.
No morse code modes were used in that communications.

As late as the year 2003, few pedantic prussian persons
REDEFINE words and phrases to insist that "Interest In
Radio" = "Must Get An Amateur License." QED.

Of course it is a "Bad Thing" to some. They NEED that
amateur radio license to wave around and show how superior
they are to others. No problem here, it is well understood.

>Perhaps we should have a nice ragchew on 80 or 40 CW some evening. It would
>be good to hear tales of Helsinki, Dar-es-Salaam, and other exotic locales
from
>someone who lived there for years, while serving our country's diplomatic
>mission.

Wow, yes. It should be on display Here! Especially the
"exotic" parts of the capitol of Finland! [tales of intrigue and
drama "on the scene?"] Can't wait to hear more about
exotic middle African countries.

Meanwhile, feel free to deride those of us who were in the US military doing communications from overseas locations, being soldiers or sailors who had the mission to defend our country (by force if need be) at the same time. No problem. I'm sure you think the military on duty before your birth are of no consequence.

<signature here, payroll signature as written once a month>

1431. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 01:44:28 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302011744.1863d8a5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60513

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0301300527.435379f4@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030129172713.08900.00000268@mb-mf.aol.com>...
> > >Subject: Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It
> > >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> > >Date: 1/29/03 1:16 PM Central Standard Time
> > >Message-id: <f45722ac.0301291116.5831a623@posting.google.com>
>
> > >You say that there are other IMMEDIATE issues..., but stated none.
> >
> > CC & R pre-emptions, spectrum protection, VEC examiner liability, to name
> > a few.
>
> Well, Steve, you're a little late. I've alread brought up issues.
> We'll discuss them first.

Hello? Hello?? Hello???

Steve, hey buddy, are you still there???

1432. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 02:25:29 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302011825.6dd5f350@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60515

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0301301534.665285be@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030130113854.03252.00000362@mb-cr.aol.com>...
> > >Subject: Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It
> > >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> > >Date: 1/30/03 7:30 AM Central Standard Time
> > >Message-id: <f45722ac.0301300530.7176bf9a@posting.google.com>
>
> > >Proven to be irrelevent?
> > >
> > >OK, prove it.
> >
> > The FCC's done that for me, Brian. They have stated that they will not
> > consider any further petitions on this subject as no new evidence on the
> > validity of code testing hes been provided.
> >
> > Furthermore, FCC officials of some repute (ie Messrs Hollingsworth and
> > Cross) have publically stated that any further badgering of the FCC on this
> > matter only hurts the Service's overall standing with them...And they made it
> > clear they were addressing both the pro and anti factions.
>
> Steve, I didn't ask you to tell me about it, I asked you to prove it.
> Post your proof.

Sick, sick, sick, homosexual pornographic stuff snipped.

Now prove it Steve/K4YZ.

1433. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 02:40:27 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3E3C851B.46C28747@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 60516

N2EY wrote:

>
> Fact is, FCC wants out of code testing for a number of reasons that have little
> to do with the good of amateur radio. Examples:
>
> - FCC doesn't want all the admin work of medical waivers.
> - FCC doesn't want more petitions for or against code testing
> - FCC thinks that if code testing is removed and written testing reduced,
> people who formerly went to cb or freebanding will become hams, thereby
> reducing enforcement headaches.

All they reduced was the code. It's still the same material on the writtens.
The differing amount of questions on the tests has little effect on how hard
one needs to study to prepare for the tests.

I wonder if any freebanders decided to get a ham license (general or
extra, the ones with HF privs) and operate legally on ham bands and
quit illegal operations in other bands. Of course nobody is going to
say that he "upgraded" to ham from "freeband".

All the above can be explained by the fact that it reduces costs
for the FCC.

1434. Re: The coders embarrass themselves on 14.275 MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 02:54:20 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E3C8857.F70AF778@att.net>
Source record: 60517
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Alun Palmer wrote:

> haaaynorton@comnospam (Ed Norton) wrote in
> news:296332854.FF1640746@lloyds.lover.boy:
>
> > I've been reading all of this hoopla about K1MAN and the activities on
> > 14.275 MHz, but have never really paid much attention to it until
> > today when I tuned in to see what could be heard.
> >
> > It was then that I heard some CW operators making real asses of
> > themselves, proving that CW confers no virtue upon its practitioners.
> >
> > A short listen at approximately 2100Z quickly turned up a CW operator
> > sending "shit" over and over again at about 10 wpm. Fifteen minutes
> > later, another CW operator joined in with the word "fuck," this time
> > repeated over and over at around 20 wpm.
> >
> > Yes sir. CW capability sure improves the hobby. NOT!
>
> Riley Hollingsworth recently visited our local club. One of the things he
> said in his talk was that he had never heard of a complaint of a CW op
> jamming. It occurred to me at the time, although I didn't get the chance
> to tell him, that I had heard someone sending 'fuck' repeatedly in CW on a
> repeater. It's a myth that there's no jamming or swearing on CW.

Ah. You have no idea how any of this works. No troublemaking code hater
ever
learned even enough of it
to get on his favorite 2meter repeater and utter a few obscenities in
Morse.
We see.

Just for your enlightenment, the *REAL* CW operators are found on the
south
end of each HF band. THAT is where there are no problems with
violations, as
evidenced clearly by the FCC Enforcement logs and by Riley's
statements..
That one of your kind would stoop to swearing in Morse on a VHF FM
repeater
is certainly believable.

Hey, even YOU could learn enough code to do that.

1435. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 02:54:33 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E3C8866.F558CAE9@att.net>
Source record: 60518

"Kï¿½HB" wrote:

> "Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote
>
> :
> : Geeeeee......Wish we WERE talking about the late Lennie Anderson!
> :
>
> What a sorry-assed comment that is!
>
> I don't know Lennie very well --- I disagree with him on many issue related
> to amateur radio --- mostly he sounds like a pompous old grouch --- but
> publicly asserting that you wish he was "the late" Lennie Anderson goes way
> beyond even the bounds of "usenet" decency. The quote above makes you an
> industrial grade jerk --- no, make that an industrial grade asshole.

Even at that he comes in well below the level of either Len or Carl.

1436. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 02:54:47 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E3C8873.AE04EE4E@att.net>
Source record: 60519

Bert Craig wrote:

> "Kï¿½HB" <kï¿½hb@arrl.DOTORG> wrote in message
> news:vjWY9.4607$d66.431261@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> > An urban myth of gigantic proportions. Today's work force is so much more
> > productive than the work force of the 40/50's that comparisons are made
> not
> > in percentages, but in orders of magnitude.
> >
> > 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
> The Element 1 issue notwithstanding, I have to agree with the above
> statement in general wholeheartedly!

Don't credit the workforce, it's not their doing. It's the advances in
their
tools that did it.

1437. Re: The coders embarrass themselves on 14.275 MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 02:56:31 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E3C88DB.9C90FBAE@att.net>
Source record: 60520

Brian wrote:

> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030127083647.16889.00000237@mb-cc.aol.com>...
>
> > Of curse it's a myth. The point is, however, that it's far less common on CW
> > than on voice modes. Just read the FCC enforcement letters. Lots of enforcement
> > actions against hams using voice in the voice bands, extremely few (if any)
> > against hams using CW or digital in the CW/digital bands.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Could it be that the FCC no longer has a pool of trained CW operators
> to monitor amateur CW communications?
>
> Don't forget that Dick Carrol sends code so attrociously that machine
> copy is not possible.

Really? What was it that put you in position to possess that
knowledge? A post I once madethat indicated that it is indeed
easy to send code such that a computer couldn't copy it?
So google up that one and we'll check our your veracity yet one more
time.

You now have done your usual totally DISHONEST thing and mutilated my
statement beyond recognition for your illicit purposes, all the while
insisting that you don't lie. What you are, is for a fact, a truly
pathological liar.
No wonder you get along so well the Putzy Poo, AKA AveryFineManhole

1438. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 02:57:29 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E3C8916.463CDFA@att.net>
Source record: 60521

StevenSON

AnderSON

Foghorn Leghorn: "I say there, SON......."

No doubt I wasn't the only one to notice the connection????

1439. Re: The coders embarrass themselves on 14.275 MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 02:58:11 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E3C8940.1C864ED8@att.net>
Source record: 60522

Alun Palmer wrote:

>
> You may be onto something.

No, he's *on* something.

1440. Re: Claims Of Dishonesty

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 02:59:19 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E3C8984.308EA516@att.net>
Source record: 60523

Brian wrote:

> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030128194823.12173.00000227@mb-mr.aol.com>...
> >
> > In article <20021201183714.00112.00000794@mb-fz.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> > writes:
> >
> > >In article <20021201133916.21441.00000449@mb-mc.aol.com>, j1aguiar@aol.com
> > >(J1aguiar) writes:
> >
> > >Accusing the VECs of falsifying test results is pretty serious stuff, btw. Do
> > >you have any solid evidence?
> >
> > VEC test sessions are NOT monitored by anyone else DURING
> > testing. All that is monitored is the FCC scanning over test
> > RESULTS sent to them by the VEC teams.
> >
> > PAUSE QUOTE
> >
> > Despite the unnecessary shouting, this first paragraph is just a restatement of
> > the obvious. Note that FCC has not had any reservations about the testing of
> > young children for amateur radio exams, nor of the VE session in question.
>
> Now it is obvious that exams are NOT monitored? Unfrigginbelievable;
> what unpalatable concessions are made in the effort to hang Len.
>
> You might want to clue in buddy Dick Carrol/W0EX. He thinks otherwise
> and you had -ample- opportunity to correct him at the time.

Yer not only untruthful you're also totally clueless...But that's been
clear for years and
everyone who knows anything knows it. Why d' ya think the FCC insisted
on THREE ve's at each
and every test session - to hold each other's hands?

Yer an Energizer Bunny full of nothing but hot air and gibberish. No
wonder you sat
on the sidelines all those years bitching and whining insted of getting
into the game. You
couldn't find the playing field!

1441. Re: More Of How KB1HMW "Supports" Amateur Radio...NOT!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 03:21:01 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030201222101.23945.00000096@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 60524

>Subject: Re: More Of How KB1HMW "Supports" Amateur Radio...NOT!
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 2/1/03 11:12 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030201121249.01669.00000190@mb-mk.aol.com>

>Most implies greater than 50%. Most is incorrect. What I meant is a high
>percentage of Hams are fat. Also, it is a greater percentage than the general
>population. I drew this conclusion from seeing Hams at a few clubs and at
>Hamfests. Also, a survey supports this conclusion.

WHAT "survey", Vipul? WHAT reputable polling agency conducted this
"survey" and under what accepted polling tchniques?

>There is a high percentage of overweight people in Ham radio. Therefore there
>must be some behavioral reason. Perhaps lack of physical activity due to
>amateur radio aspects such as contesting or Worked All States.

Vipul, is there a responsible adult in your house that knows you're
playing with the computer?

>It's not just me, there are many others that believe Hams are weird.

Who? The Reilians?

>No, I said that Hams are not: ex-cons, wife beaters, alcoholics, druggies,
>nut
>cases, slobs, fruits. But, many are societal (or social) misfits.

No, Vipul...YOU statd MOST hams were fat, and are (social) misfits. You
can't have it both ways.

>> You are really sick, Vipul. What's with you and obsessions of
>>"cults"..?!?!
>
>Pointing it out does not make me one. The Ham radio hobby is very much like a
>cult. The word "Ham", the use of strange Q codewords, hatred of CBers, Morse
>code sub cult.*

Yes, Vipul, you ARE "one of them". You continue to post to a newsgroup
for an avocation that you clearly disdain, yet as of 10 minutes ago, I see you
are still listed in the FCC database. Obvioulsy you LIKE being "weird" because
you continue to maintain the basic vestige of what YOU consider "weird", tha
Amateur Radio license.

Take it out of your pocket or off the wall, write "CANCEL" across it and
mail it to Gettysburg.

Failure to do so makes you "one of us", just as "weird", "fat", "old", "mis(fit)" and basically no different than those you ridicule.

>True, these are the typical Hams. Seems like a normal group. But, when they
>get
>together in cult-like activities, then it becomes weird.

As opposed to Vipul Shaw, who is weird all by himself.

So let's consider Vipul and HIS weirdness...

He enters a newsgroup for Amateur Radio and begins posting as if he knows what he's talking about...Except it only takes a post or two to tell he has little or no experience in Amatuer Radio.

He asserts otherwise, but his posts are rebuked by a dozen other posters.

He also refuses to identify himself, callsign, licensure and amount of experience, only to have it found out and posted to the NG by a person with little if any investigative skills.

Then you deny it for a week, but finally "admit" it is you.

You then assert in yet another post that you only express criticsm of Amateur Radio within Amateur Radio circles, yet only 3 days later you are found posting under your own screen name in the CB NG, not only being critical, but outright insulting.

You then have the temerity to resume psoting in THIS NG telling us how weird "WE" are...

Son, you have some serious problems.

Steve, K4YZ

1442. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 03:29:25 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030201222925.23945.00000100@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 60526

>Subject: Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 2/1/03 7:17 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0302011717.44b8f0c7@posting.google.com>

>Yo! Hey! Steve? Where didja go?

Sorry, Brian. Believe it or not, SOME of us have more important things to
do that sit impatiently in front of our monitors awaiting the next round in NG
volley ball.

>Can anyone tell me what kinds of meds might be accessible via the
>emergency room???

I imagine I could...but why...???

1443. Re: Do You Think It's Time?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 03:29:27 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.h9nlf3w.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 60525

On Fri, 31 Jan 2003 23:18:08 -0500, RG wrote:

>Do you think it's time to drop LSB for the lower bands and switch to USB
>exclusively (like commercial/military) for all amateur bands?

No.
>
>Surely, it was warranted for technical reasons 50 years ago to have
>selectable sidebands but now it's somewhat silly---and a technically
>backward practice.

The ARS should be, and is, free to use all "technically backward
practices" of modulation that it wishes with one exception - Type B.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1444. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 03:34:11 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030201223411.23945.00000102@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 60527

>Subject: Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 2/1/03 7:28 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0302011728.50a9d497@posting.google.com>

>I know it sounds like I'm in a culvert, but I'm trying to get a viable
>response from the ARRL Nurse.

As I said...better things to do today. Sorry you're so impatient.

You've been provided the answers, Lennie, but you're ignoring them just
like you did the facts about your alleged T5 operation.

Excuse me...I meant Brian, but it seems sooooooooooo close.

1445. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 03:36:42 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030201223642.25154.00000106@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 60528

Here are the number of unexpired FCC ARS licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:

As of May 14, 2000:

Novice - 49,329
Tech - 205,394
Tech Plus - 128,860
General - 112,677
Advanced - 99,782
Extra - 78,750
Total - 674,792

As of January 31, 2003:

Novice - 35,621 (decrease of 13,708)
Tech - 249,365 (increase of 43,971)
Tech Plus - 72,359 (decrease of 56,501)
General - 140,008 (increase of 27,331)
Advanced - 84,188 (decrease of 15,594)
Extra - 103,394 (increase of 24,644)
Total - 684,935 (increase of 10,143)

73 de Jim, N2EY

1446. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 03:38:02 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030201223802.23945.00000103@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 60529

>Subject: Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/1/03 7:31 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030201203102.03532.00000094@mb-cp.aol.com>

>1. Guinea-Bisseau (a former colony) has a low rank among...bumpbump...

>1. Guinea-Bisseau (a former colony) has a low rank among...bumpbump...

>1. Guinea-Bisseau (a former colony) has a low rank among...bumpbump...

>1. Guinea-Bisseau (a former colony) has a low rank among...bumpbump

>2. The use of manual telegraphy on an otherwise RTTY circuit..bumpbump...

>2. The use of manual telegraphy on an otherwise RTTY circuit...bumpbump...

>2. The use of manual telegraphy on an otherwise RTTY circuit...bumpbump...

>2. The use of manual telegraphy on an otherwise RTTY circuit...bumpbump...

>3. US State Department communications networks are much
> smaller...bumpbump..

>3. US State Department communications networks are much
> smaller...bumpbump...

>3. US State Department communications networks are much
> smaller...bumpbump...

1447. Re: Claims Of Dishonesty

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 03:40:12 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030201224012.23945.00000105@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 60530

>Subject: Re: Claims Of Dishonesty
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/1/03 7:31 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030201203105.03532.00000096@mb-cp.aol.com>

>Reverend Jimmie Callsign seems to get prissy and pedantic
> whenever his "honor" is perceived sullied...says anyone not
> going along with his statements is "mistaken" or "in error."

The Pathological Liar Leonard H Anderson has been quoted word for word in this thread and others and his inability to tell the truth made unerringly clear.

He is a person of low moral character and is untrustworthy.

1448. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 03:41:19 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030201224119.23945.00000106@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 60531

>Subject: Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 2/1/03 7:44 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0302011744.1863d8a5@posting.google.com>

>Hello? Hello?? Hello???
>
>Steve, hey buddy, are you still there???

Yep. Got anything to offer?

1449. Re: More Of How KB1HMW "Supports" Amateur Radio...NOT!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 03:41:53 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <v3p4te8vr3qh7b@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 60532

While I won't dwell on the fact that a lot of various groups have their own way of doing things (gee, why can't tennis simply score 0, 1, 2, 3 like normal folks?), I can see his point about the HTs. Gee, imagine that, carrying around a radio. Of course, if you take that HT, bubble pack the thing, make it in bright vivid colors, allow the user to play pac-man on it and have it play "charge" in all twelve keys, then it becomes a "normal" thing. I can't believe the folks wearing ear protection with those radios (oh, cell phones; but they are nothing but a duplex HT connected to the telephone system - and my HT can connect to the telephone system too) stuck under one of the earpads so they can look busy and chat for hours on end. Yep, the hams sure are a strange group, huh?

As far as overweight, I don't know. Most of the hams I personally know are not overweight. I doubt I'd have a problem doing as many pushups as years I've been on earth; most likely in well under two minutes as well (I'll be 56 in a few months).

So, keep on jabbering away. Maybe you'll start believing what you are saying. I still get a big laugh over the HT statement when just about everyone is yakking on a cellphone (especially the idiots trying to drive while yakking on the phone - and running red lights to boot).

Go back to your padded cell and shut the door behind you; thanks.

Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.449 / Virus Database: 251 - Release Date: 1/27/03

1450. Re: Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, FCC, Cronkite, ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 03:55:12 UTC
From: drakeswl@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <c0588492.0302011955.2de32680@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60533
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Boy did I just get an eyeful! I got an email from a Ham in Pittsburgh named Brian. He sent me a link to his website and sent me some original documents that convinced me he knew what he was talking about regarding the subject of this thread. I should interject here and say the FCC is the least of Baxter's worries if the material I read is even halfway accurate. Brian also did some excellent reasearch, which, if I were an ALJ, would convince me to revoke Baxter's license. The Part 97 research is as good as I've ever seen in court.

I cut and pasted Brian's opinion below:

ï¿½97.101 General standards.

(a) In all respects not specifically covered by FCC Rules each amateur station must be operated in accordance with good engineering and good amateur practice.

Apparent Violation #1[Distorted, drifting transmitters, and frequently broken tape recorders are apparent violations]

(b) Each station licensee and each control operator must cooperate in selecting transmitting channels and in making the most effective use of the amateur service frequencies. No frequency will be assigned for the exclusive use of any station.

Apparent Violation #2[No frequency is assigned exclusive use of any station, bulletin stations notwithstanding. Broadcasting on top of other hams is an apparent violation]

(d) No amateur operator shall willfully or maliciously interfere with or cause interference to any radio communication or signal.

Apparent Violation #3[Again, broadcasting over top of hams already using the frequency is an apparent violation]

ï¿½97.103 Station licensee responsibilities.

(c) The station licensee must make the station and the station records available for inspection upon request by an FCC representative. When deemed necessary by an EIC to assure compliance with FCC Rules, the station licensee must maintain a record of station operations containing such items of information as the EIC may require in accord with ï¿½0.314(x) of the FCC Rules.

Apparent Violation #4[Missing at least 2 FCC visits due to lack of a control operator at the transmission point is an apparent violation]

ï¿½97.105 Control operator duties.

(a) The control operator must ensure the immediate proper operation of the station, regardless of the type of control.

Apparent Violation #5[Tapes that break, repeat, and automatically replay themselves without correction, indicate a lack of station control, and are an apparent violation]

ï¿½97.109 Station control.

(a) Each amateur station must have at least one control point.

(b) When a station is being locally controlled, the control operator must be at the control point. Any station may be locally controlled.

Apparent Violation #6 [The only control ever alleged by K1MAN is local control. To the extent that he is not in the station during the broadcast, he is out of control, which is an apparent violation]

ï¿½97.111 Authorized transmissions.

b) In addition to one-way transmissions specifically authorized elsewhere in this Part, an amateur station may transmit the following types of one-way communications:

(6) Transmissions necessary to disseminate information bulletins

Apparent Violation #7[ARnewsline and RAIN are already stretching the bulletin rule. A call-in and talk-show is beyond the pale and is an apparent violation]

ï¿½97.113 Prohibited transmissions.

(a) No amateur station shall transmit:

(3) Communications in which the station licensee or control operator has a pecuniary interest, including communications on behalf of an employer. Amateur operators may, however, notify other amateur operators of the availability for sale or trade of apparatus normally used in an amateur station, provided that such activity is not conducted on a regular basis

Apparent Violation #8[K1MAN has an obvious pecuniary interest in the success of his charities, the International Amateur Radio Network, and the Amateur Radio Peace Corp Foundation, as well as the American Amateur Radio Association, which he soliticits donations to on a daily basis. On his website, to which he also refers his listeners, are all kinds of items for sale and solicitations for donations.]

(5) Communications, on a regular basis, which could reasonably be furnished alternatively through other radio services.

Apparent Violation #9[Every bit of the K1MAN broadcast could be alternately furnished on Short-wave]

b. nor shall an amateur station engage in any activity related to program production or news gathering for broadcasting purposes, except that communications directly related to the immediate safety of human life

Apparent Violation #10[K1MAN has routinely engaged in newsgathering and production for the purpose of retransmitting same on his broadcast. The Sam Voron interview, the John Palmer interview and the Joe Fairclough interviews in January 2003 are just a few examples in a long list]

ï¿½97.117 International communications.

Transmissions to a different country, where permitted, shall be made in plain language and shall be limited to messages of a technical nature relating to tests, and, to remarks of a personal character for which, by reason of their unimportance, recourse to the public telecommunications service is not justified.

Apparent Violation #11[Publicly calling for the resignation of an FCC official and criticizing the Federal government are not technical or personal and unimportant transmissions. To the extent that K1MAN can be heard in other countries, this is an apparent violation]

ï¿½97.3 Definitions.

(10) Broadcasting. Transmissions intended for reception by the general public, either direct or relayed.

Apparent Violation #12[Remarks directed toward non-hams, for example, offering code practice tapes to short wave listeners, during the K1MAN broadcast is an apparent violation]

(23) Harmful interference. Interference which endangers the functioning of a radionavigation service or of other safety services or seriously degrades, obstructs or repeatedly interrupts a radiocommunication service operating in accordance with the Radio Regulations.

Apparent Violation #13[Another reference indicating an apparent violation is the harmful interference to stations operating in accordance with the radio regulations who are using the frequency prior to the broadcast]

(25) Information bulletin. A message directed only to amateur operators consisting solely of subject matter of direct interest to the amateur service.

Apparent Violation #14[K1MAN is apparently in violation to the extent that his transmissions are aimed toward non-hams]

(30) Local control. The use of a control operator who directly manipulates the operating adjustments in the station to achieve compliance with the FCC Rules.

Apparent Violation #15[To the extent that K1MAN is not in the shack or using telecommand to control the station, this is an apparent violation. A radio shack timer does NOT take the place of station control]

Also Paul, many of these issues were supposed to be immediately corrected LAST YEAR on receipt of Riley Hollingsworth's letter of January 2002. Also consider the alleged apparent lack of cooperation with the Federal licensing authority; alleged threats to other hams who refuse to relinquish the frequency; and the alleged practice of sending bogus felony affidavit complaints through the US Mail, and you have a nice recipe for an immediate suspension, followed by a license revocation hearing in front of an ALJ.

End of email summary

Well, there you have it. If the FCC wants Baxter off the air, I'd say all they need to do is copy this page and send the letter.

-PJ

1451. Re: Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, FCC, Cronkite, ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 03:59:16 UTC
From: N8KDV <n8kdv@iserv.net>
Message-ID: <3E3C9793.7A8B4FED@iserv.net>
Source record: 60534
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Paul wrote:

> Boy did I just get an eyeful! I got an email from a Ham in Pittsburgh
> named Brian. He sent me a link to his website and sent me some
> original documents that convinced me he knew what he was talking about
> regarding the subject of this thread. I should interject here and say
> the FCC is the least of Baxter's worries if the material I read is
> even halfway accurate. Brian also did some excellent reasearch, which,
> if I were an ALJ, would convince me to revoke Baxter's license. The
> Part 97 research is as good as I've ever seen in court.
>
> I cut and pasted Brian's opinion below:
>
> ï¿½97.101 General standards.
>
> (a) In all respects not specifically covered by FCC Rules each amateur
> station must be operated in accordance with good engineering and good
> amateur practice.
>
> Apparent Violation #1[Distorted, drifting transmitters, and frequently
> broken tape recorders are apparent violations]
>
> (b) Each station licensee and each control operator must cooperate in
> selecting transmitting channels and in making the most effective use
> of the amateur service frequencies. No frequency will be assigned for
> the exclusive use of any station.
>
> Apparent Violation #2[No frequency is assigned exclusive use of any
> station, bulletin stations notwithstanding. Broadcasting on top of
> other hams is an apparent violation]
>
> (d) No amateur operator shall willfully or maliciously interfere with
> or cause interference to any radio communication or signal.
>
> Apparent Violation #3[Again, broadcasting over top of hams already
> using the frequency is an apparent violation]
>
> ï¿½97.103 Station licensee responsibilities.
>
> (c) The station licensee must make the station and the station records
> available for inspection upon request by an FCC representative. When
> deemed necessary by an EIC to assure compliance with FCC Rules, the
> station licensee must maintain a record of station operations

> containing such items of information as the EIC may require in accord
> with ï¿½0.314(x) of the FCC Rules.
>
> Apparent Violation #4[Missing at least 2 FCC visits due to lack of a
> control operator at the transmission point is an apparent violation]
>
> ï¿½97.105 Control operator duties.
>
> (a) The control operator must ensure the immediate proper operation of
> the station, regardless of the type of control.
>
> Apparent Violation #5[Tapes that break, repeat, and automatically
> replay themselves without correction, indicate a lack of station
> control, and are an apparent violation]
>
> ï¿½97.109 Station control.
>
> (a) Each amateur station must have at least one control point.
>
> (b) When a station is being locally controlled, the control operator
> must be at the control point. Any station may be locally controlled.
>
> Apparent Violation #6 [The only control ever alleged by K1MAN is local
> control. To the extent that he is not in the station during the
> broadcast, he is out of control, which is an apparent violation]
>
> ï¿½97.111 Authorized transmissions.
>
> b) In addition to one-way transmissions specifically authorized
> elsewhere in this Part, an amateur station may transmit the following
> types of one-way communications:
>
> (6) Transmissions necessary to disseminate information bulletins
>
> Apparent Violation #7[ARnewsline and RAIN are already stretching the
> bulletin rule. A call-in and talk-show is beyond the pale and is an
> apparent violation]
>
> ï¿½97.113 Prohibited transmissions.
>
> (a) No amateur station shall transmit:
>
> (3) Communications in which the station licensee or control operator
> has a pecuniary interest, including communications on behalf of an
> employer. Amateur operators may, however, notify other amateur
> operators of the availability for sale or trade of apparatus normally
> used in an amateur station, provided that such activity is not
> conducted on a regular basis
>
> Apparent Violation #8[K1MAN has an obvious pecuniary interest in the

> success of his charities, the International Amateur Radio Network,
> and the Amateur Radio Peace Corp Foundation, as well as the American
> Amateur Radio Association, which he soliticits donations to on a daily
> basis. On his website, to which he also refers his listeners, are all
> kinds of items for sale and solicitations for donations.]
>
> (5) Communications, on a regular basis, which could reasonably be
> furnished alternatively through other radio services.
>
> Apparent Violation #9[Every bit of the K1MAN broadcast could be
> alternately furnished on Short-wave]
>
> b. nor shall an amateur station engage in any activity related to
> program production or news gathering for broadcasting purposes, except
> that communications directly related to the immediate safety of human
> life
>
> Apparent Violation #10[K1MAN has routinely engaged in newsgathering
> and production for the purpose of retransmitting same on his
> broadcast. The Sam Voron interview, the John Palmer interview and the
> Joe Fairclough interviews in January 2003 are just a few examples in a
> long list]
>
> ï¿½97.117 International communications.
>
> Transmissions to a different country, where permitted, shall be made
> in plain language and shall be limited to messages of a technical
> nature relating to tests, and, to remarks of a personal character for
> which, by reason of their unimportance, recourse to the public
> telecommunications service is not justified.
>
> Apparent Violation #11[Publicly calling for the resignation of an FCC
> official and criticizing the Federal government are not technical or
> personal and unimportant transmissions. To the extent that K1MAN can
> be heard in other countries, this is an apparent violation]
>
> ï¿½97.3 Definitions.
>
> (10) Broadcasting. Transmissions intended for reception by the general
> public, either direct or relayed.
>
> Apparent Violation #12[Remarks directed toward non-hams, for example,
> offering code practice tapes to short wave listeners, during the K1MAN
> broadcast is an apparent violation]
>
> (23) Harmful interference. Interference which endangers the
> functioning of a radionavigation service or of other safety services
> or seriously degrades, obstructs or repeatedly interrupts a
> radiocommunication service operating in accordance with the Radio
> Regulations.

>
> Apparent Violation #13[Another reference indicating an apparent
> violation is the harmful interference to stations operating in
> accordance with the radio regulations who are using the frequency
> prior to the broadcast]
>
> (25) Information bulletin. A message directed only to amateur
> operators consisting solely of subject matter of direct interest to
> the amateur service.
>
> Apparent Violation #14[K1MAN is apparently in violation to the extent
> that his transmissions are aimed toward non-hams]
>
> (30) Local control. The use of a control operator who directly
> manipulates the operating adjustments in the station to achieve
> compliance with the FCC Rules.
>
> Apparent Violation #15[To the extent that K1MAN is not in the shack or
> using telecommand to control the station, this is an apparent
> violation. A radio shack timer does NOT take the place of station
> control]
>
> Also Paul, many of these issues were supposed to be immediately
> corrected LAST YEAR on receipt of Riley Hollingsworth's letter of
> January 2002. Also consider the alleged apparent lack of cooperation
> with the Federal licensing authority; alleged threats to other hams
> who refuse to relinquish the frequency; and the alleged practice of
> sending bogus felony affidavit complaints through the US Mail, and you
> have a nice recipe for an immediate suspension, followed by a license
> revocation hearing in front of an ALJ.
>
> End of email summary
>
> Well, there you have it. If the FCC wants Baxter off the air, I'd say
> all they need to do is copy this page and send the letter.
>
> -PJ

That all makes perfect sense to me Paul.

Steve
Holland, MI

1452. Re: Ironic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 04:20:50 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <C01%9.29012$HG.5410738@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 60535
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:1KY_9.24118$HG.4532802@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:b1h6e80t2d@enews4.newsguy.com...
> > This article is just too creepy. It was in *yesterday's* San Francisco
> > Chronicle.
> >
> > http://sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2003/01/31/MN90087.DTL
>
> What aspect was "creepy?"
>
> --
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI

My bad, I was unaware of today's tragedy until approx. 21:00. (Spent the day working the Ten-Ten contest.) I certainly meant no disrespect. :'-(

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

1453. Re: Ironic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 05:15:16 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v3paavse62gpe8@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 60536
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:C01%9.29012$HG.5410738@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> news:1KY_9.24118$HG.4532802@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> > "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:b1h6e80t2d@enews4.newsguy.com...
> > > This article is just too creepy. It was in *yesterday's* San Francisco
> > > Chronicle.
> > >
> > > http://sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2003/01/31/MN90087.DTL
> >
> > What aspect was "creepy?"
> >
> > --
> > 73 de Bert
> > WA2SI
>
> My bad, I was unaware of today's tragedy until approx. 21:00. (Spent the
day
> working the Ten-Ten contest.) I certainly meant no disrespect. :'-(
>
> --
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI

Bert
I listened to some of the Ten-Ten contest today. I don't have
a number so I didn't try to join in. How did you do in it?
BTW I heard about the accident during the Mid-CARS net
on 7258 kHz, I wasn't watching any TV today either.
--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx

1454. Re: Shuttle, Saddam (standby all shortwave KOOKS!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 05:30:48 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v3pb82spurht43@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 60537
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:b1hl3gkrm1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "Roland Stiner" <nk2u@1stconnect.com> wrote in message
> news:AfU_9.6776$yU6.2794@fe01...
> > > I don't see how anyone with any sense of humanity could
> > > find ANYTHING connected to this tragedy "funny" in any
> > > manner whatsoever ...
> >
> > I can see all Muslims all around the world rejoicing over this-very sad.
> > Roland
>
> I would hope that to be not true. I expect "some" Muslims (those
> radical extremists that simply hate all and anything American)
> to probably rejoice, but not "all". I pray I am right.
>
> Bill K2UNK
>
Bill here is a link for you to check out. At least the
Palestinians are not rejoicing over this.
http://abcnews.go.com/wire/World/reuters20030201_360.html
--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx

1455. Re: Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, FCC, Cronkite, ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 05:49:27 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@att.net>
Message-ID: <Hj2%9.17210$rq4.1237044@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 60538
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Paul" <drakeswl@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:c0588492.0302011955.2de32680@posting.google.com...
> Boy did I just get an eyeful! I got an email from a Ham in Pittsburgh
> named Brian. He sent me a link to his website and sent me some
> original documents that convinced me he knew what he was talking about
> regarding the subject of this thread. I should interject here and say
> the FCC is the least of Baxter's worries if the material I read is
> even halfway accurate. Brian also did some excellent reasearch, which,
> if I were an ALJ, would convince me to revoke Baxter's license. The
> Part 97 research is as good as I've ever seen in court.
>
> I cut and pasted Brian's opinion below:
>

<<<<<<<<SNIP>>>>>>>>>>

Wow! so this is how a lawyer thinks!!

What if K1MAN's advocate would establish that W1AW, has over time, done essentially all of the same things? (The only stipulated difference is bulletin "content".)

What if K1MAN's advocate could produce sworn depositions that W1AW used to swing its BC frequencies a few hertz to avoid starting up on on-going QSO's? (ed. This occured up into the '70's but was dropped along about the time that W1AW simultaneous multi-frequency broadcast was upgraded to commercial transmitters on fixed frequencies with robot control. -- Note that this suggests that there may not be control operators in attendance, according to Brian's rules).

Perhaps some more research is required before going before the ALJ?

Again, IMHO, the only rational way out of this is to require all bulletin stuff be restricted to the Morse/Data segments. W1AW saved, K1MAN gone.

73,
Clay N4AOX

1456. ARNewsline 1329 - Jan 31 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 08:28:57 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030202032857.21580.00000805@mb-mu.aol.com>
Source record: 60539

Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1329 - January 31, 2003

==========

A NOTE TO THOSE WHO ONLY "READ" AMATEUR RADIO NEWSLINE(tm)

For those of you who only know of the Amateur Radio Newsline (tm) as a text newsletter we would like to invite you to listen to the audio version. This Amateur Radio Newsline (tm) script is actually written for the "spoken word." It is recorded each by professional broadcasters and is available for private listening or rebroadcast over your repeater. Two methods of delivery are available: FTP MP3 or dial-in telephone. Please visit our website at http://www.arnewsline.org for a list of telephone numbers (you have to pay your own long distance charges) and links to our voice newscast. On site free FTP Downloads are available at our site by clicking on the newscast number at the top of the page.

de
The Newsline Production Team

==========

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1329 with a release date of Friday, January 31, 2003 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T. Ham radio assiastance continues at the Australian wildfires and the ARRL asks the FCC to go slow on spectrum reorganization. Find out the details on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1329 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

RESCUE RADIO: AUSTRALIAN FIRES FOLLOW-UP

Amateur Radio is still supporting firefighting efforts in Australia. Q-News Graham Kemp, VK4BB, is in Brisbane with the latest.

--

--
vk1zpl audio
--

That's the voice of Phil Longdon VK1ZPL WICEN - ACT Coordinator speaking from Canberra.

As these Wildfires, or as we "downunder" call them "Bushfires" raced through South Eastern Australia they came dreadfully close to the Deep Space Network antennas at the NASA's site at Tidbinbilla. Here four giant antennas including Deep Space Station 43 - a 230-foot steerable antenna - the largest in the Southern Hemisphere are located.

The world famous Mount Stromlo Observatory west of Canberra was totally incinerated by the fires - a nearly $12 million loss.

Luckily for the Amateur Population, their main repeater was spared.

--

"The VK1 Black Hill repeater: Well if the hill wasn't black before it is now. It will be two to three weeks before they can gain access to the site, all the coaxial cables on the mast have been melted or damaged in some way.

A contractor for the tracking station will be removing and replacing them. Unfortunately these VK1 cables are not part of the contractors work, VK1 hams intend to try and get a price from the contractor to install their cables as they do the work for the tracking station. The equipment in the hut appears to be undamaged however will need to be checked out".

--

And the current scene in VK1 Phil?

--
Audio Here
--

Further South from Phil in VK3, The number of radio amateurs involved in providing communications assistance during the three week long fire disaster in north-east Victoria is growing DAILY, with two separate and distinct activities taking place.

WICEN Victoria has radio operators at three Incident Control Centres and two airbases in the north-east, while Red Cross is using its RECOM data communications system.

WICEN Victoria State Coordinator, John Kerr VK3BAF expects the provision of radio operators to the Department of Sustainability and Environment in the north-east could continue for at least another two weeks.

Additionally, John Kerr VK3BAF said, "WICEN has now been requested by the Victoria Police to be on a much higher level of standby to provide point to point communications should other radio or telephone networks fail".

--

"WICEN Victoria has now set up a statewide HF-radio network using the 40 and 80 meter bands. 3.6 and 7.075 MHz +/- QRM with 'W' abbreviated callsigns. Operators at Corryong will use callsigns 'WIC', Mt Beauty

'WIB,' etc. and net control AWI to the designated listening post on each band.

Schedule times are 0700 and 2000 hrs for 80 meters, 0900 and 1800 hrs for 40 meters with a continuous listening watch at all other times, especially on the hour up to three minutes past".

--

In other activity, the Australian Red Cross National Registration and Inquiry System is using three teams of radio amateurs at three entres - Eskdale, Bright and Omeo registering thousands of people who have been displaced.

A Red Cross WICEN communications system known as RECOM relies on radio amateurs in the field to transmit to a State Inquiry Centre the registration details of emergency evacuees.

This information is transmitted by radio amateurs at the Red Cross registration centres using laptop computers linked to amateur radio transceivers using PACTOR II.

WICEN Victoria's Division 4 Region 4 Coordinator, Peter Weeks VK3YZP reported late 29 January that currently there are 12 radio amateurs in the field - ten at Incident Control Centres, and two at airbases for fire bombing radio traffic. WICEN has been sourcing radio amateurs for the airbases who have aircraft experience.

Peter VK3YZP stresses that no radio amateur should enter the Alpine region without being assigned by WICEN Victoria, authorised by the other authorities, have been properly equipped with clothing, and provided an entry escort.

Reporting from Brisbane Australia, Im Graham Kemp, VK4BB, of Q-News for the Amateur Radio Newsline.

--

Meantime, Phil Longdon, VK1ZPL reports that Australia's Wireless Institute Civic Emergency Network or is providing operators at the Yarralumla Shire Fire Control Center. Longworth says that WICEN is supplying a total of ten operators with others on standby if needed. (VK1 WICEN, WIA Victoria and QNEWS)

**

REGULATORY: ARRL ASKS FCC TO GO SLOW

The ARRL has registered mixed feelings about the FCC's Spectrum Policy Task Force Report issued last November. In comments filed this week, the League called the report a positive first step in developing a comprehensive spectrum management approach but stopped short of endorsing it as presented.

In a bulletin to its members the ARRL says that the report fails to address the needs and goals of the Amateur Service. It also says that the report's orientation toward commercial services makes it not wholly applicable to the Amateur Radio which cannot pay for spectrum access.

And says the ARRL there's not been enough time to study the report's recommendations thoroughly, much less deploy them immediately. The League urged the FCC to not abandon longstanding allocation policies that are based on engineering.

But the ARRL reaction is not entirely negative. It says that it was encouraged that the FCC had worked to involve all portions of the telecommunications industry in developing a spectrum policy. And the ARRL has asked the FCC to consider greater use of "negotiated rulemaking" to expedite allocation decisions. (ARRL)

**

RADIO LAW: GOVERNMENT TOLD IT CANNOT RECLAIM FREQUENCIES

The United States Supreme Court has ordered the Federal government to return billions of dollars worth of unused wireless licenses to NextWave Telecom Inc.. This, as the court tells the government that it cannot take back what has been bought, even if it was not paid for.

Nextwave had defaulted on payment for the licenees it purchased at auction and the FCC had moved to reclain the bandspace. Nextwave went to litigation to stop the government seizure.

It all ended on Monday January 27th. At that time Justice Anthony Scalia, writing for the court, said the Commission could not justify intervening in the bankruptcy proceeding to take the licenses by claiming a regulatory motive.

The spectrum has been hanging limbo during the protracted court battle. (Published reports)

**

Break 1

From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world Xerox Amateur Radio Club repeater -- WD6CZH -- serving El Segundo California.

(5 sec pause here)

**

ENFORCEMENT: COORDINATED REPEATER VS. COORDINATED REPEATER

Two coordinated repeaters in the North-East have squared off over the use of a repeater pair. And if the FCC does decide to try to solve this one, it may need the wisdom of a King Solomon. Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, has more:

--

Connecticuts Northville Amateur Radio Association's NA1RA machine is coordinated by the Connecticut Spectrum Management Association. This is a relatively new repeater coordinator that was formed a few years after the failure of the Tri-State Amateur Repeater Council. Tri-State was the group used to serve parts of New York, New Jersey and Connecticut.

And now Northville has complained to the FCC about interference to its NA1RA operation coming from the W2KGY repeater. This is a system operated by the West Point Military Academy Amateur Radio Club at West Point New York. But unlike most cases where one repeater is coordinated and the other is not, W2KGY holds coordination from UNYREPCO -- The Upper New York Repeater Council.

When one repeater is coordinated and the other is not, the answer is simple. The uncoordinated repeater bears the majority of responsibility to clear up interference to the coordinated machine. But in this case, both machines appear to hold legitimate coordination but from different adjoining coordinators. In other words, at least at this writing, both repeaters appear to be on the same channel pair becasuse a coordinator says thats where each respective systems should be.

So far, the only action by the FCC has been to send out an information gathering letter to UNYREPCO. UNYREPCO has responded and a copy of that response has been forwarded to the Northville group for its reply along with a recommendation that
a response from the Connecticut Spectrum Management Association be included as well. Only after digesting that response is the FCC likely to render a decision as to whether or not it will get involved. Well let you know what the agency decides.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF.

--

In the past, on verification that all systems in a dispute held bona fide assignments from a recognized frequency coordinator the FCC has opted to stand aside and permit the coordinators solve any disagreements that might arise. (FCC)

**

ENFORCEMENT: HAM WHO OPERATED UNLICENSED STATION TURNS IN LICENSE

A Berkely Michigan ham has submitted his license to the FCC for cancellation after being accused of operating an unlicensed transmitter in the FM broadcast band. According to the W5YI Report, Thomas Brothers, may not reapply for another Amateur Radio license for the next five years. He was also fined $10,000 after direction finding and an inspection of his premisis found the transmitter on 88.3 Mhz in the F-M band. (W5YI)

**

ENFORCEMENT: OPERATION BEFORE LICENSE ARIVES BRINGS SET ASIDE

The FCC has set aside of General Class license of John Gregory, W3ATE, of Lake Placid, Florida. This, for operation outside of his Technician class license privileges prior to recieving his General class license grant.

According to the regulatory agency at various times in 2002 Gregory apparently checked into a net on 14.300 MHz while still licensed as a Technician. He was issued Warning Notices regarding this matter on May 6 and June 6, 2002 but letters were returned to the FCC marked unclaimed.

Now the FCC has issued another notice to Gregory that gave him 20 days to explain his actions. If he fails to respond the FCC says that his General class application will be dismissed. (FCC)

**

ENFORCEMENT: UNLICENSED OUT OF BAND WARNING

Ten radio operators, eight of whom are hams have been sent warning notices by the FCC. This, regarding their alleged operation on 26.555 and 25.540 MHz.

In each case the warning letter recipient was told that operation of radio transmitting equipment on these frequencies without a license is a violation of Section 301 of the Communications Act . As such he could be subject to a fine or imprisonment if he continues on the air. Fines normally range from $7,500 to $10,000. (FCC)

**

NAMES IN THE NEWS: AA6JR NAMED TO HEAD ARRL PR COMMITTEE

On a much more positive note, word that Jeff Reinhardt, AA6JR, of Agoura Hills, California, has appointed by ARRL President Jim Haynie, W5JBP, as 2003 chairman of the League's Public Relations Committee. Reinhardt, who was recently elercted Mayor of Agoura Hills is also Public Information Coordinator for the ARRL Santa Barbara Section and Public Information Officer for his local club. (ARRL)

**

PROMOTING THE HOBBY: "AMATEUR RADIO TODAY" - THE VIDEO - FOLLOW-UP

This word to those who are wanting to obtain a copy of the new ARRL ham video "Amateur Radio Today." Please remember that the American Radio Relay League holds the legal and intellectual copyright to this program and that it is the one and only official, legitimate source for the new show. No other individual or group has been authorized to distribute it -- be it free or for a charge.

The ARRL plans to make Ham Radio Today available on both Video C-D and VHS tape. To get on the list for a copy please take your web browser to www.arrl.org/catalog and follow the instructions to order item number

8861. (ARRL)

**

HAM RADIO TRAINING: OMARC IN NEW JERSEY

OMARC - New Jersey's Oceam Monmouth Amateur Radio Club is sponsoring ham radio training classes again this winter. The sessions begin Tuesday, March 18th 2003 and run through the end of May. Classes will be held at the InfoAge Center OMARC Diana site, building 9116 on Marconi Road, in Wall Township. All classes will be begin promptly at 6:30p.m., each Tuesday night. For information on the clsees, ham radio testing and directions visit www.qsl.net/n2mo (OMARC)

**

CONVENTIONS AND HAMFESTS: NAB HAM RADIO RECEPTION IN LAS VEGAS

The annual National Association of Broadcasters Ham Radio Reception will take place during the NAB Convention on Wednesday April 9. The reception venue is the Hilton Hotel adjacent to the Las Vegas Convention Center.

Again this year the reception is co-hosted by CQ Magazine and Kenwood Communications and runs from 6 to 8 PM. This gives anyone planning to attend ample time to see one another yet ending early enough so that people can enjoy a night on the town or grab a flight nome.

More information on the Ham Radio Reception will be posted at www.cq-amateur-radio.com. Information about the convention and on-line registration is at www.nab.org/conventions (CQ)

**

BREAK 2

This is ham radio news for today's radio amateur. From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org and being relayed by the volunteer services of the following radio amateur:

(5 sec pause here)

**

THE WEB: NEW BUG SLOWS DOWN THE WWW

If you had problems surfing the World-Wide-Web last weekend you were not alone. A fast-spreading worm-like infection called Slamm SQL is being blamed for dramatically slowing down Internet traffic, interfering with Web browsing and delaying e-mail delivery. Bruce Tennant, K6PZW takes a look at what happened:

--
Agencies assigned to monitor the Internet say that the latest bug hit on

Saturday, January 25th. That's when at least 40,000 infected computers were found to be transmitting a flood of data that was disrupting hundreds of thousands of other servers worldwide.

The virus-like attack, which began about 12:30 a.m. EST, sought out vulnerable computers on the Internet to infect using a known flaw in popular database software from Microsoft Corp. According to the Computer Associates Virus Information Center, the SQL Slamme worm exploits a buffer overrun security vulnerability in Microsoft SQL Server 2000 and the Microsoft Desktop Engine 2000. The worm scans randomly generated I P addresses for vulnerable systems and sends out numerous packets, which may effectively cause a denial of service attack on the infected network. That translates into a lot of useless data clogging the Internet and causing it to bog down.

The only good thing about this worm -- if there can be anything good -- is that it does not go after home computers unless they happen to be running Microsoft SQL Server as an operating system. Also, this worm does not infect files and does not send any e-mail out. It exists only in the memory of the successfully exploited system. The downside is that there is no file based anti-virus signature available to detect this worm.

Monitors reported significant slowdowns, although recovery efforts appeared to be succeeding. A spokesman for Microsoft Corp. confirmed that Internet congestion was interfering with administrators trying to download the crucial software patch that Microsoft made available to protect vulnerable computers. The spokesman said that the congestion was also preventing consumers from contacting Microsoft over the Internet to unlock the anti-piracy features of its latest products.

According to a statement from Bill Murray of the Federal Bureau of Investigations National Infrastructure Protection Center, the overall Internet began to normalize by early Monday the 27th. And while everyone from on-line publishers in the United States to a telephone company in Finland seemed to be hit by the latest worm the world's largest Internet provider, America Online, reported no problems with any aspect of its service.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Bruce Ternnant, K6PZW, in Los Angeles.

--

A check of our own statistics shows that Amateur Radio Newsline was not badly affected by the worm. Comparing downloads to the previous weekend we saw no significant change. (ARNewsline™ from published reports)

**

EMERGING TECHNOLOGY: PORTABLE PEOPLE METERS ARE WATCHING YOU

Media ratings company Arbitron has released some initial ratings results for its new television, cable and radio audience measurement system that it calls the Portable People Meter or P-P-M. The Portable People Meter has been undergoing U.S. market trials within the Philadelphia market since December of 2000. The PPM is pager-sized and is carried by consumers. It automatically detects inaudible codes that TV and radio broadcasters as well as cable networks embed in the audio portion of their programming using encoders provided by Arbitron. (TV Technology)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: AMSAT PRESENTS THE FUTURE

Slow Scan TV and a possible plasma cloud experiment were among possible future projects discussed at a recent meeting of the Amateur Radio on the International Space Station or ARISS International Team. According to the ARRL Letter, the group included representatives from ARISS partner countries, their national ham radio societies and several national AMSAT groups.

Among other experiments discussed was a slow-scan television system camera that could be launched later this year. It would allow school groups to see as well as hear the astronauts during ARISS contacts.

Also discussed were a number of other future possibilities. These ranged from crossband operation from VHF to 10 meters using PSK-31 and a full-duplex voice repeater to comparing the performance of various solar arrays and even conducting a plasma cloud experiment. No details were available on what that might entail but plans are well under way to activate a 70-centimeter station from the I-S-S. (ARRL, ARISS, CQ)

**

RADIO IN SPACE: EDUCATOR ASTRONAUT RECRUITMENT PROGRAM

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration says that recruitment is currently underway for the Educator Astronaut Program. Applicants must be teachers who are U.S. citizens, certified to instruct Kindergarden through 12th grade with a minimum three years in-classroom teaching experience within the past four years. They must also hold at least a bachelor's degree in physical science, biological science, engineering or mathematics, or an education degree with a concentration in physical science, biological science, engineering or mathematics. An Amateur Radio license is not required. Applications are being accepted through April 30th. More information and the application package is available at http://edspace.nasa.gov. (NASA)

**

INTERNATIONAL - ISRAEL: TREES REMEMBER 911

Hagal International reports that the Israel Amateur Radio Club will plant one hundred and nineteen trees in that nations Silent Keys' Forest. These trees are in memory of the ham radio operators who lost their lives in the September 11th 2001 terrorist atacks in New York

City, Washington D-C and Pennsylvania.

Hagal International is the English language on-line edition of the Israel Amateur Radio Club's monthly magazine. It can be found in cyberspace at www.iarc.org. The planting of trees in rememberence is a tradition among people of the Jewish faith. (Hagal International)

**

INTERNATIONAL - UK: CLUB GETS LOTTERY FUNDING

Now how's this for getting money for club projects. The Telford and District Amateur Radio Society in Great Britain has received confirmation of receiving U-K National Lottery funding to the tune of 2,908 Pounds. This, for its Foundation and Intermediate class Amateur Radio licence training programes.

The monies will cover the purchase of training materials, room rental expensse, equipment, tools and everything else needed to do the job properly. Currently, 16 beginners are undergoing training at the home of G3JKX on weekends. The club is also a certified examination center and offers all levels of Morse and written testing. (RSGB)

**

DX

In D-X, word that Marti Laine, OH2BH, and several of his friends will be active from Johnston Island through February 5th. Laine made the destination of his latest D-X adventure public on a stop over for lunch with some friends in Los Angeles on Friday January 24th. The multi-member team will operate the High Frequency bands plus 6 meters on SSB, CW and RTTY. Q-S-L direct to OH2BH. (Various)

And the second DX'pedition to Ducie Island is scheduled to begin on March 8th and last about a week. According to the C-Q website, the new operation will include nine operators from five countries, with stations on all bands from 160 through6 meters plus the AO-40 satellite, on CW, SSB and RTTY. The callsign will be VP6DI2. Yes, that's a number two at the end, not a zee or zed. Very apropos don't you think. (CQ)

Lastly, word that IV3NCC is active portable A 4 from Oman for a the next several months. Look for him on the usual frequencies on the High Frequency bands and QSL as directed on the air. (GB2RS)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: BE PREPARED

And finally this week, as the world grows more tense with each passing day, it is important for ham radio communicators to be prepared for any eventuality. Lloyd Colston, KC5FM, is with the Mayes County Emergency Management in Pryor Oklahoma. He says that the first step is to form a Community Emergency Response Team:

--
Audio only report. Hear it at http://www.arnewsline.org
--

Lloyd will be back next week with some ideas on how you can personally be ready to cope with any emergency or disaster in your area. (KC5FM)

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, Amateur News Weekly, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline @arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I'm Mert Garlick, N6AWE, saying 73 and we thank you for listening." Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2002. All rights reserved.

1457. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 13:08:26 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E3D1806.8543FD35@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60540

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> StevenSON
>
> AnderSON
>
> Foghorn Leghorn: "I say there, SON......."

A slight error, Richard. Foghorn Leghorn was intentionally funny.
Foghorn Lenhorn isn't.

> No doubt I wasn't the only one to notice the connection????

Dave K8MN

1458. Re: Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, FCC, Cronkite, ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 13:27:41 UTC
From: No Name <NoName@mycomputer.net>
Message-ID: <mp6q3v8la50pnn4jdjvm8nguqrdssmocp9@4ax.com>
Source record: 60543
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

On Sun, 02 Feb 2003 05:49:27 GMT, "Clay N4AOX" <wyn@att.net> wrote:

>
>"Paul" <drakeswl@hotmail.com> wrote in message
>news:c0588492.0302011955.2de32680@posting.google.com...
>> Boy did I just get an eyeful! I got an email from a Ham in Pittsburgh
>> named Brian. He sent me a link to his website and sent me some
>> original documents that convinced me he knew what he was talking about
>> regarding the subject of this thread. I should interject here and say
>> the FCC is the least of Baxter's worries if the material I read is
>> even halfway accurate. Brian also did some excellent reasearch, which,
>> if I were an ALJ, would convince me to revoke Baxter's license. The
>> Part 97 research is as good as I've ever seen in court.
>>
>> I cut and pasted Brian's opinion below:
>>
>
><<<<<<<<<SNIP>>>>>>>>>>
>
>Wow! so this is how a lawyer thinks!!
>
>What if K1MAN's advocate would establish that W1AW, has over time, done
>essentially all of the same things? (The only stipulated difference is
>bulletin "content".)
>
>What if K1MAN's advocate could produce sworn depositions that W1AW used to
>swing its BC frequencies a few hertz to avoid starting up on on-going QSO's?
>(ed. This occured up into the '70's but was dropped along about the time
>that W1AW simultaneous multi-frequency broadcast was upgraded to commercial
>transmitters on fixed frequencies with robot control. -- Note that this
>suggests that there may not be control operators in attendance, according to
>Brian's rules).
>
>Perhaps some more research is required before going before the ALJ?
>
>Again, IMHO, the only rational way out of this is to require all bulletin
>stuff be restricted to the Morse/Data segments. W1AW saved, K1MAN gone.
>
>73,
>Clay N4AOX
>
>

The easiest thing for the FCC to hang its hat on is the lack of control operator. Baxter admits using a "Radio Shack timer" W1AW has 1 or 2 fully licensed operators at the transmitter controls during all of its operations. That in itself should be enough to rid us of Mr. Baxter with no collateral damage to W1AW. The time has come to drain this festering boil.

1459. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 13:36:31 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030202083631.05048.00000418@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 60541

In article <3E3C851B.46C28747@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>>
>> Fact is, FCC wants out of code testing for a number of reasons that have
>little
>> to do with the good of amateur radio. Examples:
>>
>> - FCC doesn't want all the admin work of medical waivers.
>> - FCC doesn't want more petitions for or against code testing
>> - FCC thinks that if code testing is removed and written testing reduced,
>> people who formerly went to cb or freebanding will become hams, thereby
>> reducing enforcement headaches.
>
>All they reduced was the code. It's still the same material on the writtens.
>The differing amount of questions on the tests has little effect on how hard
>one needs to study to prepare for the tests.

The old written system required 5 tests, the new system only 3. A new Tech used
to have to pass two tests totalling 65 questions, now it's only a single 35
question test. Upgrading from General to Extra used to require two tests
totalling 90 questions, now it's a single 50 question test.

Yes, the material tested is roughly the same (some obsolete rules questions
were deleted). But with fewer tests and questions, the tendency is to focus
more on rules & regs and less on technical stuff.
>
>I wonder if any freebanders decided to get a ham license (general or
>extra, the ones with HF privs) and operate legally on ham bands and
>quit illegal operations in other bands.

Perhaps a few. More likely, someone contemplating freeband might go legit
instead.

>Of course nobody is going to
>say that he "upgraded" to ham from "freeband".
>
BINGO!!

>All the above can be explained by the fact that it reduces costs
>for the FCC.
>
Agreed, but I don;t think that's the only reason.

In any event, note this: What reduces costs for the FCC isn't necessarily what's goodt for the ARS. FCC cut back on enforcement for years to reduce costs - was that good for the ARS?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1460. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 13:56:34 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E3D2343.B2CCE6C8@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60542

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E3AF193.B187CE47@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <3E39A342.59208604@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >> Just how did you communicate out of Helsinki without any
> >> >> radio set, boy? MilSpec Nokia cell-phones? :-)
> >> >
> >> >Why do you want to know? Are you beginning a new series of lies?
> >> >Shall I reproduce N2EY's insightful quote?
> >>
> >> Reproduce anything you want. Create hordes of bastard
> >> Truthspeak statements.
> >>
> >None were bastard statements. The statements I reposted were archives
> >of what I actually wrote as compared to what you've repeatedly and
> >incorrectly said I wrote. You've told told quite a number of times that
> >your statements were incorrect. I've offered proof.
>
> "...told told..."? :-)

"Go such..." :-)

> I've remarked some of what transpired in here 1997 through 1998.
> That isn't "incorrect" except in a universe centered on yourself.

You can't get the years correct even after you were advised of your
error.

> >Why should I allow you to attribute statements to me which are not
> >truthful?

> You should not.

Let's let that response stand in stark white for full effect.

> Then again, what you've said is no more
> "truth" than selective quoting, taking one message out of a
> thread of many as stored in a privately-run "archival" site as
> handled as if it were court documents.

I've asked where the selective quoting came from. I provided quoted messages showing my original comments and stating that I did not originate the system but worked with what was in place. The privately run archive sight has all posted messages from the time in question to present. You are free to look for anything I might have omitted and to repost it here.

> There are several reality-based statements that I made some
> long time ago that apparently outraged Heil. These were:
>
> 1. Guinea-Bisseau (a former colony) has a low rank among
> 3rd world middle African countries...its chief export in
> world trade is reported to be cashew nuts. It seems to
> remain in the same regard some years later.

Most African countries are former colonies. Guinea-Bissau is an armpit. You missed fish, shrimp and lobster as major exports--lots and lots of fish, shrimp and lobster. As fascinating as all of this is, it does not address statements made by me regarding the use of CW by the USG.

> 2. The use of manual telegraphy on an otherwise RTTY circuit
> for exchange of operating schedules and other comm data
> is questionable. That is very uncommon procedure among
> all other commercial or military or government HF radio
> users, including localities close to the equator. That is
> normally not done now nor was it done back before WW2.
> If a TTY works at all on a radio circuit, then a TTY is used
> for the "order-wire." If TTY will not work as an "order-wire"
> then it makes no sense to use it for regular message traffic.

So far, the only questioning I've ever received on the issue is from you. Others seem to understand my frequent explanations. I've never claimed that the use of CW for this purpose was common or worldwide. You'd, of course, not have any way of knowing what is or was done by military or government HF radio users in Africa or worldwide in the present era--your being a retired fellow in California whose big claim to HF operation was half a century back.

> Add to this -
>
> 3. US State Department communications networks are much
> smaller than any communications networks among the US
> Army, US Navy, and US Air Force. USN and US Army
> radio networks were running on HF prior to WW2 on a
> 24/7 basis (continuously, around the clock) using equipment
> designed for the task. The US State Department radio
> communications equipment, procedures, etc., have never
> been considered "leading edge" nor always up to the state
> of the radio art by anyone except the US State Department.

I've never made any statement regarding the size of State Department communications networks nor have I ever stated the State Department comms of the time were "leading edge", though they are now certainly

"state of the art".
So, what's your point?

> 4. A small former colony with small population and small economy
> and posing no real threat to anyone in middle Africa or the
> rest of the world cannot logically be considered to be any
> sort of "key post" ("key" as in important or meaningful or of
> high rank). One can assume that US Embassy activities
> would not be, nor have to be, in operation continuously around
> the clock except for the USMC guard activities.

There is no Department of State listing of "key posts". There is the
"Key Officers" listing, as you've discovered. You can assume whatever
you'd like about the hours of operation. Those will remain only
assumptions.

> 5. The US Department of State is engaged in US government
> foreign relations in an overall diplomatic mission (as in work
> assignment). It is not engaged in direct defense of the
> USA nor is it tasked for direct offense from the USA...with
> the possible exception of certain former employees who feel
> superior to ordinary citizens IN the USA.

You are not in a position to be an expert on what the U.S. Department of
State does. You could learn a great deal more from public documents.
There are a great many things that you'll never know. My superiority in
this case will consist merely of "I know more about it than you know".

> 6. Activities of the US State Department do not solely involve
> radio, certainly not amateur radio. The US military branches
> all have MARS facilities which sometimes work with US
> radio amateurs. The US State Department does not, nor
> can it "rule" over communications activities of the US military
> abroad (that is an NTIA and DoD liason activity enforced
> within respective military commands).

Actually, Len, the Department of State does "rule" over activity within
a country where the United States has an embassy. The Ambassador, as the
President's representative in the host country, is in charge.
State RULEZ!

> 7. All of the above can be researched by anyone else and
> found to be correct...with the exception of certain newsgroup
> regulars who demand others to follow their words explicitly
> and without question...for they are superior.

It looks as if you could stand to do some more research.

> >Incorrect, Foghorn Lenhorn.
>
> Some creativity on Heil's part noted. AFTRA yields a grade
> of D+ due to lack of respect for the late Kenny Delmar, the
> voice of "Senator Claghorn" on the Fred Allen Show (radio).

You're no Kenny Delmar, nor did I refer to Kenny Delmar.

> >Your current predicament came about as a
> >result of one too many of your deliberate falsehoods.
>
> I have NO "predicament."

Your inability to perceive it only compounds your predicament.

> Heil has NOT discussed the validity of using manual CW on
> a US government RTTY circuit, the original question raised
> some years ago. Heil is thus ruled technically deficient.

Wrong again. Heil has discussed it. You didn't like it. That doesn't
begin to address you often repeated false statements about what I've
written.

> >> Amateur radio policy matters are well down on the list.
> >> What matters most is PCTA "personal honors" at stake,
> >> that their Truthspeak is true when it is not.
> >
> >That isn't what happened at all. You are the individual responsible for
> >bringing up any of this.
>
> I was never involved in US State Department communications
> and never stationed in any 3rd world middle African country at
> any US embassy.

Well, there you have it.

You did, however, repeatedly make a number of false statements. One of
them was that I claimed originality for a CW order wire. Your current
rant has conveniently left that unaddressed.

> I have been part of a much larger US Army
> radio network working "24/7" (continuously, around the clock)
> during a period of over 30 years. Heil insists that "no one"
> operates 24/7 and forbids the expression "24/7" referring to
> anyone being "on-call" at any time away from their scheduled
> operating times.

Heils insists simply because no one anywhere on the planet works 24/7.
Companies can be in operation 24/7. Military organizations can operate
24/7.
Military components can work 24/7. You can't work 24/7 despite your
earlier statement that you did so. Being on call is not working 24/7.
I spent my entire State Department career being on call for at least one
week out of three. I've spent large parts of those years being on call
for months on end.
At no time did I ever work 24/7.

> Heil has continued to redefine colloquialisms and common
> expressions to suit his purpose. That purpose is, seemingly,
> to portray himself as a radio expert, an important guru within

> US government

It isn't to suit my purpose, Len. It suits reality. If I wanted to portray myself as an important guru like yourself, I'd have claimed that I worked 24/7 for all of those years.

> ...all because so few others have ever been
> working in the same US government capacity.

So few others? That's absurd. I can see that more research on your part is called for.

> He MUST reply to this message. His "honor" demands it. He
> MUST be "right." QED.

He did reply to your message. Accuracy demands it.

(Len MUST reply to this message. His compulsive-obsessive side demands it.
He MUST have the last word.)

Dave K8MN

1461. Re: Claims Of Dishonesty

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 14:19:33 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E3D28A8.B5A2A2C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60544

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20030131211320.27873.00000375@mb-mj.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:
>
> >In article <3E3A019D.737290D7@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >writes:
> >
> >>Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>>
> >>> In article <f45722ac.0301300603.26f915b@posting.google.com>,
> >>> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> >>>
> >>> >> Careful, Brian, Reverend Jimmie might be Out To Getcha!
> >>> >>
> >>> >> Check for tatoos on his knuckles if you see him... :-)
> >>> >
> >>> >Len, give it up! He nailed you good on the Extra out of the box (no
> >>> >time limit stipulated, however). I think I told Bruce I was going to
> >>> >get Extra, also.
> >>>
> >>> Reverend Jimmie rode into town, found an old message
> >>> under an old stack of messages, yanked it out and...
> >>
> >> ...posted it for all to see. There is was in black and white.
> >>
> >> Googled again.
> >
> >That's really what it comes down to, Dave. But Mr. Anderson becomes quite
> >agitated when he is shown to be in error.
>
> Reverend Jimmie Callsign seems to get prissy and pedantic
> whenever his "honor" is perceived sullied...says anyone not
> going along with his statements is "mistaken" or "in error."

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

> >Note the above comparisons to an old movie character.
>

> Note some others' use of old cartoon character names! :-)

Those appear when you go into your "Herr Robust" or "the colonel" or
"Prussian" rants. They'll continue to do so, Foghorn.

> >We've been all through this before, Dave. The context is whatever Mr.
> >Anderson says it is.
>
> How so? I don't redefine common expressions. No human
> individual can work continuously without rest or food, yet
> tens of thousands of humans around the world are on call
> outside of regular work hours. Heil disallows the expression
> of "on call" in reference to the expression "24/7." Heil does
> not want the "24/7" label to apply to units and organizations
> (which they DO apply to), only to individuals. Illogical and
> invalid demands.

False statement. Heil has no objections to units and organizations
working 24/7. I object when you tell us that YOU worked 24/7. You did
not.

By the way, you've repeatedly used the phrase "out of context" but
you've never advised us of what you considered to be the context.
You've never shown that your remark was taken out of context. All we
get is a rant about "Heil".

> >More than 2000 years after Julius Caesar crossed the Rubicon, too. 2500 or so
> >years since the battle on the plain of Marathon. Humans still run marathons,
> >by the way - guess we runners are "clinging to the past".
>
> Ahem...the old Romans and old Greeks did NOT have radio.
>
> How does elementary world history of ancient times apply to
> amateur radio, let alone amateur radio policy?

Those who ignore history are condemned to repeat it.

> >Mr. Anderson has said he "knows morse" in another post, but perhaps that was
> >another error, since anyone who "knows morse" in the context of amateur radio
> >should be able to pass the 5 wpm test.
>
> Perhaps Reverend Jimmie Callsign confuses himself in an
> effort to Correction Of The Heathen or to the Sacred NEED
> To Take A Ticket Test?

Well, you did claim to know morse. Five words per minute is about as
basic as it gets. Even children can decode morse at 5 wpm.

> Apparently this is another in a series of Redefinition Statements
> wherein (the Heil case) "An Interest In Radio = Amateur Licensing."

No wiggling, Len. You claimed an interest in AMATEUR radio for some
decades.

That decades long "interest" hasn't resulted in your becoming licensed
despite your having told us that you were going for Extra right out of
the box.

> According to Rev. J. Callsign, "Knowing Morse (code that is) =
> Should Take An Amateur Test."
>
> :-)

Decades of interest in amateur radio + knowledge of morse code + going
for an Extra right out of the box = zilch.

> >Dave, Mr. Anderson obviously suffers from poor language comprehension. He
> >does not understand your radio operations for the State Department. Such
> >misunderstandings and misquotes are common for Mr. Anderson.
>
> Ah, but Rev. Jimmie Callsign DOES! Amazing. Here's a holy
> man who never served in any US military or US government
> position in any sort of radio communications who KNOWS
> all. The good reverend never worked any commercial HF
> radio carrier's position yet he KNOWS all about procedures
> and methods and equipment in the rest of the radio world.

Naw, he just compehends it.

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

>
> First of all, that was a Negative against ARRL. The Reverend
> does NOT like ANY negative comment against ARRL. (they
> are inviolate, all criticsms are to be battled against with fury,
> scorn, derision, etc.). Next we have Jimmie trying to shoot
> down a book reseller with charges of "unprofitable business!"

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

>
> >Interest levels vary, Dave. Mr. Anderson's interest level has not reached the
> >point of being licensed in the amateur radio service. Is that a bad thing?
>
> Pssst, Reverend, Mr. Anderson got involved AND interested in

> radio communications and all electronics beginning in 1952
> while in the service of his country (the USA), actually working
> HF communications beginning in 1953. Big-Time comm, lots
> of messaging, stations working around the clock continuously.
> No morse code modes were used in that communications.

Pssst--that ain't amateur radio, Len.

> As late as the year 2003, few pedantic prussian persons
> REDEFINE words and phrases to insist that "Interest In
> Radio" = "Must Get An Amateur License." QED.

Decades of interest in amateur radio + knowledge of morse code + going
for an Extra right out of the box = zilch.

> Of course it is a "Bad Thing" to some. They NEED that
> amateur radio license to wave around and show how superior
> they are to others. No problem here, it is well understood.

If you object to being made to feel inferior to hams, why do you spend
your time in an amateur radio newsgroup?

> >Perhaps we should have a nice ragchew on 80 or 40 CW some evening. It would
> >be good to hear tales of Helsinki, Dar-es-Salaam, and other exotic locales
> from
> >someone who lived there for years, while serving our country's diplomatic
> >mission.
>
> Wow, yes. It should be on display Here!

Sorry, Len. Jim was interested in a CW rag chew on 40 meters. It won't
be on display here.

> Especially the
> "exotic" parts of the capitol of Finland! [tales of intrigue and
> drama "on the scene?"] Can't wait to hear more about
> exotic middle African countries.

Straight from the Fox and Grapes fable.

> Meanwhile, feel free to deride those of us who were in the US
> military doing communications from overseas locations, being
> soldiers or sailors who had the mission to defend our country
> (by force if need be) at the same time. No problem. I'm sure
> you think the military on duty before your birth are of no
> consequence.

You were being derided for your military service? Poor, poor Leonard.

Dave K8MN

1462. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 14:24:23 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E3D29CB.D118B84E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60545

Brian wrote:
>
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030131152454.03820.00000302@mb-fr.aol.com>...
> > In article <f45722ac.0301301530.198cb3a3@posting.google.com>,
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> >
> >
> > >Tube technology, Steve, tube technology. Clinging to the past, Steve,
> > >clinging to the past.
> >
> > Go easy, Brian, it's probably all he knows. :-)
>
> No kidding. DXpert Dave/K8MN thinks I'm going to manufacture DIODES
> for a cub scout (BSA) radio project,...

No, I don't think you're going to manufacturer diodes. I commented that
you told us that you intend to manufacture diodes this year.

> ... but he cannot envision an antenna
> NOT tilted as in a 1949 QST report.

You left out the 1951, and 1953 CQ articles and their publication in an
antenna anthology from 1963. The T2FD, not tilted, isn't a T2FD.

> L Cebik is waaay out in front of the Worlds Greatest DXer.

Cebik made a simple error. Your error is more complex.

> > -----
> >
> > Several years ago I was in a discussion of RF circuits and
> > mentioned a "2N918."
>
> Whatever you do, don't mention a discrete component as the HEIRARCHY
> of OF's will demand that you manufacture it.
>
> > A long-time ham overheard that and asked, with a straight
> > face, "What country is that? A little island?"
>
> Yes, K8MN has been assinged there.

I was never burned there.

Dave K8MN

1463. Re: The coders embarrass themselves on 14.275 MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 15:15:08 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns931668453C252elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 60546
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

<SNIP>
>
> Ah. You have no idea how any of this works. No troublemaking code
> hater
> ever
> learned even enough of it
> to get on his favorite 2meter repeater and utter a few obscenities in
> Morse.

You must be joking. To jam or send obscenities using CW you don't have to be able to read it atall. A computer or a piece of paper listing the code would work for that. All you can assume is that the person doing it doesn't want their voice recognised.

> We see.
>
> Just for your enlightenment, the *REAL* CW operators are found on the
> south
> end of each HF band. THAT is where there are no problems with
> violations, as
> evidenced clearly by the FCC Enforcement logs and by Riley's
> statements..

That wasn't what he said, though.

> That one of your kind would stoop to swearing in Morse on a VHF FM
> repeater
> is certainly believable.
>
> Hey, even YOU could learn enough code to do that.
>

I would never do that, but why do you assume I can't read code? I passed the 20 wpm test, but I still hate code. All I said was I couldn't read by ear unless it was slow (maybe 10 wpm, and that's pushing it), and that I have to write it down at higher speeds (20 wpm, and I would be missing a lot). Doubtless if I actually liked code I would be using it and could do better than that, but so what? Equally, if the test speed had been dropped to 5 wpm by then, I wouldn't be able to copy even that well. Again, so what?

1464. Re: The coders embarrass themselves on 14.275 MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 15:17:21 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns931668A551C34elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 60547

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in news:3E3C8940.1C864ED8@att.net:

>
>
> Alun Palmer wrote:
>
>>
>> You may be onto something.
>
> No, he's *on* something.
>

I don't know about that, but I'm prepared to beleive that the monitors
can't read CW, hence no complaints about CW ops.

1465. Re: The coders embarrass themselves on 14.275 MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 15:18:22 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302020718.15254b3f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60548

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E3C88DB.9C90FBAE@att.net>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030127083647.16889.00000237@mb-cc.aol.com>...
> >
> > > Of curse it's a myth. The point is, however, that it's far less common on CW
> > > than on voice modes. Just read the FCC enforcement letters. Lots of enforcement
> > > actions against hams using voice in the voice bands, extremely few (if any)
> > > against hams using CW or digital in the CW/digital bands.
> > >
> > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> > Could it be that the FCC no longer has a pool of trained CW operators
> > to monitor amateur CW communications?
> >
> > Don't forget that Dick Carrol sends code so attrociously that machine
> > copy is not possible.
>
> Really? What was it that put you in position to possess that
> knowledge? A post I once madethat indicated that it is indeed
> easy to send code such that a computer couldn't copy it?
> So google up that one and we'll check our your veracity yet one more
> time.
>
> You now have done your usual totally DISHONEST thing and mutilated my
> statement beyond recognition for your illicit purposes, all the while
> insisting that you don't lie. What you are, is for a fact, a truly
> pathological liar.
> No wonder you get along so well the Putzy Poo, AKA AveryFineManhole

Dick, if you don't want things repeated on RRAP, then you shouldn't
say them. And once said, you shouldn't keep defending it. It's all
on you.

You now have the opportunity to reverse your years gone by rantings,
done simply to spite No-Code Technicians, in your usual mean little
Dick way.

You can start with an apology to No-Code Technicians everywhere.

1466. Re: The coders embarrass themselves on 14.275 MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 15:20:37 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302020720.4e10cd5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60549

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E3C8940.1C864ED8@att.net>...
> Alun Palmer wrote:
>
> > >
> > > You may be onto something.
> >
> > No, he's *on* something.

Yep, its called "truth."

1467. Re: The coders embarrass themselves on 14.275 MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 15:43:22 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302020743.75af5003@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60550
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E3C8857.F70AF778@att.net>...
> Alun Palmer wrote:
>
> > haaaynorton@comnospam (Ed Norton) wrote in
> > news:296332854.FF1640746@lloyds.lover.boy:
> >
> > > I've been reading all of this hoopla about K1MAN and the activities on
> > > 14.275 MHz, but have never really paid much attention to it until
> > > today when I tuned in to see what could be heard.
> > >
> > > It was then that I heard some CW operators making real asses of
> > > themselves, proving that CW confers no virtue upon its practitioners.
> > >
> > > A short listen at approximately 2100Z quickly turned up a CW operator
> > > sending "shit" over and over again at about 10 wpm. Fifteen minutes
> > > later, another CW operator joined in with the word "fuck," this time
> > > repeated over and over at around 20 wpm.
> > >
> > > Yes sir. CW capability sure improves the hobby. NOT!
> >
> > Riley Hollingsworth recently visited our local club. One of the things he
> > said in his talk was that he had never heard of a complaint of a CW op
> > jamming. It occurred to me at the time, although I didn't get the chance
> > to tell him, that I had heard someone sending 'fuck' repeatedly in CW on a
> > repeater. It's a myth that there's no jamming or swearing on CW.
>
> Ah. You have no idea how any of this works. No troublemaking code hater
> ever
> learned even enough of it
> to get on his favorite 2meter repeater and utter a few obscenities in
> Morse.
> We see.

So the hater of No-Code Technicians thinks.

> Just for your enlightenment, the *REAL* CW operators are found on the
> south
> end of each HF band. THAT is where there are no problems with
> violations, as
> evidenced clearly by the FCC Enforcement logs and by Riley's
> statements..

So the requirement to learn and then be examined on Morse/Farnsworth
code is superfluous without a requirement to become a *REAL* CW

operator?

Dick, you could petition your government to allow only one mode on amateur radio, and save the FCC all kinds of enforcement money.

> That one of your kind would stoop to swearing in Morse on a VHF FM
> repeater
> is certainly believable.
>
> Hey, even YOU could learn enough code to do that.

But if everyone that swears in Morse, swore using your cw sending techniques, no one would know they was swearing.

Dick, I've said this for years: What I fear most about reducing the Morse code requirements in restructuring is a lack of enforcement. And what I fear most about maintaining the Status Quo in restructuring is a lack of enforcement.

A lack of enforcement was a 25 year problem that isn't going to go away by just throwing Riley at it.

1468. Re: Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, FCC, Cronkite, ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 15:46:15 UTC
From: drakeswl@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <c0588492.0302020746.441d0459@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60551
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

'X-No-archive: yes'
> What if K1MAN's advocate would establish that W1AW, has over time, done
> essentially all of the same things? (The only stipulated difference is
> bulletin "content".)
>
> Again, IMHO, the only rational way out of this is to require all bulletin
> stuff be restricted to the Morse/Data segments. W1AW saved, K1MAN gone.
>
> 73,
> Clay N4AOX

Clay, let's examine your second statement first. I agree 100%. One of my first arguments in this thread was that many of the definitions in Part 97 are AWFUL! Those definitions should be changed, first and foremost. If hams change the language, through a Notice of Proposed Rule Making, then hams can do whatever the ham community wants to do, e.g., re-define bulletins, eliminate bulletins... whatever.

Now, again using one of the documents Brian sent me, let's look at how W1AW reportedly differs from its competition.

The list below refers to alleged character and lack of cooperation issues which can be used by FCC to revoke a ham license.

Does W1AW send felony affidavit complaints to people who complain? No.

Does W1AW play recorded diatribes against the Federal Government? No.

Does W1AW call Riley Hollingsworth a cheap and sleazy politician? No.

Does W1AW sue Hams who complain about its operation? No.

Does W1AW defame anyone, on any basis, routine or otherwise? No.

Does W1AW call its competitor a shallow sham of a hobby politics organization? No

Does W1AW call ANYONE names of any kind? No.

Does Walter Cronkite want to sue W1AW for copyright infringement? No.

Does W1AW have ANYONE alleging copyright infringement against it? No.

Does W1AW harass anyone using its email system or website? No.

The next list refers to Broadcasting, which is a HUGE no-no on Amateur Radio. The TV, AM, FM, and ShortWave bands are for broadcasting, not Ham Radio.

Does W1AW conduct a call-in and talk-show? No.

Does W1AW engage in a "newsgathering" type of "program production?" No.

Does W1AW record phone calls from the general public for playback? No.

Does W1AW direct its transmissions to non-hams at any time? No.

Does W1AW replay pre-recorded interviews? No.

The next list is about proper engineering practices.

Has W1AW ever been AWOL for inspection? No.

Does W1AW use distorted transmitters? No.

Does W1AW use drifting transmitters? No.

Does W1AW use a recording device that malfunctions on a routine basis? No.

Does W1AW use Radio Shack timers that routinely fail to operate properly? No.

The next list refers to other rules violations under Part 97.

Does W1AW record and play back phone calls without permission? No.

Does W1AW routinely solicit donations to QST or any other ARRL service? No.

Does W1AW refer listeners to ARRL's website to sell it's services? No.

Does W1AW sue the FCC, lose, and still refuse to conform to the rules? No.

There are 7 more pages but, I'll spare the members of this list. After a very exhaustive review, what K1MAN is doing now, is alleged by the FCC to be in violation in several major ways. Hollingsworth wrote K1MAN over one year ago asking him to change the way the K1MAN operates.

It is interesting to note that extra penalties routinely apply to the scofflaw. A scofflaw is someone who behaves as though rules do not apply to him. Apparently, operating procedures at K1MAN are much the same as they were over one year ago when K1MAN received the Hollingsworth letter.

I'll save the conclusions for the ALJ.

-PJ

1469. Re: More Of How KB1HMW "Supports" Amateur Radio...NOT!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 16:12:30 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030202111230.06461.00000405@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 60552

From: "KB9TMP"
>I believe YOU are weird, a amateur op that HATES ham history,
>ham jargon, and it seems hams in general!

I don't hate Hams. Certain aspects aren't being realized and I want to participate in those aspects. Much of this is due to what most Hams aren't interested in those aspects.

>Check out the next Star Trek convention if you
>don't believe it.

Someone compared a Ham radio Hamfest to a Star Trek convention, so this is not a good example. Then, he asked me if Ham radio is a cult. However, not all cults are bad.

>When was the last time you saw someone
>walking down the street wearing a mask to make them look
>like a Klingon?

When was the last time you saw someone wearing a hat with their callsign on it, a shirt that says "Learn Morse code or Ham radio will become CB", and carrying a bunch of HTs? My guess is not too long ago.

From:K4YZ

>>No, I said that Hams are not: ex-cons, wife beaters, alcoholics, druggies,
>>nut
>>cases, slobs, fruits. But, many are societal (or social) misfits.
>
> No, Vipul...YOU statd MOST hams were fat, and are (social) misfits. You
>can't have it both ways.

I am not having it both ways. I did say that Hams are social misfits. But I also said that Hams do not have those other negative qualities mentioned.

>Obvioulsy you LIKE being "weird" because
>you continue to maintain the basic vestige of what YOU consider "weird", tha
>Amateur Radio license.

I can have a license and get the benefits from having one. Is it wrong to have a dialogue to change the hobby from within so that my interests get more participants? And, the demographical comment is for the improve the image of the hobby.

From AA2QA

>I still get a big laugh over the HT statement when just about
>everyone is yakking on a cellphone (especially the idiots trying to drive

>while yakking on the phone - and running red lights to boot).
>

I was quoting someone else.

> I can't believe the folks wearing ear protection with those radios
>(oh, cell phones; but they are nothing but a duplex HT connected to the
>telephone system - and my HT can connect to the telephone system too) stuck
>under one of the earpads so they can look busy and chat for hours on end.
>Yep, the hams sure are a strange group, huh?

Even better example - pagers. Also appointment schedulers. There are a number
of devices a non-Ham could have. Your point makes sense.

1470. Re: Ironic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 16:33:14 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <eLb%9.41094$HG.7310806@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 60553
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

"KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com> wrote in message
news:v3paavse62gpe8@corp.supernews.com...
>
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> news:C01%9.29012$HG.5410738@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> > news:1KY_9.24118$HG.4532802@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> > > "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > > news:b1h6e80t2d@enews4.newsguy.com...
> > > > This article is just too creepy. It was in *yesterday's* San
Francisco
> > > > Chronicle.
> > > >
> > > > http://sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2003/01/31/MN90087.DTL
> > >
> > > What aspect was "creepy?"
> > >
> > > --
> > > 73 de Bert
> > > WA2SI
> >
> > My bad, I was unaware of today's tragedy until approx. 21:00. (Spent the
> day
> > working the Ten-Ten contest.) I certainly meant no disrespect. :'-(
> >
> > --
> > 73 de Bert
> > WA2SI
>
> Bert
> I listened to some of the Ten-Ten contest today. I don't have
> a number so I didn't try to join in. How did you do in it?
> BTW I heard about the accident during the Mid-CARS net
> on 7258 kHz, I wasn't watching any TV today either.
> --
> '73' From KB9TMP
> "The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
> if you can fake that, you've got it made."
> -Groucho Marx

Hi William, (Bill?)

I don't have a number either. That's the reason I worked the contest. Each
contact gave the other station a point and I got to log another Ten-Ten

number for my membership. I'm not a contester, it was just fun for me. I "casually" worked (...or attempted to work, hihi.) 30 or so stations. Take care now.

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

1471. Re: More Of How KB1HMW "Supports" Amateur Radio...NOT!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 16:53:12 UTC
From: Jackie <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com>
Message-ID: <Y1c%9.74213$to3.88962@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 60554

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030202111230.06461.00000405@mb-cv.aol.com...
[snip]

> I am not having it both ways. I did say that Hams are social misfits.

Gee, thanks Vipul! Love you too! Mean it!

tthhhbbbppp

Jackie

1472. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 17:58:17 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@att.net>
Message-ID: <Z_c%9.27755$zF6.2014878@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 60555

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
news:3E3C8873.AE04EE4E@att.net...
>
>
> Bert Craig wrote:
>
> > "K�HB" <k�hb@arrl.DOTORG> wrote in message
> > news:vjWY9.4607$d66.431261@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> > > An urban myth of gigantic proportions. Today's work force is so much
more
> > > productive than the work force of the 40/50's that comparisons are
made
> > not
> > > in percentages, but in orders of magnitude.
> > >
> > > 73, de Hans, K0HB
> >
> > The Element 1 issue notwithstanding, I have to agree with the above
> > statement in general wholeheartedly!
>
> Don't credit the workforce, it's not their doing. It's the advances in
> their
> tools that did it.

It is also a result of cooking the books like using the labor of millions of
illegal aliens, yet not reporting them in the per capita divisor.

73,
Clay N4AOX

1473. Re: Ironic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 18:10:47 UTC
From: "Alan W. Craft" <mauritius4@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <onnq3vcquhqaj0t6umk9oqb0uhirqakmto@4ax.com>
Source record: 60556
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

On Sat, 01 Feb 2003 23:27:57 GMT, "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote:

>"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>news:b1h6e80t2d@enews4.newsguy.com...
>> This article is just too creepy. It was in *yesterday's* San Francisco
>> Chronicle.
>>
>> http://sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2003/01/31/MN90087.DTL
>
>What aspect was "creepy?"

That Columbia did indeed "appear like a bright meteor"?

Alan

1474. Re: Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, FCC, Cronkite, ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 18:31:58 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030202133158.26864.00001110@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 60559

In article <b1f2ssafi1@news.hawaii.edu>, jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu (Jeffrey Herman)
writes:

>In article <b1cioafic0@pita.alt.net>, Bruce <Apply@anon.com> wrote:
>>ARRL? K1MAN? Who cares? By your count there are 479,000 of us out here that
>>do NOT belong to either. And why bother? Why waste the money on either one?
>>They do not speak for me.
>
>You might honestly believe that the ARRL doesn't speak for you, but
>amateur radio exists today *only* because of the ARRL.

Jeff, that claim has been discussed in r.r.a.p. several times
before and been shot down each time.

NO ONE can "prove" an alternate-time continuum or "what
would have happened."

>One of dozens
>of examples: There would not have been any ham radio after WWI if it
>hadn't been for the ARRL's efforts fighting the Navy's desire for all
>radio to be under military control.

Oh, dear, another alternate "reality." Thomas H. White does a
scholarly presentation of early US radio regulations for ALL radio
services here prior to WW2. I would suggest that you study that
the USN of that time was simply seeking control of all common-
carrier radio services to be under USN control. It wasn't just
"military." Those recommendations were shown the light of day
by many others.

Hiram P. Maxim DID go to Washington and convinced a bunch
of lawmakers that amateurs "should" have their own band after
WW1 but it is disinformation to say that he or "just" the ARRL
"made amateur radio possible."

Neither was any ARRL Handbook edition on any national top-
ten, top-twenty, or even top-hundred best-seller list by any of
the three publishing industry statistics.

<signature here, as required by ABA listings + Strunk&White>

1475. Re: arrl article on echolink - impress a non ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 18:31:59 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030202133159.26864.00001111@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 60561

In article <3E39FC2A.79E1C9AC@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Vshah101 wrote:
>> "Herb" <Herbie@KingOftheJammers.net> wrote in message
>> news:b1bb9j$lt2$0@pita.alt.net...
>
>> >> Impress a non ham even more. Take them to a ham radio club
>> >> meeting or better yet, a hamfest.
>>
>> Yes, invite a non-Ham to a club meeting or a Hamfest. There one can see the
>> typical Ham. The non-Ham will see that Hams are weird.
>
>Hams are wired.
>
>
>> >"Herb" <Herbie@KingOftheJammers.net> wrote
>> YES,
>> >> DO impress a non ham friend with today's ham radio hobby!
>> >>
>> >> Herb
>>
>> Exactly. I have been saying this, but you have expressed it in more detail
>and
>> more eloquently than I have. One just has to go to a Hamfest and/or club
>> meeting and non-Hams will see the typical Ham. Societal misfits, fat,
>obsessed,
>> cult-like, and a fantasy of importance.
>
>That's quite a unique manner of newsgroup attribution you use, Vipul.
>Let me ask--how do you see yourself? Do you see yourself as fitting
>into society? Do you believe yourself to be a fully functional, well
>rounded individual? In your quest to expose radio amateurs for whatever
>it is you believe they are, do you see yourself as having a "fantasy of
>importance"? What type of individual obtains an amateur radio license
>and spends large amounts of his time complaining that hams aren't like
>he believes they should be and that amateur radio isn't what he thought
>it would be?

I'd call him someone with the callsign W8MN. Heil spends a
lot of time on here doing that... :-)

<signature here, in proper and traditional manner...>

1476. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 18:32:00 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030202133200.26864.00001112@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 60557

In article <b1hlhd$e7c$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030125192919.03463.00000209@mb-cr.aol.com...
>> In article <20030124212905.27873.00000176@mb-mj.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>
>> N2EY writes:
>....
>> >Why are the writtens a sacred cow but the code a scapegoat?
>....
>Len replied:
>> The FCC requires ALL US radio amateurs to be responsible for the
>> technical and legal requirements of amateurs' operation. All.
>> No exceptions.
>>
>> The FCC does NOT require any US amateur to operate OOK CW
>> over and above any other mode. All modes are optional within
>> allocated bands.
>
>Nor does the FCC require anyone to operate at any particular
>speed when using morse. It is perfectly legal for me to have
>a morse QSO with someone at one wpm if we want.
>Nor does the FCC care if I send erroneous morse characters by mistake.

Quite true, Bill.

Not only that, non-morse-tested Technician Class licensees
are perfectly free to use manual telegraphy on allocated
ham frequencies above 30 MHz.

Imagine that, UN-tested in morsemanship allowed to use CW!

:-)

<signature here, as in comments on 98-143>

1477. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 18:32:01 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030202133201.26864.00001114@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 60558

In article <f45722ac.0302011430.60da1dc3@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20030201103647.29016.00000066@mb-fy.aol.com>...
>
>> Lack of experience, lack of knowledge and lack of skill are three reasons.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>In a nutshell, N2EY dismisses the T2FD antenna, and insults anyone who
>might be using one. Since he has no use for it, it cannot be good.

Careful, Brian, he might try the following on you...

QUOTE FROM REV. CALLSIGN:

>Mr. Anderson projects his own behavior and feelings onto others. Note how
>angry, upset and abusive he gets over my calm, reasoned, well-documented
>posts pointing out his errors.

END OF QUOTE FROM REV. CALLSIGN

If you don't follow his "calm,reasoned, well-documented
posts pointing out your errors" you will not be allowed
even a 1.2 SWR reading... :-) :-) :-)

<signature here as required in the good book...>

1478. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 18:32:01 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030202133201.26864.00001113@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 60560

In article <b1fu0mqja1@news.hawaii.edu>, jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:

>Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> wrote:
>> ARRL has been around since 1914.
>
>But only as a division and "under the thumb" of the
>Radio Club of Hartford. In January 1915 it gained
>independence and became the organization that we
>know of today. To be exact, on January 29, 1915,
>the Connecticut Secretary of State recorded the
>incorporation of the League.

Okay, I will accept that correction. Thank you.

However, shouldn't ARRL be informed also?
My rather old Handbook says 1914...

>
>> I think it is rather well-known that ARRL can't get as much as a
>> whole quarter of US amateur licensees. Since it has never had
>> a much greater fraction for 89 years that ought to demonstrate
>> something.
>
>In 1916, League members were the only one's permitted on the air
>between the hours of 2100 and 0700 (in order to do trans-continental
>relaying of traffic and not be bothered by local rag-chewers). That
>shot League membership up to 4,000, about 40% of those licensed at
>the time.

Okay, I accept the correction on 1916.

1916 was, um, 87 years ago. Vacuum tubes were around but
not much in use by amateurs yet (Rev. Callsign will say they
were something like plentiful or "legacy devices").

1946 is only 57 years ago. What was the percentage of ARRL
members then? Greater than 40%? Less than 40%? Today,
stretching some percentage points in favor of ARRL, I count
maybe 27% (using a very big stretch since ARRL doesn't
present up-to-the-date exact numbers) and that shows a
decline in percentages over an 87-year period from 1916

<signature here, as found in fulfillment listings...>

1479. Re: Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, FCC, Cronkite, ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 18:43:39 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@att.net>
Message-ID: <vFd%9.17810$rq4.1295603@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 60562
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Paul" <drakeswl@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:c0588492.0302020746.441d0459@posting.google.com...
> Now, again using one of the documents Brian sent me, let's look at how
> W1AW reportedly differs from its competition.

So are we comparing W1AW operation, content and operator(s) character to K1MAN operation, content, and character? Looks like it.
One thing that makes it difficult to compare is that K1MAN BC is a one to three man (creeps?) operation some where in Maine. W1AW BC is a multi-man (angels?) operation, in content and operations, particularly, somewhere in Connecticut. How do you judge the character or compare the character of a multi-man organization with Washington lobbyests and communcation law firms on retainer to a one-three man operation on a low budget?
>
> The list below refers to alleged character and lack of cooperation
> issues which can be used by FCC to revoke a ham license.

As a barrister, one will recognize the following as libel proof innuendo, of course.

> Does W1AW send felony affidavit complaints to people who complain? No.

This implies that K1MAN sends affidavit complaints to people who complain. I believe the record will show that K1MAN has sent affidavit complaints to protest those who jam his on-air BC attempts. I "complain" about K1MAN. I did not get named on a felony affidavit.

etcetra.
>
> The next list is about proper engineering practices.
>
> Has W1AW ever been AWOL for inspection? No.

Knowing something about W1AW operations, I don't think you want to use this for your case.
>
> Does W1AW use distorted transmitters?

Amateur equipment failure is prohibited????????

etcetra.

73,
Clay N4AOX

1480. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 18:44:56 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E3D66DB.A843E75A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60563

Brian wrote:
>
> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0301311002.27cfb6eb@posting.google.com>...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030130211736.08181.00000271@mb-cq.aol.com>...
.
>
> No, no, no. Clinging to the past would be publishing tube radio
> CONSTRUCTION articles en leiu of publishing TODAY'S amateurs radio
> activities in the ARRL Sections. Hello Dave Heil! Whare are you on
> this???

I'm still trying to decipher "en leiu". I'm guessing but did you mean
"in lieu"?

I used to own a backup linear amp which was solid state. All of my high
power linear amps use tubes. With one exception, they were all produced
within the last ten years. While it bothers me that contest line scores
and "Section News" have been removed from the pages of QST, an article
on a piece of equipment using vacuum tubes doesn't upset me. It'd beat
"The Doctor is IN" hands down.

> > Would it be better if car magazines no longer printed articles about
> > '65 Mustangs, because that would be "clinging to the past"? How about
> > listening to "oldies", or classical music - all "clinging to the
> > past", right? Would it be better if all vintage airplanes were
> > grounded and antique cars removed from the road, because those things
> > are all examples of "clinging to the past?
> >
> > I don't think so!
>
> It would be nice to see Jim "cling to the future" once in his amateur
> career.

Why didn't you answer the question?

> Pretend that you like vanilla ice cream with mint chips, just once.

Why didn't you just answer the question?

> > > The January QST ALSO includes items on: A 222mHz transverter, computer
> > > interface with the TRX-Manager program, orientation to test equipment for new
> > > hams, product reviews on new HT's and weather station, plus the usual operating
> > > articles, ads and other "human interest" items.
> > >

> > > Within the first 12 pages of QST are ads for all sorts of new technology,
> > > INCLUDING I-Link soft and hardware. Not a single tube in sight.
> > >
> > > Whew.
> >
> > There ya go, Steve, confusing the issue with facts.
> >
> > Here's a question: Should QST refuse paid advertisements for things
> > like telegraph keys, because some folks consider such things to be
> > "clinging to the past"?
>
> Should a membership organization tell their members to go look for
> member information on another format so that they can devote space to
> paid advertisements for things like "pump telegraph keys," because
> some folks consider such things to be "clinging to the past"?

It would be silly for you to confuse advertising space with editorial
content.
More ad pages pay for more editorial pages.

Dave K8MN

1481. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 18:56:35 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E3D6996.83A839CE@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60564

Len Over 21 wrote:

> Rev. Callsign never worked IN or for the FCC, cannot possibly
> "know" their "motivations."

Foghorn Lenhorn never worked IN or for the Department of State and cannot possibly "know" its "motivations". That hasn't even slowed down his input on "knowing" what could or couldn't, has or hasn't worked as an order wire for a RTTY circuit. It hasn't prevented him from "knowing" who is or isn't on a Key Officers list or from "knowing" that the State Department uses Radio Officers despite State's never having had such a position title. Doesn't that just ruffle your feathers?

Your face should be as red as your comb from all your recent gaffes.

Dave K8MN

1482. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 19:08:25 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E3D6CAF.627A63C1@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60565

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20030201123657.05048.00000382@mb-cs.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:

> There is NO guarantee that ARRL "represents" anyone since
> they are NOT bound by government rules applying to elected
> public governmental positions. Most "decisions" are reached
> by a limited group, called the Board of Directors, the ones who
> do nearly all the "deciding" on what is good for the member-
> ship.

Are you writing of those fellows elected by the membership?--the folks with a definite term of office?--the ones who can be voted out by the members of their division? Those people? Why is "decisions" in quotes? Why is "deciding" in quotes? Why is "represents" in quotes?

> The only "guarantee" of "democratic process" in "representation"
> comes from the Word of ARRL that it does what it says.

Why are the several items above in quotes? ARRL members see directors replaced by vote of a Division's membership on a routine basis.

> Members of ARRL must "tug their forelocks and bow" to all
> decisions of ARRL BoD. ARRL "represents all radio
> amateurs."

Obviously a product of your fertile imagination.

> Since the FCC is the ONLY federal agency regulating US
> amateur radio, one had damn well obey the FCC in order
> to be legal in amateur radio transmission.

Let us know how it works out once you obtain a license for amateur radio transmission.

Dave K8MN

1483. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 19:14:19 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E3D6E11.4C993770@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60567

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E3AF193.B187CE47@earthlink.net>...
> >
> > That isn't what happened at all. You are the individual responsible for
> > bringing up any of this. You were silly to do so.

>
> Much like a big run of out of band frenchmen on 6M. You were silly to
> bring it up. Must have been hurting for greenbacks.
>
> Maybe next time...

...you'll be more careful, Brian. I broke no regs in my operation from
any DX spot in which I operated. Your problem then as now is that you
chose to attack the wrong target. Len's situation is quite different.
He made a number of statements which were at best unfactual; at most,
deliberate falsehoods.

His claims were easily refuted. It'd be trickier with something like
your alleged verbal permission to operate from Somalia.

Dave K8MN

1484. Re: Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, FCC, Cronkite, ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 19:16:02 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b1jqni$p10$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 60566
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Are you saying that those that are on frequency long before the k1man transmissions are required to leave the frequency when K1MAN comes on?

Dan/W4NTI

"Clay N4AOX" <wyn@att.net> wrote in message news:vFd%9.17810$rq4.1295603@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...

> This implies that K1MAN sends affidavit complaints to people who complain.
> I believe the record will show that K1MAN has sent affidavit complaints to
> protest those who jam his on-air BC attempts. I "complain" about K1MAN.
I
> did not get named on a felony affidavit.
>
> etcetra.>

1485. Re: Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, FCC, Cronkite, ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 19:19:30 UTC
From: jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu
Message-ID: <b1jr02$k3j$1@news.hawaii.edu>
Source record: 60568
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Hi Clay! Haven't heard from you in years!

Clay N4AOX <wyn@att.net> wrote:
>What if K1MAN's advocate would establish that W1AW, has over time, done
>essentially all of the same things? (The only stipulated difference is
>bulletin "content".)

I believe they'd have trouble proving that W1AW is conducting
"willful" and "malicious" interference. Those two intentions
are absent in ARRL's character.

>Again, IMHO, the only rational way out of this is to require all
>bulletin stuff be restricted to the Morse/Data segments.
>W1AW saved, K1MAN gone.

Amen!

73, Jeff KH6O

--
Operations Specialist Mathematics Lecturer
U.S. Coast Guard Kapiolani College
Dept. of Homeland Security University of Hawaii System

1486. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 19:21:51 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E3D6FD6.1E048EA5@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60569

Brian wrote:
>
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030201103647.29016.00000066@mb-fy.aol.com>...
>
> > Lack of experience, lack of knowledge and lack of skill are three reasons.

> In a nutshell, N2EY dismisses the T2FD antenna, and insults anyone who
> might be using one. Since he has no use for it, it cannot be good.

If you have need for a loss antenna, go for it. I should have had one this morning when chasing Johnston Island on 160m. It was far too easy to nail AH3D with three calls. Maybe the broadband T2FD would have permitted me to work him on 160, 80 and 40 at the same time if (and here's the rub) he could have heard me.

I've never had use for an antenna which requires a linear amp to break even on gain when transmitting. I have used and do use loss antennas when receiving on 160m or 80m. I can rotate them to null noise and use a preamp to bring up the desired signal.

Dave K8MN

1487. Re: MARS opinions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 19:27:09 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b1jrcd$rg3$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 60570

Of course you must have HF capability if you want to operate MARS. That is where the nets are that you must check into to get the proper amount of time to keep active.

I believe you are correct. A minimum of two frequencies are required.

Most of the MARS freqs are just outside of the 'normal' ham bands. Although some are quite a bit out.

If one only has a older rig I would recommend staying away from AF MARS then. Our primary is way out of the ham band ranges.

Dan/W4NTI

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message news:b1htif25nq@enews2.newsguy.com...
> I believe you must be able to operate on AT LEAST 2 HF bands to qualify.
> That is the last I knew....
>
>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF/MFR
> REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
>
> "Symbolism is for the simple minded....."
>
>
> >
> > From what I am told you have to have HF capability to even be
> > considered for MARS.
> >
> > - H. Johnson
> > 73, KG4WOU
> > ==
> > *** SPAM Filter in place ***
> > Just de-classify the e-mail address for correct reply-to
> > ==
> >
>
>

1488. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 19:29:43 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E3D7156.DF1BB4C0@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60571

```
Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E3A104F.DEB7453A@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E36F9E9.42FD8459@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E367B86.5F2FFB61@earthlink.net>...
> >
> > > > > > Brian is making great progress in his quest for knowledge about the
> > > > > > antenna. Just a few short months ago he didn't understand what it was.
> >
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave, you couldn't be more wrong. I was using that type of antenna
> > > > > > more than a decade ago.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Better luck next time.
> > > > >
> > > > > I prefer my luck THIS time. Remember the following stuff?
> > > > >
> > > > > ----------------------------------------------------------------
> > > > >
> > > > > From: Brian P Burke (bpburke@prodigy.net)
> > > > > Subject: Re: Sixty Meter Band Planning
> > > > > Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> > > > > Date: 2002-06-22 08:44:09 PST
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > > news:3D1401E6.37D682@earthlink.net...
> > > > > > Brian P Burke wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > > > > news:3D0FFDC5.9241EE3E@earthlink.net...
> > > > > > > > Brian P Burke wrote:
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Do you want to be the guy up on the American Embassy wall changing the
> > > > > > > > > length of an antenna, or doing the same in a chemical environment? Many
> > > > > > > > > embassy's I've seen have two T2FD's, at 90deg angles.
> > > > > > > > >
```

> > > > > > > Not American embassies, Brian. U.S. embassies use basically five
> > > > > > > varieties of HF antenna: RX only broadband dipoles (resistive network,
> > > > > > > works poorly), B&W broadband folded dipole (resistive network, works
> > > > > > > poorly),
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > A T2FD "clone." Shorter, less spacing in the folded portion.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Not really. A T2FD is erected with a 20 to 40 degree tilt and is fed
> > > > > > with open wire line. To quote Gilbert Countryman the W3HH of the day,
> > > > > > "Basically , the antenna is the hyptoenuse of a right triangle, one leg
> > > > > > of which is along the ground."
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave K8MN
> > > > >
> > > > > Then the manuals that I've seen illustrating the "T2FD" are incorrect.
> > > > > --
> > > > >
> > > > > You can thank the folks at Google.
> > >
> > > Dave, how nice that you are finally able to use google.
> > >
> > > I'll say it again, "Then the manuals that I've seen illustrating the
> > > "T2FD" are incorrect," and everyone listed below is wrong, including
> > > one manufacturer.
> >
> > Let's examine the urls provided by you as we go along.
> >
> > > Just wishing I were wrong doesn't make it so.
> > >
> > > Would you mind exercising your newfound web skills to educate
> > > yourself? Here, I've done the hard work for you:
> > >
> > > From L. Cebik: http://www.cebik.com/t2fd.html
> >
> > > ---
> > > I'm sorry, but what were you saying about tilting the tilted antenna?
> > > ---
> >
> > Cebik gives you a hint and then proceeds to ignore the name of the
> > antenna.
> > Do you remember that T2FD is short for Terminated, TILTED, Folded
> > Dipole?
> > It would seem that it isn't a T2FD if it isn't tilted. Maybe you meant
> > T(erminated)FD.
> >
> > I note the SWR curve using the 390 ohm terminating resistor. Ratios as
> > high as 9:1 give you an idea that using this antenna with a balun and 50
> > ohm coaxial cable would introduce even more loss to the system than that
> > 50-90%% wasted in the resistor.

> >
> > > More examples of non-tilted antennas can be found at
> > >
> > > http://www.armymars.net/personal/hamstation.html
> >
> > Nothing about the T2FD here. Plenty of B&W folded dipoles though.
> >
> > > ----------
> > > Notice in the following link that the T2FD is matched to 50 ohm
> > > transmission line: http://www.johncon.com/john/T2fd/
> >
> > "Matched" is a euphemism. Adding a balun and 50 ohm coaxial feeder only
> > increases the loss in the system.
> >
> > > ----------
> > > Now navigate to : http://www.dxzone.com/ and witness the feed line
> > > used on this T2FD.
> > >
> > > Note that in paragraph 3, the 20-40 deg slope is mentioned.
> >
> > The url provided by you takes me to a main page for dxzone.com. There
> > is no feedline to witness.
> >
> > > After Cebik's analysis, where he said, "Perhaps the only advantage may
> > > be mechanical, for those lacking a suitable high support from which to
> > > hang the antenna vertically," one would be wise to mount the tilted
> > > antenna horizontally, use two of them perpendicular to each other, and
> > > take advantage of their directional nature.
> > >
> > > Where have you heard that before?
> >
> > From another guy who discounts the very name of the antenna.
> > > ----------
> > > Now check out http://www.bwantennas.com/pro/instr/fdipole.pdf, the B&W
> > > installation notes, page 3.
> >
> > Sorry, I don't currently have Adobe Acrobat installed on this computer.
> > I'll check it out in a few days if I remember.
> >
> > > Must this antenna be deployed with a 20 to 40 deg slope? I don't
> > > think so. At least the manufacturer doesn't think so.
> >
> > The antenna is not sold as a T2FD. I don't have any idea of what is
> > inside the sealed assembly nor do I know anyone who does. There may be
> > other than a single resistor in it.
> >
> > > Also notice the similarities to the antennas described as "T2FD" on
> > > the other web sites. Do you know why that might be?
> >
> > How many ways are there to make a folded dipole? Can one add a lossy

> > network to a folded dipole? Can it be tilted? Folded dipoles were
> > known in radio long before the introduction of the T2FD.
> > > ----------
> > > From http://www.ominous-valve.com/antennas.txt:
> > >
> > > "Folded dipole- This is basically a dipole that has been folded
> > > back upon itself, using parallel wires with insulated spacers. Not
> > > only does the antenna become shorter, but its impedance changes,
> > > often for the better depending on application. Most people know
> > > these antennas from the little twinlead dipoles provided with
> > > consumer FM tuners.
> > >
> > > On HF, the folded dipoles are very popular with the military, due
> > > to their ruggedness, portability, and adaptability. They can be
> > > hung from flagpoles as an inverted V, stretched out straight, or
> > > sloped, depending on the tactical need of the situation. The classic
> > > military dipole is by Barker & Williamson, and you can buy one too,
> > > for a price."
> > >
> > While folded dipoles offer some increase in SWR bandwidth, they are one
> > band antennas. We were not discussing one band antennas. The paragraph
> > above is simply incorrect.
> > > ----------
> > > From: http://www.pacificsites.com/~brooke/Ant.shtml
> > >
> > > The B&W Broadband Folded Dipole Antennas (ASW-90) U.S. Patent 4423423
> > > is an excellent receiving antenna for broad band signals like chirp
> > > sounders. This design is also called a T2FD. The efficiency for
> > > transmission goes down rapidly below 40 meters.
> > >
> > If a patent was issued to B&W for the antenna, it would have to be
> > somehow different from the T2FD, a Navy antenna brought into amateur
> > use. That would lead me to believe that there is indeed something aside
> > from a simple terminating resistor inside the sealed assembly. Maybe it
> > is the spiffy stainless steel wire which adds even more loss. By the
> > way, I have the assembly instructions for the B&W antenna. B&W does not
> > refer to the antenna as a T2FD.
> > >
> > > ----------
> > > Oh, gosh no! The B&W antenna is a variant of the T2FD? Like Cebik's
> > > "narrow/short" version?
> > >
> > That case hasn't been made though there are some similarities. The B&W
> > would have to be tilted and we'd have to know what is inside the sealed
> > assembly. We'll discount the lossy stainless steel wire.
> > >
> > > It looks like it's "Dave against the world" again.
> > >
> > > Dave, what were you saying?
> > >

> > That only several months ago, you didn't know much about the antenna
> > (like that it was designed to be tilted).
>
> If you say so.
>
> > Allow me to recommend the June, 1949 QST article by Countryman. It is
> > entitled "An Experimental All-Band Nondirectional Transmitting antenna
> > (Some Possibilities Offered by the Tilted Folded Dipole). You can also
> > try "Performance of the Terminated Folded Dipole" by Countryman,
> > November 1951 CQ magazine and "More on the T2FD" by Countryman, February
> > 1953 CQ magazine.
> > The latter two articles can be found reprinted in CQ's "Antenna Roundup"
> > book, published in 1963.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> 1949? What was Steve saying about amateurs not clinging to the past?
>
> Anyway, IF you do know what you're talking about, then my statement
> stands.
>
> Do you remember my statement?
>
> It went like this: "Then the manuals that I've seen illustrating the
> "T2FD" are incorrect."
>
> Thus, your argument is with L. Cebik, Barker and Williamson, and all
> the others. There. I've pointed you in the right direction. Now go
> to it.

I don't have an argument with Cebik. I wrote that his blurb about the
T2TD was incorrect. The man can make a mistake. B&W does not claim
that their antenna is a T2FD. The MARS site makes no reference to a
T2FD. The dxzone site is a main page. You never did tell us to which
manuals you referred.

> Unless you're willing to concede that there are contemporary uses of
> the T2FD for which the 1949 QST article could never have forseen.

or what? This isn't even a sentence, much less a paragraph.

Dave K8MN

1489. Re: Out Of The Box?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 19:32:12 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E3D71F6.E98429AC@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60572

Brian wrote:

> And then Dave had to go back into the annals of amateur history to
> "prove" that a ttfd MUST be tilted, regardless of what Cebik and the
> manufacturer says.

Cebik is a talented antenna man. Even Cebik can make a mistake or not know the history of an antenna.

Which manufacturer is it which you claim produces a T2FD?

Dave K8MN

1490. Re: More Young Hams - Then And Now

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 19:36:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030202143625.12173.00000340@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 60573

In article <v3mas5f50ec48f@corp.supernews.com>, "Jim Hampton"
<aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:

>Certainly makes it tough to blame the 'danged Morse code' for being too
>difficult, doesn't it?

Jim,

Gotta remember that these young hams are most probably very bright and in very supportive surroundings. The six-year-old General in the story is from a family full of hams, home-schooled, has been reading since age 5, etc.

> Thanks for the URL.
>
You're welcome!

73 de Jim, N2EY

1491. Re: arrl article on echolink - impress a non ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 19:37:26 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E3D7335.E596C7B3@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60574

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E39FC2A.79E1C9AC@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Vshah101 wrote:
> >> "Herb" <Herbie@KingOftheJammers.net> wrote in message
> >> news:b1bb9j$lt2$0@pita.alt.net...
> > >
> > >> >> Impress a non ham even more. Take them to a ham radio club
> > >> >> meeting or better yet, a hamfest.
> > >>
> > >> Yes, invite a non-Ham to a club meeting or a Hamfest. There one can see the
> > >> typical Ham. The non-Ham will see that Hams are weird.
> > >
> > >Hams are wired.
> > >
> > >
> > >> >"Herb" <Herbie@KingOftheJammers.net> wrote
> > >> YES,
> > >> >> DO impress a non ham friend with today's ham radio hobby!
> > >> >>
> > >> >> Herb
> > >>
> > >> Exactly. I have been saying this, but you have expressed it in more detail
> > >and
> > >> more eloquently than I have. One just has to go to a Hamfest and/or club
> > >> meeting and non-Hams will see the typical Ham. Societal misfits, fat,
> > >obsessed,
> > >> cult-like, and a fantasy of importance.
> > >
> > >That's quite a unique manner of newsgroup attribution you use, Vipul.
> > >Let me ask--how do you see yourself? Do you see yourself as fitting
> > >into society? Do you believe yourself to be a fully functional, well
> > >rounded individual? In your quest to expose radio amateurs for whatever
> > >it is you believe they are, do you see yourself as having a "fantasy of
> > >importance"? What type of individual obtains an amateur radio license
> > >and spends large amounts of his time complaining that hams aren't like
> > >he believes they should be and that amateur radio isn't what he thought
> > >it would be?
>
> I'd call him someone with the callsign W8MN. Heil spends a
> lot of time on here doing that... :-)

You'd call him Jari Kulkki? How did he get into your diatribe? You yourself would fit the mold except for that part about obtaining an amateur radio license.

Dave K8MN

1492. Re: The coders embarrass themselves on 14.275 MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 19:37:46 UTC
From: jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu
Message-ID: <b1js2akph1@news.hawaii.edu>
Source record: 60575
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote:
>I would never do that, but why do you assume I can't read code? I passed
>the 20 wpm test, but I still hate code. All I said was I couldn't read by
>ear unless it was slow (maybe 10 wpm, and that's pushing it), and that I
>have to write it down at higher speeds (20 wpm, and I would be missing a
>lot).

How did you pass the 20 wpm test? Passing that exam used to involve one
minute of *perfect* error-free copy out of five.

>Equally, if the test speed had been dropped
>to 5 wpm by then, I wouldn't be able to copy even that well.

Again I must ask, how on Earth did you pass the 20 wpm test?

>but I still hate the code.

Too bad. How about we conduct a fun little race: We each build
a transmitter from scratch, picking our favorite mode (mine will
be CW). Whoever finishes first and collects the most contacts wins.
(Guess who the winner will be!)

73, Jeff KH6O

--
Operations Specialist Mathematics Lecturer
U.S. Coast Guard Kapiolani College
Dept. of Homeland Security University of Hawaii System

1493. Re: K1MAN for the 2003 Amateur Hall of Fame!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 19:57:24 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E3D7824.7070907@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 60576
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

K1MAN Man wrote:
> CQ Magazine is accepting nominations for their 2003 Amateur Radio Hall
> of Fame awards until march 1. Be sure to write to
>
> hall-of-fame@cq-amateur-radio.com
>
> and nominate Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, for this year's awards. He has
> single handedly goten the FCC to rexamine part 97 and will probably be
> the reason that the bad wording will be replaced by something clearer.
> He also saved the virgin islands after the huricane, and was the only
> one who worried about Mexico after the recent earth quake there.

And the Mexicans did not want his help.

>
> He has also done lots of other public service to numerous to mention
> here, but you can list it in the reasons part of your nomination. It
> should have the information below.

I would be happy to nominate Glenn for the shit-head-of-the-year
award, and nominate you for a spelling class.

1494. Re: K1MAN for the 2003 Amateur Hall of Fame!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 21:21:12 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030202162112.08990.00000078@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 60577

>I would be happy to nominate Glenn for the shit-head-of-the-year
>award,

You have that award hands down.

1495. Re: The coders embarrass themselves on 14.275 MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 21:56:22 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E3D9409.7080907@adelphia.net>
Source record: 60578

Alun Palmer wrote:

> Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in news:3E3AC478.2010804@psu.edu:
>
>
>>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>
>>>From actual observation I can say that violations such as jamming,
>>>obscenity/profanity, and failure to identify are uncommon in amateur
>>>radio as a whole, and extremely rare in the CW/digital parts of the HF
>>>bands. In the past 35 years of operating amateur radio CW I don't
>>>recall a single instance where I heard obscenity/profanity on CW in
>>>the CW/digital bands. Can you say that about the 'phone bands?
>>>
>> Only once have I heard "strong" language on a digital mode.
>> Someone was
>>giving out a tongue lashing to another on PSK31. Okay-maybe a keyboard
>>lashing. It was deserved though, the guy was running waaay too much
>>power and way overdriving his audio, and taking up half the frequency.
>>That's it. One case.!
>>
>> OTOH give me 30 seconds on phone and I'll give you swearing,
>> malicious
>>interference, poor operating practice and a host of other
>>unpleasantness.
>>
>
> Only on certain frequencies (certain spots on 80m and 20m and a few
> renegade repeaters), and only at certain times. Does giving you 30 seconds
> on phone mean on 14.275?

It means I can tune the band and find it. I don't usually look for the
"hot spots", but it doesn't take long to find them.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1496. Re: The coders embarrass themselves on 14.275 MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 21:59:54 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E3D94DE.5090306@adelphia.net>
Source record: 60579

N2EY wrote:

> In article <Xns9314DFCC38367elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>
>
>>Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in news:3E3AC478.2010804@psu.edu:
>>
>>
>>>
>>>N2EY wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>From actual observation I can say that violations such as jamming,
>>>>obscenity/profanity, and failure to identify are uncommon in amateur
>>>>radio as a whole, and extremely rare in the CW/digital parts of the HF
>>>>bands. In the past 35 years of operating amateur radio CW I don't
>>>>recall a single instance where I heard obscenity/profanity on CW in
>>>>the CW/digital bands. Can you say that about the 'phone bands?
>>>>
>>> Only once have I heard "strong" language on a digital mode.
>>> Someone was
>>>giving out a tongue lashing to another on PSK31. Okay-maybe a keyboard
>>>lashing. It was deserved though, the guy was running waaay too much
>>>power and way overdriving his audio, and taking up half the frequency.
>>>That's it. One case.!
>>>
>>> OTOH give me 30 seconds on phone and I'll give you swearing,
>>> malicious
>>>interference, poor operating practice and a host of other
>>>unpleasantness.
>>>
>>Only on certain frequencies (certain spots on 80m and 20m and a few
>>renegade repeaters), and only at certain times.
>>
>
> Perhaps. Still a lot compared to the lack of such behavior on CW/digital.
>
>
>>Does giving you 30 seconds
>>on phone mean on 14.275?
>>
>
> 3.950, 14.313.....

>
>>>
>>>>FCC enforcement actions today are largely complaint-driven. Somebody
>>>>sends a credible complaint (such as audio tapes with
>>>>time/date/frequency clearly marked) to the FCC, and FCC follows up
>>>>with their own investigation. Why are there so many complaints about
>>>>'phone but so few about CW and digital?
>>>>
>>>
>>>>If the use of a certain mode results in far fewer violations by those
>>>>using the mode, doesn't that make the mode somewhat better?
>>>>
>>> No Jim, it doesn't make the mode better. What it means is that the
>>>people who partake of that mode are more gentlemanly or gentlewomanly.
>>>They also "play nice".
>>>
>
> The let me rephrase:
>
> If the use of a certain mode results in far fewer violations by those
> using the mode, isn't that a good reason to support use of the mode?

Sorry for the whole repost, Jim. Som confusion with quotes. I support Morse CW mode. I think most of the users are good right-thinking hams (right as in correct! ;^)) I never thought about supporting testing on that account. Just that its a better neighborhood.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1497. W1AW vs. The Wannabe

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 22:00:54 UTC
From: drakeswl@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <c0588492.0302021400.3a47dced@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60580
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.misc

'X-No-archive: yes'

Just received the following interesting links.

Look at all the other info first by following this link:

http://users.adelphia.net/~k3vr

Then click on "W1AW vs. The Other Guy"

Or go to the W1AW comparison immediately, with this link:

http://users.adelphia.net/~k3vr/otherguy.htm

-PJ

"Always happy to help a good cause"

1498. Re: The coders embarrass themselves on 14.275 MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 22:29:48 UTC
From: Dean Arthur <dearthur@silverstar.com>
Message-ID: <3E3D9BDC.9B3BD8BA@silverstar.com>
Source record: 60581
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

>...cwers making real asses of themselves [sending shit, shit, shit]

c'mon give them a break. prolly due to millisec attention spans and only able to send the one word they learned to send in finishing school.

1499. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 23:05:24 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030202180524.16280.00001370@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 60583

In article <3E3C8866.F558CAE9@att.net>, Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> writes:

>"Kï¿½HB" wrote:
>
>> "Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote
>>
>> : Geeeeee......Wish we WERE talking about the late Lennie Anderson!
>>
>> What a sorry-assed comment that is!
>>
>> I don't know Lennie very well --- I disagree with him on many issue related
>> to amateur radio --- mostly he sounds like a pompous old grouch --- but
>> publicly asserting that you wish he was "the late" Lennie Anderson goes way
>> beyond even the bounds of "usenet" decency. The quote above makes you an
>> industrial grade jerk --- no, make that an industrial grade asshole.
>
> Even at that he comes in well below the level of either Len or Carl.

Well below septic tank bottoms. Thank you, Dickie, we
finally agree on something after three years or so... :-)

1500. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 23:05:27 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030202180527.16280.00001371@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 60582

In article <3E3C851B.46C28747@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> Fact is, FCC wants out of code testing for a number of reasons that have
little
>> to do with the good of amateur radio. Examples:
>>
>> - FCC doesn't want all the admin work of medical waivers.
>> - FCC doesn't want more petitions for or against code testing
>> - FCC thinks that if code testing is removed and written testing reduced,
>> people who formerly went to cb or freebanding will become hams, thereby
>> reducing enforcement headaches.
>
>All they reduced was the code. It's still the same material on the writtens.
>The differing amount of questions on the tests has little effect on how hard
>one needs to study to prepare for the tests.

One minor matter as highlighted some time ago by Hans
Brakob. An addendum (?) to R&O 99-412 put the type of
written questions entirely up to the VEC QPC...the FCC
took away minimum questions of a particular type such as
regulations, technical things, etc., and just stated a
minimum number of questions per element.

>I wonder if any freebanders decided to get a ham license (general or
>extra, the ones with HF privs) and operate legally on ham bands and
>quit illegal operations in other bands. Of course nobody is going to
>say that he "upgraded" to ham from "freeband".

No? :-)

>All the above can be explained by the fact that it reduces costs
>for the FCC.

I think that was clearly stated in Congress' initial Biennial
Review as well as up front in NPRM 98-143.

1501. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 23:05:31 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030202180531.16280.00001372@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 60586

In article <3E3D2343.B2CCE6C8@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <Oberst@Stalag17.com>
writes:

>I've asked where the selective quoting came from. I provided quoted
>messages showing my original comments and stating that I did not
>originate the system but worked with what was in place. The privately
>run archive sight has all posted messages from the time in question to
>present. You are free to look for anything I might have omitted and to
>repost it here.

Okay, here's something from the "sight." -

==========
From: Dave Heil (k8mn@clinet.fi)
Subject: Re: Can't we all just get along?
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 1998/01/03

Brian wrote:
>
> big, Big snip
>
> > Len, you tried to give me a lesson in the history of radio and you also
> > twisted some dates and events but, to what end? What was that all
> > about? FYI: I was handling the QSYs, openings and closings for a
> > government 75 baud circuit via CW from late '87 through late '89 from
> > Guinea-Bissau. Guess we didn't know CW was obsolete, huh?
> >
> > Dave Heil OH2/K8MN
>
> Dave, as a professional communicator, you should have already known that
> your CW circuit was obsolete. At least you should have had the
> initiative to ask if there was a better way to move your message traffic
> than through a CW circuit.
> Doing something the same old way just because "thats the way we always
> did it," is no longer the right answer. When one of my younger troops
> asked why we were doing something the way we were doing it (or why we
> were doing it at all), I had to have a better answer than that. When I
> didn't, change was imminent.
> By the way, I was using SATCOM voice way back then. Worked great.
> 73, Brian/N0iMD

Brian,

Do you really think I was doing something the hard way because of my
personal choice? Asking for a better way and getting a better way are

two different things. I didn't have access to satellite equipment and certainly wouldn't consider SATCOM voice an alternative for maintaining a 24 hour per day circuit which handled high volumes of traffic.

The point I made was that the government was using such circuits. Nobody was interested in whether I had a better way or not--I was there to run the existing circuit. Multipath propagation and the slow 75 baud RTTY circuit were the unpleasant parts--the CW was fun.

Dave OH2/K8MN

2003 Google

==========

That was from January 3, 1998, over FIVE YEARS ago.

Five years and one month to be more accurate...

Is the colonel's skin so thin that he must, like the resident Reverend Callsign, be continually going back going back going back to old disputes? Yes, it must be, for the colonel is NEVER wrong, not ever.

Here's another -

==========

From: Dave Heil <k8mn@clinet.fi>
Date: Mon, Jan 5, 1998 00:44 EST
Message-id: <34B07331.682@clinet.fi>

>You failed reading comprehension. My post stated that CW was used to
>coordinate openings/closings, QSYs of an RTTY circuit.

Ok, let me requote, word for word, what you originally wrote:

>>>about? FYI: I was handling the QSYs, opening and closings for a
>>>government 75 baud circuit via CW from late '87 through late '89 from
>>>Guinea-Bissau. Guess we didn't know CW was obsolete, huh?

Firstly, you didn't qualify "government." Since you call from a Finnish server, have an OH2 (Finland) slash on your signature, and Guinea-Bissau is an independent country, one needs telepathy to accurately attach "US" in front of "government." Secondly you wrote "75 baud circuit via CW..." which could be a high-speed CW one as much as TTY; "baud" is the old rate name in all telegraphy.

If this was a United States government link, that slow a rate sounds suspicious considering that the military and State Department were already starting to upgrade to 110 Baud (100 WPM) TTY in the late 1960s. Commercial TTY users were doing the same at the same time. Lots of older 60 WPM TTY machines were becoming available as surplus by the mid-1970s, many being converted for

TDD use by hearing-impaired persons courtesy of many clubs of
ex-telephone-company-workers.

Now, I'll grant you that surplus telecomm equipment COULD have
gone into use in Guinea-Bissau considering that country subsists
largely on grant money from other nations and such aid is of minor
value. [the USA is contributing $2.5 million to them in proposed
1998 aid grants] It's difficult to envision a US government circuit
running that slow some 20 years after starting to upgrade to 100
WPM machinery.

>Now we get a geography lesson from Len. It was a U.S. government
>circuit, Len. It wasn't 75 baud CW; it was 75 baud RTTY with CW to
>coordinate it.

There's LOTS of geographic, socio-political information available
on the Web, many site choices. ARRL publications don't carry
much of such information. Anyone with Web access can look them
up. As to "lessons," do you think everyone knows ALL the small
and emerging nations of the world?

Why does an RTTY circuit (of any speed) need "CW to
coordinate it?" RTTY circuits have been used on HF since the
1930s without any extra CW circuit for "coordination." It's a very
simple task to tune in an 170 to 850 Hz shift RTTY signal and lock
onto mark and space with an RTTY demod. "R-Y" generators
were common in old 5-level days, even one-print-line "Fox Test"
generators. ???

Len Anderson

==========

That one is more current...from January 5, 1998! :-)

The colonel never did justify anything insofar as technical
procedures. On RTTY radio circuits anywhere else, the
TTY is used to "coordinate" things (the term "order-wire").
If TTY fails in "coordination" then the circuit won't be
any use in regular TTY traffic, will it?

While "CW" (common term for on-off keyed continuous
waves) may be "fun" to morsemen, a State Department
radio circuit isn't supposed to be some government-run
radio disneyland for its staffers, is it?

>Most African countries are former colonies. Guinea-Bissau is an armpit.
>You missed fish, shrimp and lobster as major exports--lots and lots of
>fish, shrimp and lobster. As fascinating as all of this is, it does not
>address statements made by me regarding the use of CW by the USG.

No matter how I "addressed it," the recipient refuses to
accept delivery! :-)

"Armpit" or not, the colonel never technically explained ANY
use of OOK CW to "coordinate" an RTTY circuit which,
presumably, became fine for TTY message transmission
once CW "coordination" was done! :-)

>So far, the only questioning I've ever received on the issue is from
>you. Others seem to understand my frequent explanations.

"Others" haven't commented...except maybe voices in
your head. "Others" weren't there or doing comm from
there at the time. All we readers had was your claim.

The alleged procedure you outlined is NOT in radio
communication textbooks or military manuals written
from the 1950s on through the 1980s and available for
public (declassified) reference.

Perhaps some "others" can jump in on this 5-year-
dispute over the colonel's Honor and Claims to explain
that State Department procedures are highly classified
on a need-to-know basis? Yes, that is a good way to
Avenge Honor, hiding behind alleged classified-so-nobody-
can-say-you-are-wrong "procedures." Such excuses can
be airlifted in by those wonderful black helicopters by the
ton to buttress your argument butt.

Today, last year, and some time before that the DSN has
and had the procedures to use along with descriptions of
DSN circuits through both land and radio and satellite
relay circuits. It's not any sort of violation of anything to
explain generalities in US government communications.
It's only a serious (very serious) violation to reveal the
encryption keys, method of encryption, some of the
technical synchronization details, and the contents of
sensitive messages.

>I've never
>claimed that the use of CW for this purpose was common or worldwide.

No...and neither have you revealed much of anything else
of a radio communication nature. You are not a nature lover,
only a self-presentation-as-expert kind of lover.

>You'd, of course, not have any way of knowing what is or was done by
>military or government HF radio users in Africa or worldwide in the
>present era--your being a retired fellow in California whose big claim
>to HF operation was half a century back.

I claim only what is declassified. Public sources are
available. I've given references, can give more, even
repeat the title of a nice NavShips technical manual that
explains proper procedures for TTY and RTTY along
with technical details of the mechanical TTYs. It was
available for public sale through the US Government

Printing Office in the mid-1970s. It was used in all
military branches as a common text on TTY until the
conversion to electronic data terminals beginning in
the late 1970s.

The colonel's argument was that near-equatorial
regions of middle Africa prevented regular use of RTTY
there so CW (on-off keyed continuous wave) had to be
used to "coordinate" things. There aren't many in here
who've operated anything, let alone set foot in middle
Africa. That's a good basis for the usual fish-story
snow job...hoping that nobody will burst the bubble.

The first pin-prick in bubble-bursting is the "need" to
"coordinate" things using OOK CW and then switching
to another mode. If "coordination" through OOK CW
works but other modes don't, why isn't procedure stated
to use OOK CW for regular traffic? If RTTY would work
for regular traffic, why wasn't that used to "coordinate"
the circuit? The "explanation" was the claim to conditions
in equatorial Africa "prevented coordination." Circular
logic. Invalid. Rationalization of newsgroup message
statements, NOT any sort of "technical explanation."

This is like another "colonel" (claimed, retired) "whose son
was behind enemy lines in Iraq" during the Gulf War,
"sending intelligence data back by CW" on HF. Another
snow job. Nobody in the newsgroup was IN the Gulf War
therefore no one could discount a claimed 'retired colonel'
whose SON "was there." Snow job. Fish story. No way
to prove the tale by public references...except to show
references of 1980s and 1990s US military communications
doctrine and equipment that were public.

>There is no Department of State listing of "key posts". There is the
>"Key Officers" listing, as you've discovered. You can assume whatever
>you'd like about the hours of operation. Those will remain only
>assumptions.

I've seen embassy staff listings. If State wants to embelish
labels they can call them anything they want. :-)

I can also present DSN numbers to dial up directly many
embassies...if DSN connection is permitted. Such calls
will go through to someone on-watch is the supposition.
It is inconceivable that embassies and offices would lock
up after an 8-hour day and leave no one in contact.

It doesn't bother me that the Defense Switched Network
can complete a circuit on landline OR via radio circuit,
anywhere in the world, including equatorial Africa..

If a communication by radio could get through other
world equatorial regions three decades before the colonel's
"armpit" time, the alleged failure of middle African radio
circuits for State was not explained nor reasonable.

>You are not in a position to be an expert on what the U.S. Department of
>State does. You could learn a great deal more from public documents.
>There are a great many things that you'll never know. My superiority in
>this case will consist merely of "I know more about it than you know".

Heh heh heh..."there we have it."

I'll never know enough. I'll never accept fish stories or snow
jobs or black helicopters. Just as well... :-)

The colonel is once again "superior." US Department of State
has and does things no one will ever know? Or only known by
a very privileged few? State uses radio in "different ways" than
all other radio users? Of course...apparently...just like all US
radio amateurs "must" test for morsemanship in order to be
granted an amateur license having below-30-MHz privileges.
The colonel has stated...he is superior...he worked for State!

The rest of US citizens are rather familiar with what State has
done. It hasn't been that good in the last half century, has it?

Now, in truth, State Department procedures and uses aren't
directly related to amateur radio policies. Neither are military
radio communications directly related to amateur policy even
if Army, Navy, or USAF comm nets were each larger than the
whole of State's. But...they all involve RADIO and radio
technology, the use thereof, and they all set a base for other
radio services to follow or as examples of what can be done.

==========

I can take the time to counter FIVE-YEAR-OLD messages and
rehash all old outrages by the mighty morsemen. I have the
messages from that prehistory. This constant rehashing is
wasted time, time that can be used to look FORWARD, not
backward or to follow someone claiming "leadership" in an
avocation just because they call themselves "superior."

Gruss gott, colonel, go on back to Google.

1502. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 23:05:32 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030202180532.16280.00001373@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 60584

In article <f45722ac.0302011836.7d34e6c5@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20030131152454.03820.00000302@mb-fr.aol.com>...
>> In article <f45722ac.0301301530.198cb3a3@posting.google.com>,
>> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>>
>> >Tube technology, Steve, tube technology. Clinging to the past, Steve,
>> >clinging to the past.
>>
>> Go easy, Brian, it's probably all he knows. :-)
>
>No kidding. DXpert Dave/K8MN thinks I'm going to manufacture DIODES
>for a cub scout (BSA) radio project, but he cannot envision an antenna
>NOT tilted as in a 1949 QST report.

If it wasn't in an ARRL publication it can't be any good...

>L Cebik is waaay out in front of the Worlds Greatest DXer.

Has a nicer and more informed source of information website
on antennas and other things about amateur radio. W4RNL
regularly posts at Antennex, a website devoted to antenna
experimentation around the world. www.antennex.com

New article viewing requires a subscription but Jack Stone
(editor-publisher) is liberal about letting non-subscribers
view older articles freely. "Older" meaning two to three
months old.

>> Several years ago I was in a discussion of RF circuits and
>> mentioned a "2N918."
>
>Whatever you do, don't mention a discrete component as the HEIRARCHY
>of OF's will demand that you manufacture it.

Please forgive me. Lost my head and mentioned a technical
thing, a transistor that appeared over three decades ago and is
still available and still used. :-)

>> A long-time ham overheard that and asked, with a straight
>> face, "What country is that? A little island?"
>
>Yes, K8MN has been assinged there.

He's been roasted rather well in here. :-)

>> Another turned to him and explained it was a transistor,
>> one of the first to have a transition frequency (f-sub-t)
>> close to microwave region, first appearing in the early
>> 1960s. [about three decades before that discussion]
>> The 2N918 and its cousin the 2N2222 are still on the
>> market and available today. :-)
>
>Hey, none of that damned f-sub-t microwave talk around here!!!

Sorry. :-)
:-)

>This is AMATEUR Radio, bubba.

Yup. Professionals are hated. CBers are hated. Anyone
not loving morse is hated. Anyone not loving OF morsemen
are hated.

So much for the upcoming Valentine's Day...

<signature here, in the shape of a heart symbolising love>

1503. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-02 23:05:35 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030202180535.16280.00001374@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 60585

In article <f45722ac.0302011822.63fd74ba@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<c2356669.0301311002.27cfb6eb@posting.google.com>...
>> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
>news:<20030130211736.08181.00000271@mb-cq.aol.com>...
>> >
>> > I support honoring the laws we have. I don't like the idea that code
>> > testing is going away, but , as I have said repeatedly (and within the
last 48
>> > hours) that I accept it's demise.
>>
>> Same here.
>
>Bull CRAP!!! Dog FECES!!! Human Poop!!! Horse $hit!!
>
>You're all over map regards "not monitoring" exams!!!

Right Rev. Jimmie Callsign will make you go back to
Google with prissy, pedantic paragraph-parsing
screams of outrage that "he never said that!"

:-)

>No ONE is monitoring exams, and if the ARRL wants to push Farnsworth
>to 35 WPM, then -Jim-/N2EY ain't enuf of a ham to stop it even if he
>wanted to. Once you dudes get away with breakin the law there's no
>return, and you've been there and back. It's a runaway train. Call
>FEMA or Homeland Security.

That wonderful example of noble long-time amateurism,
the misery mule, likes VEs "holding hands" during an
exam session. ? What must he be imaging?

VEs aren't staffers of the FCC. The FCC gives VEs and
VECs virtual carte blanche ONLY in observing themselves
as well as the examinees. They are de facto "officers of
the court" in a way, beholden to NO ONE but themselves.
No checks, no balances except among themselves or
between them and their VEC.

According to post-examination disputes of the FCC with
VEs and VECs, they can only find improprieties as a
result of checking test result documents VEs return or
as a result of "tips" from others.

There are NO proper checks-and-balances. All testing
is conducted by VEs/VECs who are the sole on-site
monitors. "Carte blanche?" It's enough for Blanche to
role her cart away, shaking her head...

>We're basically in a holding pattern until S25.5 is
>> changed, and the changed treaty (yes, it really is a treaty) is
>> ratified by the US.
>
>Ratified?

Rev. Callsign thinks ITU-R Recommendations as some kind
of "constitutional amendment" to "ratified" among the states.
:-)

>> However, note this simple fact: Hams today still use Morse.
>
>Hams still pick their noses. Is that a good thing?

They are free to pick their noses...unfortunately some
don't pick the right ones... :-)

Noses can generate sinus waves...

>In fact,
>> it's the second most popular mode on the HF/MF ham bands. Keys,
>> keyers, Morse software, and CW transceivers are being made, bought,
>> sold and USED today in large numbers. In fact, there are probably more
>> hams on the air today using Morse code than at any time in the past.
>
>IS that because there are more hams today???

As Cecil used to remark, "If all you have is a hammer,
everything looks like a nail."

Rev. Jimmie has only the "CW hammer" as his favorite
tool. If a radio receiver don't got no BFO or a transmitter
don't got no morse key jack he no like it. To him, peering
nearsightedly from his ancient, creaky pulpit, everything
Good and Proper in amateur radio involves MORSE with
all caps pronounced as if an edict from Divine Sources.

Evidence of mental near-sightedness comes from NOT
realizing that there are MORE PEOPLE in the USA
NOW than before. Without any benefit of any poll or
even looking at an almanac (certainly not year 2000
Census for the USA), he states with equanimity and
the surety of a morse apostle that "more hams on the
air today using CW than ever before." :-)

Rev. Callsign does NOT present an equal case on
counting those using Voice or Data modes in comparison
with OOK CW. NOT. That's a "fair and reasonable
factual, accurate" response according to him. No

information on other modes, no recent polls, nothing but
statements solely about OOK CW.

>> Hardly "clinging to the past".
>
>Clinging to the past.

...sigh, one of the original "clingons" in ham radio.

>> > I'm also sorry they stopped making 65 Mustangs...But got over that
>too.
>>
>> Remember how the "New Coke" flopped?
>
>Remember how the Restructuring flopped with O.F. hams?
>No-Code=No-Ham???

Rev. Callsign thinks amazon.com is a "not making a profit"
because they can resell ARRL publications without
shipping charges...while orders to ARRL Newington
charge extra for shipping.

R&O 99-412 did not affect Rev. Callsign one bit insofar as
his amateur radio privileges...but it raised holy heck with
his personal picture of divinity as an upper-upper OF.

>> > >Some think it is needed regardless of the ITU requirement. A
>> > >particularly large club began rejecting changes in the code as early
>> > >as 1975 when forward thinking hams begans questioning it relavence.
>> >
>> > A "particularly large club" in the 70's.
>> >
>> > Now there's timeliness and relevence for ya.
>>
>> The fact of the matter is that FCC proposed a complex, "two ladder"
>> license system in 1975,
>
>They shudda lost the code at that point, except for a LARGE membership
>organization and a bunch of O.F's. Welp, I guess 27 years too late
>probably isn't too late to upright the Titanic, unless you're selling
>Titanic Pump Keys.

Rev. Jimmie *IS* the past. He lives there. One might suspect
that he has some kind of highly-advanced time communicator
to post on the Internet in this time-continuum from the past.
Probably using a morse key to modem translator... :-)

>with seven license classes. One of those
>> classes (Communicator?) would have had no code test, and very limited
>> VHF/UHF privileges.
>
>Jim, way, waay, waaay too late to be pushin that CRAP!

What was that about "noses?" I doubt he has a working
model. He should realize that horse died years ago and
all the whipping of the corpse won't bring it to life or make
the smell go away.

>> But most hams (not just members of any club) opposed such a system,
>> and FCC eventually gave up on the proposal.
>
>And amateur radio was set back a quarter of a CENTURY!!!

He thinks that some "war of attrition" had a glorious victory
for the old-timers and the old ways.

>> This was almost simultaneous with the idea of taking 220 from hams and
>> creating a new "Class E" cb band. Lotta weird ideas back then. Musta
>> been the bell bottoms and platform shoes.
>
>Or Exlax.

Rev. Callsign was never young. It would seem he was
born wearing an eye shade and sleeve garters, hand
flexed to operate that Icon of Excellence in Radio, a
morse key. Why he thinks that some mumbling about
"mod" anything will take away the mental picture others
get is beyond me...

>> > >You are wrong.
>> >
>> > Not until you provide some specific cite I'm not. Sorry you "think"
>> > otherwise.
>> >
>> > >January is about tube radios.
>>
>> Is that a bad thing?
>
>Yo Jim, is your kit radio a tube radio???

He probably has his Elecraft KIT (which he designed, he designs
ALL his radios) modded for a tube circuit of some sort...

>> > And I SPECIFICALLY said with the exception of items of historical
>> > relevence...That article is about history and nostalgia...NOT about
>> > excluding new technology.
>> >
>> > >Tube technology, Steve, tube technology.
>>
>> Are tubes no longer used by hams?
>
>Yo Jim, is your kit radio a tube radio???

Elecraft ought to make their KIT cabinets with electro-
luminescent panel inlays. That way they could all "glow
in the dark" and make boatanchor types feel warm...

>> > > Clinging to the past, Steve, clinging to the past.
>> >
>> > "Clinging to the past" would be publishing stories on tube
>technology TO
>> > THE EXCLUSION of all other technologies.
>>
>> Exactly.
>
>No, no, no. Clinging to the past would be publishing tube radio
>CONSTRUCTION articles en leiu of publishing TODAY'S amateurs radio
>activities in the ARRL Sections. Hello Dave Heil! Whare are you on
>this???

One-tube regenerative receivers were a tremendous techie
breakthrough in the 1930s. Tradition of OFs Nostalgia
demands the Tradition to Live, always rediscovering the
past and glorious achievements of yesteryear. Sigh.

The colonel is presently living in the State of Google but
is grabbing his official ARRL Dictionary to correct a
couple of your typos to show you are "always error prone
and therefore every single post you make is of no
consequence." Some things are SO predictable.

>> Would it be better if car magazines no longer printed articles about
>> '65 Mustangs, because that would be "clinging to the past"? How about
>> listening to "oldies", or classical music - all "clinging to the
>> past", right? Would it be better if all vintage airplanes were
>> grounded and antique cars removed from the road, because those things
>> are all examples of "clinging to the past?
>>
>> I don't think so!
>
>It would be nice to see Jim "cling to the future" once in his amateur
>career.

Warrior Clingons don't do that. The future doesn't exist yet so
Google doesn't have any references on the future nor has ARRL
published a "Future Handbook." He can't post on the future
because he doesn't have a reference to the future so that he
can post mannerly, orderly, factually correct things on the
future.

This "electronics industry wizard" who "gave talks to industry"
probably doesn't read electronics trade publications received
at his workplace. Someplace. Those trades regularly carry
articles on the technology that will come in the near future
as well as discussions of standards that will be part of the
future. If it isn't stated in QST, it won't happen for him.

>Pretend that you like vanilla ice cream with mint chips, just once.

If the spoon isn't shaped like a morse key, I doubt he would
try a new flavor.

>> Here's a question: Should QST refuse paid advertisements for things
>> like telegraph keys, because some folks consider such things to be
>> "clinging to the past"?
>
>Should a membership organization tell their members to go look for
>member information on another format so that they can devote space to
>paid advertisements for things like "pump telegraph keys," because
>some folks consider such things to be "clinging to the past"?
>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>Jim, quit clinging to the past. I know it's scary, but I'm confident
>that the closet monsters won't get you.

Them monsters won't come out of the closet. He is a pedantic
prissy puritan in radio matters. I suspect the monsters are all
under his bed like Calvin's...(from the late comic strip Calvin &
Hobbes by Bill Waterston). It was better, far better than ARRL
tailored comic strips about "Archie." :-)

1504. Re: More Of How KB1HMW "Supports" Amateur Radio...NOT!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-03 00:03:40 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v3rcemniijhteb@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 60587

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030202111230.06461.00000405@mb-cv.aol.com...
> From: "KB9TMP"
> >I believe YOU are weird, a amateur op that HATES ham history,
> >ham jargon, and it seems hams in general!
>
> I don't hate Hams.

There you go using that "H" code word again.

>Certain aspects aren't being realized and I want to
> participate in those aspects.

Like what for instance? Name some of those aspects
that aren't being realized. We all know that a hamfest
isn't one of them.

> Much of this is due to what most Hams aren't
> interested in those aspects.
>

Like what? I might be interested in them, or not
depending on what they are, you never seem to say.

> >Check out the next Star Trek convention if you
> >don't believe it.
>

Where did the rest of my statement go? When you
cut stuff out of a post you need to leave enough so
people can follow the line of thought. Also putting
a <SNIP> can let the reader know that a part has
been cut out of a post.

> Someone compared a Ham radio Hamfest to a Star Trek convention, so this is
not
> a good example. Then, he asked me if Ham radio is a cult. However, not all
> cults are bad.

Then why do you keep on raggin on the hams as
being part of a cult? BTW I'm the one who did
that comparison

>
> >When was the last time you saw someone
> >walking down the street wearing a mask to make them look
> >like a Klingon?

>
> When was the last time you saw someone wearing a hat with their callsign
on it,
> a shirt that says "Learn Morse code or Ham radio will become CB", and
carrying
> a bunch of HTs? My guess is not too long ago.

The thing is at a Star Trek convention a person dressed
up as a klingon is a "NORMAL" part of the convention.
Just as a callsign hat and Morse Code "T" shirt are a
"NORMAL" part of a hamfest.

Carrying a number of HTs seems to be new trend in
the ARS, but when you have APRS, and multi bands
to cover I can see where it might be done. BTW at
work I carry my work radio, and I carry my EMA
radio (two radios at once) , I used to get kidded
about it until we had an emergency at the school and
I was on the school radio and the fire repeater at the
same time coordinating the school and ambulance
response, now I don't get ANY flack! The EMA
radio has ham radio frequencies in it also, so that
saves me at least ONE radio.

>
> From:K4YZ
>
> >>No, I said that Hams are not: ex-cons, wife beaters, alcoholics,
druggies,
> >>nut
> >>cases, slobs, fruits. But, many are societal (or social) misfits.
> >
> > No, Vipul...YOU statd MOST hams were fat, and are (social) misfits.
You
> >can't have it both ways.
>

RIGHT ON!

> I am not having it both ways. I did say that Hams are social misfits. But
I
> also said that Hams do not have those other negative qualities mentioned.
>

If they are a "social misfit" that IS A NEGATIVE QUALITY!

> >Obvioulsy you LIKE being "weird" because
> >you continue to maintain the basic vestige of what YOU consider "weird",
tha
> >Amateur Radio license.
>
> I can have a license and get the benefits from having one. Is it wrong to

have
> a dialogue to change the hobby from within so that my interests get more
> participants? And, the demographical comment is for the improve the image
of
> the hobby.
>

If you want your interests to get more participants try LEADING NOT
WHINING to get your point across. Again what are those interests?
You never get around to telling us what they are! So your dialogue
from within isn't doing to well!

> From AA2QA
>
> >I still get a big laugh over the HT statement when just about
> >everyone is yakking on a cellphone (especially the idiots trying to drive
> >while yakking on the phone - and running red lights to boot).
> >
>
> I was quoting someone else.
>
> > I can't believe the folks wearing ear protection with those radios
> >(oh, cell phones; but they are nothing but a duplex HT connected to the
> >telephone system - and my HT can connect to the telephone system too)
stuck
> >under one of the earpads so they can look busy and chat for hours on end.
> >Yep, the hams sure are a strange group, huh?
>
> Even better example - pagers. Also appointment schedulers. There are a
number
> of devices a non-Ham could have. Your point makes sense.
>
>

Face it Vipul, look hard enough and ANY group of people
will look wierd. It just doesn't make any sense to be a part
of that group and point your finger at them and tell them how
wierd THEY ARE. If you don't like the company LEAVE!!!
--
KB9TMP
I don't want to belong to any club
that will accept me as a member.
-Groucho Marx

1505. Re: The coders embarrass themselves on 14.275 MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-03 00:49:25 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b1ke8k$m9l$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 60588
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

... -.-. .-. . .-- -.-- --- ..-

Dan/W4NTI

"Dean Arthur" <dearthur@silverstar.com> wrote in message
news:3E3D9BDC.9B3BD8BA@silverstar.com...
> >...cwers making real asses of themselves [sending shit, shit, shit]
>
> c'mon give them a break. prolly due to millisec attention spans and only
> able to send the one word they learned to send in finishing school.
>

1506. Re: The coders embarrass themselves on 14.275 MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-03 01:41:09 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v3ri5egrj0mrf9@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 60589
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:b1ke8k$m9l$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> ... -.-. .-. . .-- -.-- --- ..-
>
> Dan/W4NTI

.-- . -.-- -.-- ... .- .. -.. -.. .- -.
.-- ....- -. - .. -.. . -.- -... ----. - -- .--.
>
> "Dean Arthur" <dearthur@silverstar.com> wrote in message
> news:3E3D9BDC.9B3BD8BA@silverstar.com...
> > >...cwers making real asses of themselves [sending shit, shit, shit]
> > >
> > > c'mon give them a break. prolly due to millisec attention spans and only
> > > able to send the one word they learned to send in finishing school.
> > >
> >
> >

1507. Re: The coders embarrass themselves on 14.275 MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-03 02:06:31 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b1kip6$vc2$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 60590
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Thank you.

Dan/W4NTI

"KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com> wrote in message
news:v3ri5egrj0mrf9@corp.supernews.com...
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:b1ke8k$m9l$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> > ... -.-. .-. . .-- -.-- --- ..-
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
>
> .-- . -.-- -.-- ... .- .. -.. -.. .- -.
> .-- ....- -. - .. -.. . -.- -... ----. - -- .--.
> >
> > "Dean Arthur" <dearthur@silverstar.com> wrote in message
> > news:3E3D9BDC.9B3BD8BA@silverstar.com...
> > > >...cwers making real asses of themselves [sending shit, shit, shit]
> > >
> > > c'mon give them a break. prolly due to millisec attention spans and
only
> > > able to send the one word they learned to send in finishing school.
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

1508. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-03 02:06:54 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030202210654.11988.00000339@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 60591

>Subject: Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/2/03 5:05 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030202180531.16280.00001372@mb-mo.aol.com>

>I can take the time to counter FIVE-YEAR-OLD messages and
> rehash all old outrages by the mighty morsemen. I have the
> messages from that prehistory. This constant rehashing is
> wasted time, time that can be used to look FORWARD, not
> backward or to follow someone claiming "leadership" in an
> avocation just because they call themselves "superior."

Interesting stuff, Lennie, but what did you "prove"? Nothing you quoted disproved anything Dave Heil's been saying.

On the otherhand, recent posts made about you HAVE proven that you HAVE BEEN lying.

And speaking of "looking forward", when can we look forward to seeing you signing posts with an Amateur calllsign?

1509. Re: Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, FCC, Cronkite, ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-03 02:18:15 UTC
From: drakeswl@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <c0588492.0302021818.6664c84f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60592
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

'X-No-archive: yes'

Was anyone under the impression that the FCC has to "prove" anything in front of the ALJ? No mon freres, it is the licensee, not the FCC, that has the burden of proof in front of the ALJ. The licensee must show the ALJ why he should remain a licensee, after being hauled before the ALJ by the Commission.

Remember we are talking about an administrative body here. It isn't the kind of court where we are talking about citizen's rights. The Commission is charged by Congess with overseeing a body of administrivia. They are presenting information to a Judge of administrivial matters, who will rule in the FCC's favor. Who knows more about FCC administrivia than the FCC?

Here's how it works. The FCC says, "According to our records, we sent you a letter over a year ago about a bunch of stuff we thought was wrong in the operation of your station.

You sent us back a letter that didn't convince us you understand our rules, or our right to enforce them. Now, a year later, you still haven't fixed what we asked you to fix about the operation of your station. Let's go see the Administrative Law Judge."

So it's off to see the ALJ.

On the happy day, the ALJ says, "OK Mr. licensee, tell me why you should remain a licensee? Sitting in front of me here is a pile of FCC monitoring info, records of trips to an apparently empty ham shack that was on the air at the time it was apparently empty, a bunch of complaints from other licensees, another list that the Compliance and Information Bureau says are thirty-five apparent violations, quite a few tape recordings of you stomping all over people who were already using the frequency, that were submitted by impartial OO's with accompanying affidavits regarding their legitimacy, and several felony affidavit complaints you illegally sent out to people who complained about your station. You may explain Sir."

After the licensee explains, whether it takes five minutes or five hours, the ALJ says, "Thank you sir," (then he shuffles some papers for effect) and then he says "this body rejects your explanation, which is indicative of your lack of understanding of the Commission's rules and accordingly, your privilege to operate a ham radio station is hereby revoked, as is your primary ham station license. Have a nice day. Next case please."

And that's how it goes. Don't be too upset by it. You need to remember it is only a hobby. It's not like the ALJ is saying he can't worship freely or vote in the next election.

If the ALJ could speak in plain English, he would say, "Look dude, I hate to tell you this, but it is the Commission's game, not yours. They decide who is playing nicely, and following their rules, and who is acting like an asshole. If you can't convince them you are on the up-and-up, they send you to me. And I break the news as gently as I can. Game over, turn in your ticket, hasta la vista baby. Try stamp collecting or something. There are lots of fun hobbies that don't have as many rules. Now get out of my Court, you clown."

And that my friends, is that. It really is that easy. If you don't believe it, obtain and read the record for any ALJ proceeding in Amateur Radio.

-PJ

1510. Re: The coders embarrass themselves on 14.275 MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-03 02:44:52 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9316DD35740BFelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 60593
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Lloyd@no.spammmmm (K1MAN Man) wrote in
news:3E3C8857.F70AF778@taranews.net:

> On Sun, 2 Feb 2003 18:49:25 -0600, Dan/W4NTI
> <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote:
>> ... -.-. .-. . .-- -.-- --- ..-
>>
>> Dan/W4NTI
>>
>> "Dean Arthur" <dearthur@silverstar.com> wrote in message
>> news:3E3D9BDC.9B3BD8BA@silverstar.com...
>> > >...cwers making real asses of themselves [sending shit, shit, shit]
>> >
>> > c'mon give them a break. prolly due to millisec attention spans and
>> > only able to send the one word they learned to send in finishing
>> > school.
>
> NTI top posts with "screw you" in dots and dashes. He proves our
> point doesn't he?
>

Yes, especially as I didn't notice what it said, as I couldn't be bothered to decipher it. Abuse in CW doesn't grab anyone's attention, so most can't be bothered to do it in the first palce, and if they do no-one can be bothered to report it, since they don't really notice it. That's pretty much what I've been saying.

1511. Re: Shortwave KOOKS comment on Shuttle 12.160

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-03 03:57:12 UTC
From: Tom Sevart <n2uhcNOSPAM@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <b1kpa6$13igc1$1@ID-52518.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 60594
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

"shortwave woowoo" <greenfields@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:3e3c1e8f@snipnews.snip.net...
>
> ALEX JONES AND JOHN STADTMELLER - TWO VETERAN SHORTWAVE
> KOOKS COMMENTING ON COLUMBIA LOSS AS ALL BEING PART
> OF A MASSIVE CONSPIRACY TO BOOST BUSH'S RATINGS INTHE
> POLLS AS A PRELUDE TO THE IRAQ WAR !

Typical... most nutjob conspiracy theorists don't think that any major event
just happens, it's always part of a massive dark conspiracy. Kind of the
way they were all saying that the 9/11 terrorist attacks were all planned &
carried out by the government.

Tom

1512. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-03 04:16:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030202231611.22282.00000548@mb-ca.aol.com>
Source record: 60596

In article <3E3D6CAF.627A63C1@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Let us know how it works out once you obtain a license for amateur radio
>transmission.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Still on that kick...

I've had a commercial license for commercial radio
transmission since 1956...a mere 47 years in March.

The FCC doesn't require any of its staff or commissioners
to have any amateur radio license in order to set regulations
or enforce those regulations.

I never had any reason to get any radio license to work in
military radio transmission, including being an NCO and an
HF radio transmission operating team leader.

I never had any reason to use my commercial license to
transmit RF energy (higher than any Part 15 or 95 limits)
on DoD contract work on frequencies spanning from LF to
Ku band in the microwave region (up to about 25 GHz).

My only need for the commercial license for any RF
transmission after 1960 was in the early 1970s on an
RCA Corporation funded R&D project...450+ MHz and
1.6 GHz.

In order to make commentary in a newsgroup I have to
have an amateur radio license with below-30-MHz
privileges?!?

...excuse me a minute...

BWAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHEEHEE
HEEHEEHAWHAWHAWHAWHAW...GUFFAW...
HARHARHARHARHARHAR...SNICKER SNICKER.

[that was much better...]

<signature here, as on Laugh-In's list of Goldie Hawn's
body painters...>

1513. Re: arrl article on echolink - impress a non ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-03 04:16:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030202231611.22282.00000547@mb-ca.aol.com>
Source record: 60598

In article <3E3D7335.E596C7B3@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> I'd call him someone with the callsign W8MN. Heil spends a
>> lot of time on here doing that... :-)
>
>You'd call him Jari Kulkki? How did he get into your diatribe? You
>yourself would fit the mold except for that part about obtaining an
>amateur radio license.

Mea culpa. Silly me, I thought Colonel Heil had a sequential
1x2 with a W beginning...him being the OF and all.

One of the "latter-day-Ks?" Vanity? Of course... :-)

<signature here, in accord with OF directives and orders>

1514. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-03 04:16:12 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030202231612.22282.00000549@mb-ca.aol.com>
Source record: 60597

In article <3E3D6996.83A839CE@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>> Rev. Callsign never worked IN or for the FCC, cannot possibly
>> "know" their "motivations."
>
>Foghorn Lenhorn never worked IN or for the Department of State and
>cannot possibly "know" its "motivations".

Based on the past observations of the US Department of
State, I wouldn't want to. :-)

The colonel (no relation to the Sanders guy, but still chicken)
doesn't know that I never questioned the US Department of
State in this newsgroup.

>That hasn't even slowed down
>his input on "knowing" what could or couldn't, has or hasn't worked as
>an order wire for a RTTY circuit.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, I know basic procedure in most radio circuits
used by the military now as well as "BD" (before "data"),
most other US government radio circuits, and commercial
communications carriers. None of those use CW as an
order-wire on RTTY radio circuits. :-)

I have no knowledge of what US embassies use in equatorial
Africa to overcome their terrible radio conditions. I would
suggest some liason with the BIGGER radio net users in US
government to help them solve State's problems.

>It hasn't prevented him from
>"knowing" who is or isn't on a Key Officers list or from "knowing" that
>the State Department uses Radio Officers despite State's never having
>had such a position title. Doesn't that just ruffle your feathers?

Not at all. The colonel's problem is the colonel's problem and
can't be solved by logic, reason, or common sense.

A shovel might have helped all the readers with that mighty
Snow Job of five years ago.

>Your face should be as red as your comb from all your recent gaffes.

My comb is natural-finish aluminum...virtually indestructible
and I've had it for more than 15 years, still retaining hair on

the head for its use. :-)

Now pull up a bag of cashews and explain EXACTLY WHY
some equatorial African region radio circuit "needs" to
switch to CW in order to "coordinate" schedules and other
pertinent circuit data...yet a non-CW mode is used for
regular traffic?

Do morse code modes "know" the difference between regular
traffic and "coordination" information?

They don't?!? Well, then, why isn't the "coordination" data
exchanged using the same mode as regular traffic?

I've been waiting about 5 years for a valid reason. Hasn't
been posted yet...

<signature here with FEC to avoid errors...>

1515. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-03 04:16:13 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030202231613.22282.00000550@mb-ca.aol.com>
Source record: 60595

In article <3E3D6FD6.1E048EA5@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>I've never had use for an antenna which requires a linear amp to break
>even on gain when transmitting. I have used and do use loss antennas
>when receiving on 160m or 80m. I can rotate them to null noise and use
>a preamp to bring up the desired signal.

Wow, scientific breakthrough! Antennas null noise! :-)

The Deep Space Network should be appraised of this!

<signature here to avoid null sermons...>

1516. Re: Ironic...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-03 04:22:37 UTC
From: Tom Sevart <n2uhcNOSPAM@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <b1kqpt$14hvgd$1@ID-52518.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 60599
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

"Alan W. Craft" <mauritius4@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:onnq3vcquhqaj0t6umk9oqb0uhirqakmto@4ax.com...
> On Sat, 01 Feb 2003 23:27:57 GMT, "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
wrote:
>
> >"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> >news:b1h6e80t2d@enews4.newsguy.com...
> >> This article is just too creepy. It was in *yesterday's* San Francisco
> >> Chronicle.
> >>
> >> http://sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2003/01/31/MN90087.DTL
> >
> >What aspect was "creepy?"
>
> That Columbia did indeed "appear like a bright meteor"?

It was my understanding that shuttles reentering the atmosphere are always
visible and sonic booms are heard, so I didn't think the article was all
that creepy. However, it does kind of give a sense of foreshadowing of
yesterday's tragedy.

Tom

1517. Re: K1MAN for the 2003 Amateur Hall of Fame!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-03 05:19:15 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E3DFBD3.2040503@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 60605

WA8ULX the extra lite wrote:
>>I would be happy to nominate Glenn for the shit-head-of-the-year
>>award,
>
>
> You have that award hands down.

No, you would be second in line after Baxter. Still proud of that
extra lite extra class ticket?

1518. GROL vs Amateur Privileges

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-03 05:23:40 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030203002340.11961.00000396@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 60600

>Subject: Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/2/03 10:16 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030202231611.22282.00000548@mb-ca.aol.com>

>I've had a commercial license for commercial radio
> transmission since 1956...a mere 47 years in March.

A license which, in the absence of a STATION license with SPECIFIC parameters on operating frequencies, modes, hours of operation, location, antennas and power, is useless.

>I never had any reason to get any radio license to work in
> military radio transmission, including being an NCO and an
> HF radio transmission operating team leader

And what allowances did the Army make so you could decide the operating frequency, mode, who you called, what you discussed, choice of antennas, operating times, etc?

>I never had any reason to use my commercial license to
> transmit RF energy (higher than any Part 15 or 95 limits)
> on DoD contract work on frequencies spanning from LF to
> Ku band in the microwave region (up to about 25 GHz.

And those DoD contracts did not allow you to "operate" any radio on any Amateur Radio allocation, nor with the aforementioned power, mode, etc etc considerations at YOUR discretion.

>My only need for the commercial license for any RF
> transmission after 1960 was in the early 1970s on an
> RCA Corporation funded R&D project...450+ MHz and
> 1.6 GHz.

So...that hallowed ground of commercial radio licensure let you "operate" on a few spot frequencies at 70cm and 23 cm in the 70's.....Whew...I am impressed. (not!)

>In order to make commentary in a newsgroup I have to
> have an amateur radio license with below-30-MHz
> privileges?!?

By your own admission in the foregoing, you have NO practical experience in matters pertaining to Amateur Radio practice or regulations.

Your comprehension and understanding of them are dubious based upon your frequent faux pas in this forum. No doubt your conduct on the air would soon bring you to the attention of an FCC monitoring station.

Forget being unlicensed...you're just plain incompetent.

Steve, K4YZ

1519. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-03 05:52:41 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E3E038F.E094CA94@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60601

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E3D2343.B2CCE6C8@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <Oberst@Stalag17.com>
> writes:
>
> >I've asked where the selective quoting came from. I provided quoted
> >messages showing my original comments and stating that I did not
> >originate the system but worked with what was in place. The privately
> >run archive sight has all posted messages from the time in question to
> >present. You are free to look for anything I might have omitted and to
> >repost it here.
>
> Okay, here's something from the "sight." -
>
> ==
> From: Dave Heil (k8mn@clinet.fi)
> Subject: Re: Can't we all just get along?
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> Date: 1998/01/03
>
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > big, Big snip
> >
> > > Len, you tried to give me a lesson in the history of radio and you also
> > > twisted some dates and events but, to what end? What was that all
> > > about? FYI: I was handling the QSYs, openings and closings for a
> > > government 75 baud circuit via CW from late '87 through late '89 from
> > > Guinea-Bissau. Guess we didn't know CW was obsolete, huh?
> > >
> > > Dave Heil OH2/K8MN
> >
> > Dave, as a professional communicator, you should have already known that
> > your CW circuit was obsolete. At least you should have had the
> > initiative to ask if there was a better way to move your message traffic
> > than through a CW circuit.
> > Doing something the same old way just because "thats the way we always
> > did it," is no longer the right answer. When one of my younger troops
> > asked why we were doing something the way we were doing it (or why we
> > were doing it at all), I had to have a better answer than that. When I
> > didn't, change was imminent.
> > By the way, I was using SATCOM voice way back then. Worked great.
> > 73, Brian/N0iMD
>

> Brian,
>
> Do you really think I was doing something the hard way because of my
> personal choice? Asking for a better way and getting a better way are
> two different things. I didn't have access to satellite equipment and
> certainly wouldn't consider SATCOM voice an alternative for maintaining
> a 24 hour per day circuit which handled high volumes of traffic.
>
> The point I made was that the government was using such circuits.
> Nobody was interested in whether I had a better way or not--I was there
> to run the existing circuit. Multipath propagation and the slow 75 baud
> RTTY circuit were the unpleasant parts--the CW was fun.
>
> Dave OH2/K8MN
>
> 2003 Google
>
> ==========
>
> That was from January 3, 1998, over FIVE YEARS ago.
>
> Five years and one month to be more accurate...

Yeah. Neat, Len. It is also something I just recently reposted. It
clearly shows that I did not originate the idea. I also pointed out
that it was five years ago and not the three years stated by you.

> Is the colonel's skin so thin that he must, like the
> resident Reverend Callsign, be continually going back
> going back going back to old disputes? Yes, it must
> be, for the colonel is NEVER wrong, not ever.

You brought the issue up. You continue to bring the issue up. You've
lied about it for five years. You're a humbug.

> Here's another -
>
> ==========
>
> From: Dave Heil <k8mn@clinet.fi>
> Date: Mon, Jan 5, 1998 00:44 EST
> Message-id: <34B07331.682@clinet.fi>
>
> >You failed reading comprehension. My post stated that CW was used to
> >coordinate openings/closings, QSYs of an RTTY circuit.
>
> Ok, let me requote, word for word, what you originally wrote:
>
> >>>about? FYI: I was handling the QSYs, opening and closings for a
> >>>government 75 baud circuit via CW from late '87 through late '89 from
> >>>Guinea-Bissau. Guess we didn't know CW was obsolete, huh?

> Firstly, you didn't qualify "government." Since you call from a
> Finnish server, have an OH2 (Finland) slash on your signature,
> and Guinea-Bissau is an independent country, one needs
> telepathy to accurately attach "US" in front of "government."

> Secondly you wrote "75 baud circuit via CW..." which could be a
> high-speed CW one as much as TTY; "baud" is the old rate name
> in all telegraphy.

> If this was a United States government link, that slow a rate sounds
> suspicious considering that the military and State Department were
> already starting to upgrade to 110 Baud (100 WPM) TTY in the
> late 1960s.

> Commercial TTY users were doing the same at the
> same time. Lots of older 60 WPM TTY machines were becoming
> available as surplus by the mid-1970s, many being converted for
> TDD use by hearing-impaired persons courtesy of many clubs of
> ex-telephone-company-workers.

> Now, I'll grant you that surplus telecomm equipment COULD have
> gone into use in Guinea-Bissau considering that country subsists
> largely on grant money from other nations and such aid is of minor
> value. [the USA is contributing $2.5 million to them in proposed
> 1998 aid grants] It's difficult to envision a US government circuit
> running that slow some 20 years after starting to upgrade to 100
> WPM machinery.

> >Now we get a geography lesson from Len. It was a U.S. government
> >circuit, Len. It wasn't 75 baud CW; it was 75 baud RTTY with CW to
> >coordinate it.
>
> There's LOTS of geographic, socio-political information available
> on the Web, many site choices. ARRL publications don't carry
> much of such information. Anyone with Web access can look them
> up. As to "lessons," do you think everyone knows ALL the small
> and emerging nations of the world?

> Why does an RTTY circuit (of any speed) need "CW to
> coordinate it?" RTTY circuits have been used on HF since the
> 1930s without any extra CW circuit for "coordination." It's a very
> simple task to tune in an 170 to 850 Hz shift RTTY signal and lock
> onto mark and space with an RTTY demod. "R-Y" generators
> were common in old 5-level days, even one-print-line "Fox Test"
> generators. ???
>
> Len Anderson
>
> ==

Nope, nothing about me claiming that I originated the idea there.

>
> That one is more current...from January 5, 1998! :-)

>
> The colonel never did justify anything insofar as technical
> procedures. On RTTY radio circuits anywhere else, the
> TTY is used to "coordinate" things (the term "order-wire").
> If TTY fails in "coordination" then the circuit won't be
> any use in regular TTY traffic, will it?

The Foghorn is entitled to no more of an explanation than already
provided.
It has been explained yet. You've just been having difficulty with the
comprehension part.

> While "CW" (common term for on-off keyed continuous
> waves) may be "fun" to morsemen, a State Department
> radio circuit isn't supposed to be some government-run
> radio disneyland for its staffers, is it?

Nor are Foreign Service members penalized for enjoying their work.
The need for you to point out in an amateur radio newsgroup what "CW"
stands for is duly noted.

> >Most African countries are former colonies. Guinea-Bissau is an armpit.
> >You missed fish, shrimp and lobster as major exports--lots and lots of
> >fish, shrimp and lobster. As fascinating as all of this is, it does not
> >address statements made by me regarding the use of CW by the USG.
>
> No matter how I "addressed it," the recipient refuses to
> accept delivery! :-)

You haven't come up with an archived quote yet? C'mon Foghorn, I'm
pulling for you. Maybe something will come along which will allow you
to save face.

> "Armpit" or not, the colonel never technically explained ANY
> use of OOK CW to "coordinate" an RTTY circuit which,
> presumably, became fine for TTY message transmission
> once CW "coordination" was done! :-)

Sure I did.

> >So far, the only questioning I've ever received on the issue is from
> >you. Others seem to understand my frequent explanations.

> "Others" haven't commented...except maybe voices in
> your head. "Others" weren't there or doing comm from
> there at the time. All we readers had was your claim.

Well for one, N2EY has commented. He seems to have had no problem
understanding. No negative comments were received from others here who
have worked in government or military communications. There is only
you.

> The alleged procedure you outlined is NOT in radio
> communication textbooks or military manuals written

> from the 1950s on through the 1980s and available for
> public (declassified) reference.

And you point is?

> Perhaps some "others" can jump in on this 5-year-
> dispute over the colonel's Honor and Claims to explain
> that State Department procedures are highly classified
> on a need-to-know basis? Yes, that is a good way to
> Avenge Honor, hiding behind alleged classified-so-nobody-
> can-say-you-are-wrong "procedures." Such excuses can
> be airlifted in by those wonderful black helicopters by the
> ton to buttress your argument butt.

You'll have to deal with the fact that I know things which I can't tell
you.
You seem to be the guy seeing and hearing black helicopters. This isn't
the first time you've been "SUSPICIOUS".

> Today, last year, and some time before that the DSN has
> and had the procedures to use along with descriptions of
> DSN circuits through both land and radio and satellite
> relay circuits. It's not any sort of violation of anything to
> explain generalities in US government communications.

You aren't only asking generalities. I don't know you, don't like you
and certainly wouldn't post such information in an internet newsgroup.

> It's only a serious (very serious) violation to reveal the
> encryption keys, method of encryption, some of the
> technical synchronization details, and the contents of
> sensitive messages.

Wrong again, Bucko. It is not only serious to reveal just information
on the things described by you. Interesting is that you've quizzed me
on the technical synchronization details though.

> >I've never
> >claimed that the use of CW for this purpose was common or worldwide.
>
> No...and neither have you revealed much of anything else
> of a radio communication nature. You are not a nature lover,
> only a self-presentation-as-expert kind of lover.

Pretty funny stuff coming from a guy with your history, Len.

> >You'd, of course, not have any way of knowing what is or was done by
> >military or government HF radio users in Africa or worldwide in the
> >present era--your being a retired fellow in California whose big claim
> >to HF operation was half a century back.
>
> I claim only what is declassified. Public sources are
> available. I've given references, can give more, even

> repeat the title of a nice NavShips technical manual that
> explains proper procedures for TTY and RTTY along
> with technical details of the mechanical TTYs. It was
> available for public sale through the US Government
> Printing Office in the mid-1970s. It was used in all
> military branches as a common text on TTY until the
> conversion to electronic data terminals beginning in
> the late 1970s.

Interesting (not). I never did TTY work in the military and I really
don't care.

> The colonel's argument was that near-equatorial
> regions of middle Africa prevented regular use of RTTY
> there so CW (on-off keyed continuous wave) had to be
> used to "coordinate" things. There aren't many in here
> who've operated anything, let alone set foot in middle
> Africa. That's a good basis for the usual fish-story
> snow job...hoping that nobody will burst the bubble.

Hearing those black helicopters again, Foggy? Guess you'll have to
continue your quest for information. You're kind of drifting far afield
from your silly claims that I claimed originality for the idea. Now I
wonder where THOSE archived messages went.

> The first pin-prick in bubble-bursting is the "need" to
> "coordinate" things using OOK CW and then switching
> to another mode. If "coordination" through OOK CW
> works but other modes don't, why isn't procedure stated
> to use OOK CW for regular traffic? If RTTY would work
> for regular traffic, why wasn't that used to "coordinate"
> the circuit? The "explanation" was the claim to conditions
> in equatorial Africa "prevented coordination." Circular
> logic. Invalid. Rationalization of newsgroup message
> statements, NOT any sort of "technical explanation."

Not circular logic in the least. As previously explained on numerous
occasions, RTTY did not always work for regular traffic. CW did--but
your're drifting rather far afield from your statements that I claimed
originality for its use.
Where are those archived quotes?

> This is like another "colonel" (claimed, retired) "whose son
> was behind enemy lines in Iraq" during the Gulf War,
> "sending intelligence data back by CW" on HF. Another
> snow job. Nobody in the newsgroup was IN the Gulf War
> therefore no one could discount a claimed 'retired colonel'
> whose SON "was there." Snow job. Fish story. No way
> to prove the tale by public references...except to show
> references of 1980s and 1990s US military communications
> doctrine and equipment that were public.

Don't know him. I never claimed originality for that one either.

> >There is no Department of State listing of "key posts". There is the
> >"Key Officers" listing, as you've discovered. You can assume whatever
> >you'd like about the hours of operation. Those will remain only
> >assumptions.
>
> I've seen embassy staff listings. If State wants to embelish
> labels they can call them anything they want. :-)

You, ahem, YOU brought up "Key Officers Listings" and claimed that I did
not appear in them. It was one of those occasions when, true to N2EY's
explanation of your behavior, you used your slim knowledge of my job to
take a poke at me.
You were bitten in the ass by your own words. Wanna see yourself quoted
followed by the urls again?

> I can also present DSN numbers to dial up directly many
> embassies...if DSN connection is permitted. Such calls
> will go through to someone on-watch is the supposition.
> It is inconceivable that embassies and offices would lock
> up after an 8-hour day and leave no one in contact.

Is it?

> It doesn't bother me that the Defense Switched Network
> can complete a circuit on landline OR via radio circuit,
> anywhere in the world, including equatorial Africa..

Really. I'd like to see 'em put a call through to my former residence
in Freetown. The host country phone system has to work before those
folks can call anyone. That aside, I didn't have DSN, regular telephone
service or anything but HF radio available to me. But we're drifting far
afield. Do tell us if you've found an archived message confirming that
I ever wrote what you've repeatedly said I wrote. No? I'm embarrassed
for you.

> If a communication by radio could get through other
> world equatorial regions three decades before the colonel's
> "armpit" time, the alleged failure of middle African radio
> circuits for State was not explained nor reasonable.

I've never been in middle Africa. I've been in west Africa. I've been
in southern Africa. I've been in southern Africa. Just where is
"middle Africa"?
Oh, as the the rest of your rant, I've never stated just what place I
was in communication with, have I? It might have solved another piece
of your puzzle.
If you hadn't been such a toad, I might have told you. This isn't a
case where I can't tell you. This is one of those where I won't tell
you.

> >You are not in a position to be an expert on what the U.S. Department of
> >State does. You could learn a great deal more from public documents.

> >There are a great many things that you'll never know. My superiority in
> >this case will consist merely of "I know more about it than you know".
>
> Heh heh heh..."there we have it."

Yes, there YOU have it. I know a lot more about something than you
know.
Some things I can't tell you. Some things I won't tell you.

> I'll never know enough. I'll never accept fish stories or snow
> jobs or black helicopters. Just as well... :-)

But you're drifting. What about those archived messages where I claimed
originality for the CW order wire? Where are they?

> The colonel is once again "superior." US Department of State
> has and does things no one will ever know?

Some one knows 'em, Len. YOU won't know 'em.

> Or only known by
> a very privileged few?

Actually, if one takes the past, current and present State commo types,
the number isn't few at all.

> State uses radio in "different ways" than
> all other radio users?

I'm not in a position to know what all other radio users do. Come to
think of it, neither are you.

> Of course...apparently...just like all US
> radio amateurs "must" test for morsemanship in order to be
> granted an amateur license having below-30-MHz privileges.
> The colonel has stated...he is superior...he worked for State!

Oh? Did you think I originated morse testing for HF amateur radio exams
too?
I'm beginning to see part of your problem.

> The rest of US citizens are rather familiar with what State has
> done. It hasn't been that good in the last half century, has it?

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

> Now, in truth, State Department procedures and uses aren't
> directly related to amateur radio policies. Neither are military
> radio communications directly related to amateur policy even

> if Army, Navy, or USAF comm nets were each larger than the
> whole of State's. But...they all involve RADIO and radio
> technology, the use thereof, and they all set a base for other
> radio services to follow or as examples of what can be done.

There is no obligation on the part of the Department of State to do what other agencies do any more than radio amateurs are obligated to do what military or commercial stations do.

> ==========
>
> I can take the time to counter FIVE-YEAR-OLD messages and
> rehash all old outrages by the mighty morsemen. I have the
> messages from that prehistory. This constant rehashing is
> wasted time, time that can be used to look FORWARD, not
> backward or to follow someone claiming "leadership" in an
> avocation just because they call themselves "superior."
>
> Gruss gott, colonel, go on back to Google.

Oh, you can take time all right. You've just managed to miss addressing your frequently posted falsehoods. What have you countered? If you are so FORWARD looking, why haven't you come up with that "Extra right out of the box" yet?

Dave K8MN

1520. Re: arrl article on echolink - impress a non ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-03 05:56:35 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E3E0480.1ED5E3F7@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60602

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E3D7335.E596C7B3@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >> I'd call him someone with the callsign W8MN. Heil spends a
> >> lot of time on here doing that... :-)
> > >
> > >You'd call him Jari Kulkki? How did he get into your diatribe? You
> > >yourself would fit the mold except for that part about obtaining an
> > >amateur radio license.
>
> Mea culpa. Silly me, I thought Colonel Heil had a sequential
> 1x2 with a W beginning...him being the OF and all.

> One of the "latter-day-Ks?" Vanity? Of course... :-)

You can't win for losing. I do not hold a vanity callsign. I've been
K8MN
for twenty five years now. By the way, what'd your amateur call, Len?

Dave K8MN

1521. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-03 06:01:27 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E3E05A4.63D0F079@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60603

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E3D6CAF.627A63C1@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Let us know how it works out once you obtain a license for amateur radio
> >transmission.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. Still on that kick...
>
> I've had a commercial license for commercial radio
> transmission since 1956...a mere 47 years in March.

Irrelevant. This isn't a commericial radio newsgroup.

> The FCC doesn't require any of its staff or commissioners
> to have any amateur radio license in order to set regulations
> or enforce those regulations.

Irrelevant. We don't have any claims by FCC staffers that they were
going for an "Extra right out of the box".

> I never had any reason to get any radio license to work in
> military radio transmission, including being an NCO and an
> HF radio transmission operating team leader.

Irrelevant. If you'd like to participate in what you've claimed to be a
"fun hobby", you need a license.

> I never had any reason to use my commercial license to
> transmit RF energy (higher than any Part 15 or 95 limits)
> on DoD contract work on frequencies spanning from LF to
> Ku band in the microwave region (up to about 25 GHz).

Irrelevant. You need an amateur license to particpate in amateur radio.

> My only need for the commercial license for any RF
> transmission after 1960 was in the early 1970s on an
> RCA Corporation funded R&D project...450+ MHz and
> 1.6 GHz.

Irrelevant. Your need for a commerical license isn't an issue.

> In order to make commentary in a newsgroup I have to
> have an amateur radio license with below-30-MHz
> privileges?!?

Irrelevant. You've posted reams here for years. What you don't have is
an amateur radio license.

> ...excuse me a minute...
>
> BWAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHEEHEE
> HEEHEEHAWHAWHAWHAWHAW...GUFFAW...
> HARHARHARHARHARHAR...SNICKER SNICKER.
>
> [that was much better...]

...like a man with an infatuation with a Whoopie Cushion.

Dave K8MN

1522. Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-03 06:13:49 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E3E088B.E1596843@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60604

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E3D6996.83A839CE@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> >> Rev. Callsign never worked IN or for the FCC, cannot possibly
> >> "know" their "motivations."
> >
> >Foghorn Lenhorn never worked IN or for the Department of State and
> >cannot possibly "know" its "motivations".
>
> Based on the past observations of the US Department of
> State, I wouldn't want to. :-)
>
> The colonel (no relation to the Sanders guy, but still chicken)
> doesn't know that I never questioned the US Department of
> State in this newsgroup.

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

> >That hasn't even slowed down
> >his input on "knowing" what could or couldn't, has or hasn't worked as
> >an order wire for a RTTY circuit.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk, I know basic procedure in most radio circuits
> used by the military now as well as "BD" (before "data"),
> most other US government radio circuits, and commercial
> communications carriers. None of those use CW as an
> order-wire on RTTY radio circuits. :-)

I know it pains you to have this brought up again: Where are the
archived posts supporting your repeated falsehood that I claimed
originality for the circuit?

> I have no knowledge of what US embassies use in equatorial
> Africa to overcome their terrible radio conditions. I would
> suggest some liason with the BIGGER radio net users in US
> government to help them solve State's problems.

I certainly agree with that first sentence. That pretty well sums up
the whole shebang.

> >It hasn't prevented him from
> >"knowing" who is or isn't on a Key Officers list or from "knowing" that
> >the State Department uses Radio Officers despite State's never having
> >had such a position title. Doesn't that just ruffle your feathers?
>
> Not at all.

Some people are just too stupid to be embarrassed.

> The colonel's problem is the colonel's problem and
> can't be solved by logic, reason, or common sense.

Your problem, Foghorn, is that your own words have come back to haunt
you and you've not come up with a single archived post which sez what
you've long stated.

> A shovel might have helped all the readers with that mighty
> Snow Job of five years ago.

You mean the one you still can't lay your hands on--that one where I
claim originality for a CW order wire. You farted and fell on that one.

> >Your face should be as red as your comb from all your recent gaffes.
>
> My comb is natural-finish aluminum...virtually indestructible
> and I've had it for more than 15 years, still retaining hair on
> the head for its use. :-)

Geez. Go buy a new comb! Fifteen years?

> Now pull up a bag of cashews and explain EXACTLY WHY
> some equatorial African region radio circuit "needs" to
> switch to CW in order to "coordinate" schedules and other
> pertinent circuit data...yet a non-CW mode is used for
> regular traffic?

They probably couldn't get many guys to send and receive code at 100 wpm
for that many hours.

> Do morse code modes "know" the difference between regular
> traffic and "coordination" information?
>
> They don't?!? Well, then, why isn't the "coordination" data
> exchanged using the same mode as regular traffic?
>
> I've been waiting about 5 years for a valid reason. Hasn't
> been posted yet...

Sure it has, Foghorn. You just don't like it and you don't hold enough
pieces of the puzzle to figure it out. I'm still waiting for you to
post a quote from me which will let you off the hook for your
falsehoods. Maybe you could clue us in about how your stuff was taken

out of context. How about an explanation of your statement that I don't appear on any State Department Key Officer Lists? Looks like you really stepped in the bucket.

Dave K8MN

1523. Re: MARS opinions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-03 07:12:21 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b1ls7t1b7p@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 60609

I was looking into that (MARS operation) a while ago myself, but do not, and
will not have HF capability for quite a while yet (regardless of
licensure...) due to residency issues..... (a$$hole landlord)

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

"Symbolism is for the simple minded....."

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:b1jrcd$rg3$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
> Of course you must have HF capability if you want to operate MARS. That
is
> where the nets are that you must check into to get the proper amount of
time
> to keep active.
>
> I believe you are correct. A minimum of two frequencies are required.
>
> Most of the MARS freqs are just outside of the 'normal' ham bands.
Although
> some are quite a bit out.
>
> If one only has a older rig I would recommend staying away from AF MARS
> then. Our primary is way out of the ham band ranges.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
> news:b1htif25nq@enews2.newsguy.com...
> > I believe you must be able to operate on AT LEAST 2 HF bands to qualify.
> > That is the last I knew....
> >
> >
> > --
> > Ryan, KC8PMX
> > FF/MFR
> > REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
> >
> > "Symbolism is for the simple minded....."
> >
> >
> > >

> > > From what I am told you have to have HF capability to even be
> > > considered for MARS.
> > >
> > > - H. Johnson
> > > 73, KG4WOU
> > > ==
> > > *** SPAM Filter in place ***
> > > Just de-classify the e-mail address for correct reply-to
> > > ==
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

1524. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-03 11:28:07 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302030328.73937c82@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60606

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E3D6E11.4C993770@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E3AF193.B187CE47@earthlink.net>...
> > >
> > > That isn't what happened at all. You are the individual responsible for
> > > bringing up any of this. You were silly to do so.
>
> >
> > Much like a big run of out of band frenchmen on 6M. You were silly to
> > bring it up. Must have been hurting for greenbacks.
> >
> > Maybe next time...
>
> ...you'll be more careful, Brian. I broke no regs in my operation from
> any DX spot in which I operated. Your problem then as now is that you
> chose to attack the wrong target. Len's situation is quite different.
> He made a number of statements which were at best unfactual; at most,
> deliberate falsehoods.
>
> His claims were easily refuted. It'd be trickier with something like
> your alleged verbal permission to operate from Somalia.
>
> Dave K8MN

Not tricky at all. I was there, I had permission. You had bad
information, said a military commander could not give permission. You
were wrong, but have yet to admit it. You are wrong on a number of
matters, but cannot recognize it.

1525. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-03 11:36:17 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030203063617.23598.00000079@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 60607

In article <3E3D6FD6.1E048EA5@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Brian wrote:
>>
>> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20030201103647.29016.00000066@mb-fy.aol.com>...
>>
>> > Lack of experience, lack of knowledge and lack of skill are three
>reasons.
>
>> In a nutshell, N2EY dismisses the T2FD antenna, and insults anyone who
>> might be using one. Since he has no use for it, it cannot be good.
>
>If you have need for a loss antenna, go for it. I should have had one
>this morning when chasing Johnston Island on 160m. It was far too easy
>to nail AH3D with three calls. Maybe the broadband T2FD would have
>permitted me to work him on 160, 80 and 40 at the same time if (and
>here's the rub) he could have heard me.

Dave,

Perhaps you could point out where the imagined "insults" are in the sentence:

"Lack of experience, lack of knowledge and lack of skill are three reasons."

An inexperienced ham, who had not used an efficient HF dipole, might think the
T2FD/WBFD was not much different in efficiency.

A ham lacking in knowledge might not understand how the T2FD/WBFD obtains its
broadband characteristics through the use of resistive loading, which radiates
much of the RF power fed to the antenna as heat rather than RF.

A ham lacking in skill might want to avoid having to adjust a tuner.

A simple dipole that is the same size as a WBFD, fed with low loss parallel
line and matched with a suitable a tuner will have practically identical
patterns but much higher efficiency than a WBFD. Such a dipole is lighter and
mechanically simpler, and when all costs are considered, is no more expensive.

>I've never had use for an antenna which requires a linear amp to break
>even on gain when transmitting.

Nor I!

>I have used and do use loss antennas
>when receiving on 160m or 80m. I can rotate them to null noise and use

>a preamp to bring up the desired signal.

Yep. Which brings up a question - could you have even heard AH3D on 160 if you'd had a T2FD for receiving? Unlike a directional antenna like a loop, the T2FD would pick up noise from all directions.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1526. Re: K1MAN for the 2003 Amateur Hall of Fame!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-03 14:02:19 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030203090219.10179.00000127@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 60608

>No, you would be second in line after Baxter. Still proud of that
>extra lite extra class ticket?

Never was proud of it, still have not used the EXTRA. I thought the Test was a JOKE, but I sure did enjoy the $250.oo from the bet with a Bunch of CBplussers. I bet that just bugs you that the EXTRA is really rather worthless anymore. Just think anybody can be an EXTRA anymore, no real knowledge needed just memorize some stupid QanAs and you be EXTRA. Actually none of the Licenses for Ham Radio are worth anything anymore, just another hazing ritual.

1527. Re: Shortwave KOOKS comment on Shuttle 12.160

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-03 15:10:04 UTC
From: Scanner Nut <fightfanNOSPAM@twcny.rr.com>
Message-ID: <gDv%9.32840$iK4.24969@twister.nyroc.rr.com>
Source record: 60610
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

Email me, I have the shuttle shows in MP3 format that I copied from
shortwave
while the show aired

"Tom Sevart" <n2uhcNOSPAM@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:b1kpa6$13igc1$1@ID-52518.news.dfncis.de...
>
> "shortwave woowoo" <greenfields@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:3e3c1e8f@snipnews.snip.net...
> >
> > ALEX JONES AND JOHN STADTMELLER - TWO VETERAN SHORTWAVE
> > KOOKS COMMENTING ON COLUMBIA LOSS AS ALL BEING PART
> > OF A MASSIVE CONSPIRACY TO BOOST BUSH'S RATINGS INTHE
> > POLLS AS A PRELUDE TO THE IRAQ WAR !
>
> Typical... most nutjob conspiracy theorists don't think that any major
event
> just happens, it's always part of a massive dark conspiracy. Kind of the
> way they were all saying that the 9/11 terrorist attacks were all planned
&
> carried out by the government.
>
> Tom
>
>

1528. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-03 15:15:27 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0302030715.31c066ca@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60611

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message news:<20030203063617.23598.00000079@mb-fz.aol.com>...
. . . .

>
> >I have used and do use loss antennas
> >when receiving on 160m or 80m. I can rotate them to null noise and use
> >a preamp to bring up the desired signal.
>
> Yep. Which brings up a question - could you have even heard AH3D on 160 if
> you'd had a T2FD for receiving? Unlike a directional antenna like a loop, the
> T2FD would pick up noise from all directions.

OhGawd, you're leading Brainiac into the discussion about negative
30dB gain antennas being beter than T2FDs . .

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

1529. Re: GROL vs Amateur Privileges

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-03 16:24:13 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns931773FB17A98elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 60612

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in
news:20030203002340.11961.00000396@mb-mr.aol.com:

>>Subject: Re: FCC tells Cbplusser he has to upgrade
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 2/2/03 10:16 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20030202231611.22282.00000548@mb-ca.aol.com>
>
>>I've had a commercial license for commercial radio transmission since
>>1956...a mere 47 years in March.
>
> A license which, in the absence of a STATION license with SPECIFIC
> parameters on operating frequencies, modes, hours of operation,
> location, antennas and power, is useless.
>
>>I never had any reason to get any radio license to work in
>> military radio transmission, including being an NCO and an
>> HF radio transmission operating team leader
>
> And what allowances did the Army make so you could decide the
> operating
> frequency, mode, who you called, what you discussed, choice of
> antennas, operating times, etc?
>
>>I never had any reason to use my commercial license to
>> transmit RF energy (higher than any Part 15 or 95 limits)
>> on DoD contract work on frequencies spanning from LF to
>> Ku band in the microwave region (up to about 25 GHz.
>
> And those DoD contracts did not allow you to "operate" any radio
> on any
> Amateur Radio allocation, nor with the aforementioned power, mode, etc
> etc considerations at YOUR discretion.
>
>>My only need for the commercial license for any RF
>> transmission after 1960 was in the early 1970s on an
>> RCA Corporation funded R&D project...450+ MHz and 1.6 GHz.
>
> So...that hallowed ground of commercial radio licensure let you
> "operate"
> on a few spot frequencies at 70cm and 23 cm in the 70's.....Whew...I am
> impressed. (not!)
>
>>In order to make commentary in a newsgroup I have to

>> have an amateur radio license with below-30-MHz privileges?!?
>
> By your own admission in the foregoing, you have NO practical
> experience
> in matters pertaining to Amateur Radio practice or regulations.
>
> Your comprehension and understanding of them are dubious based
> upon your
> frequent faux pas in this forum. No doubt your conduct on the air
> would soon bring you to the attention of an FCC monitoring station.
>
> Forget being unlicensed...you're just plain incompetent.
>
> Steve, K4YZ
>

The GROL is not really a licence anymore. I'm not aware of anything that specifically needs it. It's just an optional qualification for BC engineers. I could pass it if I wanted to, but why bother?

73 de Alun, N3KIP

PS: I have a Bachelor's degree in EE, and have worked in jobs related to RF, so I'm not just saying I could pass it on the strength of my Amateur Extra licence, although IMHO most Extras could get their GROL, if they wanted to be BC engineers, or just to show off! (And many do. That is, get it to show off!).

1530. Re: The coders embarrass themselves on 14.275 MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-03 16:35:21 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v3t6hvt2uak27d@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 60613
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"K1MAN Man" <Lloyd@no.spammmmm> wrote in message
news:bugbear.worm.dan.posts@taranews.net...
> On Sun, 2 Feb 2003 20:41:09 -0500, KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com> wrote:
> >
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:b1ke8k$m9l$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> > > ... -.-. .-. . .-- -.-- --- ..-
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > .-- . -.-- -.-- ... .- .. -.. -.. .- -.
> > .-- ....- -. - .. -.. . -.- -... ----. - -- .--.
> > >
>
> .... --- .-- .-.. .- -- . -.-- --- ..- .- .-. . .-.-.-
>
> (anyone who thinks "screw you" is well said is a damned lid)

Thank you! I've went from "CBPlusser" to "Real Ham" to
"damned lid" in just one week. That has to be some kind of
a record, don't it? Dan could have said a lot worse, but
he didn't. That's what was well said, concise and succinct
expression of what he felt. Like I'm now starting to feel
towards you mister anonymous.

BTW what's YOUR callsign there big boy?
The screen name K1MAN Man and email
address of Lloyd@no.spammmmm just don't
get it. Until you put YOUR name or callsign
on the line, your the lid here!

--
KB9TMP
I can only please one person per day.
Today is not your day.
Tomorrow is not looking good either.
-- Dilbert

1531. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-03 17:15:58 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030203121558.14740.00000052@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 60614

>Subject: Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 2/3/03 5:46 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0302030346.2edc5cf9@posting.google.com>

>Dave, you got it! Instead of being so friggin obtuse all the time,
>you used a little creative thought and figured out what I meant
>instead of sitting there completely stuck. I know it was difficult,
>but you keep trying.
>
>Bully for you!

Give credit where credit is due, Brain...Spitting out the remanants of having had your head firmly up the old poop shoot sure makes it easier to understand you.

>It "bothered" you so much so that you went on a campain.

"Campain"...?!?! Sensation felt when you trip over your tent?

>Oldies are played on Oldies Stations. No head-banging or classical.

Sometimes, Brain. WZYP intermixes "oldies" with current urban and hip-hop rather nicely.

>Vintage airplane have their own format.

"Own format"? They share the exact same runways and airspace as I do in a "contemporary" aircraft, Brain...To what "format" were you refering?

They they have the same FAA airworthiness papers as a "contemporary" aircraft and require the same airman's certifications to operate as "contemprorary aircraft.

>Antique cars have their own format, and its not Motor Trend.

"Motor Trend" magazine does an nice job of occassionally throwing in articles on "antique" cars. Waht other "trend" were you refering? Thye use the same highway as the one I drive on and require the same operators permit to do so. In some states they DO get those neat "Antique Automobile", or other "vanity" tag.

>QST is a classic in that they offer frequent trips down memory lane,
>to the exclusion of section news.

The also offer it to the exclusion of a sports page or Wall Street results...So what?

>> Why didn't you just answer the question?
>
>Because.

There was a waste of nine years of high school.

>> It would be silly for you to confuse advertising space with editorial
>> content.
>> More ad pages pay for more editorial pages.
>>
>> Dave K8MN
>
>Section News is an editorial? You're silly and confused.

Your attempt to discredit Dave with an apples/oranges switch was
foolhearty, but not anything we don't expect from MiniLennie.

Steve, K4YZ

1532. Re: Gary Coffman: personal information

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-03 18:48:16 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.h9qn7i0.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 60615

On Mon, 03 Feb 2003 02:43:30 GMT, Gary Coffman wrote:

>Gary Coffman: personal information

Welcome back, Gary. Where have you been?

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1533. Re: GROL vs Amateur Privileges

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-03 18:48:18 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.h9qoss1.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 60616

On 3 Feb 2003 16:24:13 GMT, Alun Palmer wrote:

>The GROL is not really a licence anymore.

The GROL is in fact a real license. See FCC Rules Part 13.
What you probably mean is that it no longer carries all the
benefits and privileges that it or its predecessors once did.

On that I agree.

>I'm not aware of anything that specifically needs it.

It's required for operation and servicing/adjustment of certain
classes of maritime and aviation stations. See Parts 80 and 87 of
the FCC Rules.

>It's just an optional qualification for BC engineers.

Not any more. The Society of Broadcast Engineers has their (our)
own Certifcation program, as does several organizations dealing with
land-mobile, microwave, and EMC technologies and licensees. Those
"industry certification exams" are much tougher and more detailed
than the FCC exams ever were.

There are no qualifications whatsoever for hiring BC engineers - the
B/C licensee can, and in some cases has, hire Joe Baboon to do the
job. Reputable broadcasters will insist on SBE Certification or
equivalent proven experience.

Several California employers got into trouble with the State Labor
Board for trying to insist that applicants have a GROL for a job
where it is not required by FCC Rules. In practical terms, if the
applicant/employee had a (diploma-form) GROL or its predecessor
license(es) during a time when the FCC Rules required such
license for that job (generally mid-1980s) the employer can
(but is not forced to) accept that in lieu of any other
industry certifcation which may be required of other
applicants/employees.

After the changeover, the newer card-form GROLs plainly stated that
it was not valid for Broadcast use. It may still be there - I
haven't seen one lately.

>I could pass it if I wanted to, but why bother?

Unless you are going to operate or service transmitters where it is
required, you are right.

>PS: I have a Bachelor's degree in EE, and have worked in jobs related to
>RF, so I'm not just saying I could pass it on the strength of my Amateur
>Extra licence, although IMHO most Extras could get their GROL, if they
>wanted to be BC engineers, or just to show off! (And many do. That is, get
>it to show off!).

Broadcast material is no longer on the GROL exam, at least for the
last 10 years or so since the FCC privatized that exam process
and rewrote the exams.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1534. Re: Shortwave KOOKS comment on Shuttle 12.160

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-03 18:48:18 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.h9qoxz2.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 60617
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

On Sun, 2 Feb 2003 21:57:12 -0600, Tom Sevart wrote:

>Typical... most nutjob conspiracy theorists don't think that any major event
>just happens, it's always part of a massive dark conspiracy. Kind of the
>way they were all saying that the 9/11 terrorist attacks were all planned &
>carried out by the government.

At least they weren't claiming that it was done by the Port
Aothority, the buildings' owners, to collect on the insurance.

Or did I miss that one ?

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1535. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-03 19:37:09 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030203143709.05048.00000432@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 60618

In article <3E3E038F.E094CA94@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <3E3D2343.B2CCE6C8@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><Oberst@Stalag17.com>
>> writes:
>>
>> >I've asked where the selective quoting came from. I provided quoted
>> >messages showing my original comments and stating that I did not
>> >originate the system but worked with what was in place. The privately
>> >run archive sight has all posted messages from the time in question to
>> >present. You are free to look for anything I might have omitted and to
>> >repost it here.
>>
>> Okay, here's something from the "sight." -
>>
>> ==
>> From: Dave Heil (k8mn@clinet.fi)
>> Subject: Re: Can't we all just get along?
>> Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
>> Date: 1998/01/03
>>
>> Brian wrote:
>> >
>> > big, Big snip
>> >
>> > > Len, you tried to give me a lesson in the history of radio and you also
>> > > twisted some dates and events but, to what end? What was that all
>> > > about? FYI: I was handling the QSYs, openings and closings for a
>> > > government 75 baud circuit via CW from late '87 through late '89 from
>> > > Guinea-Bissau. Guess we didn't know CW was obsolete, huh?
>> > >
>> > > Dave Heil OH2/K8MN
>> >
>> > Dave, as a professional communicator, you should have already known that
>> > your CW circuit was obsolete. At least you should have had the
>> > initiative to ask if there was a better way to move your message traffic
>> > than through a CW circuit.
>> > Doing something the same old way just because "thats the way we always
>> > did it," is no longer the right answer. When one of my younger troops
>> > asked why we were doing something the way we were doing it (or why we
>> > were doing it at all), I had to have a better answer than that. When I

>> > didn't, change was imminent.
>> > By the way, I was using SATCOM voice way back then. Worked great.
>> > 73, Brian/N0iMD
>>
>> Brian,
>>
>> Do you really think I was doing something the hard way because of my
>> personal choice? Asking for a better way and getting a better way are
>> two different things. I didn't have access to satellite equipment and
>> certainly wouldn't consider SATCOM voice an alternative for maintaining
>> a 24 hour per day circuit which handled high volumes of traffic.
>>
>> The point I made was that the government was using such circuits.
>> Nobody was interested in whether I had a better way or not--I was there
>> to run the existing circuit. Multipath propagation and the slow 75 baud
>> RTTY circuit were the unpleasant parts--the CW was fun.
>>
>> Dave OH2/K8MN
>>
>> 2003 Google
>>
>> ==
>>
>> That was from January 3, 1998, over FIVE YEARS ago.
>>
>> Five years and one month to be more accurate...
>
>Yeah. Neat, Len. It is also something I just recently reposted. It
>clearly shows that I did not originate the idea. I also pointed out
>that it was five years ago and not the three years stated by you.
>
>> Is the colonel's skin so thin that he must, like the
>> resident Reverend Callsign, be continually going back
>> going back going back to old disputes? Yes, it must
>> be, for the colonel is NEVER wrong, not ever.
>
>You brought the issue up. You continue to bring the issue up. You've
>lied about it for five years. You're a humbug.
>
>> Here's another -
>>
>> ==
>>
>> From: Dave Heil <k8mn@clinet.fi>
>> Date: Mon, Jan 5, 1998 00:44 EST
>> Message-id: <34B07331.682@clinet.fi>
>>
>> >You failed reading comprehension. My post stated that CW was used to
>> >coordinate openings/closings, QSYs of an RTTY circuit.
>>

>> Ok, let me requote, word for word, what you originally wrote:
>>
>> >>>about? FYI: I was handling the QSYs, opening and closings for a
>> >>>government 75 baud circuit via CW from late '87 through late '89 from
>> >>>Guinea-Bissau. Guess we didn't know CW was obsolete, huh?
>
>> Firstly, you didn't qualify "government." Since you call from a
>> Finnish server, have an OH2 (Finland) slash on your signature,
>> and Guinea-Bissau is an independent country, one needs
>> telepathy to accurately attach "US" in front of "government."
>
>> Secondly you wrote "75 baud circuit via CW..." which could be a
>> high-speed CW one as much as TTY; "baud" is the old rate name
>> in all telegraphy.
>
>
>> If this was a United States government link, that slow a rate sounds
>> suspicious considering that the military and State Department were
>> already starting to upgrade to 110 Baud (100 WPM) TTY in the
>> late 1960s.
>
>> Commercial TTY users were doing the same at the
>> same time. Lots of older 60 WPM TTY machines were becoming
>> available as surplus by the mid-1970s, many being converted for
>> TDD use by hearing-impaired persons courtesy of many clubs of
>> ex-telephone-company-workers.
>
>> Now, I'll grant you that surplus telecomm equipment COULD have
>> gone into use in Guinea-Bissau considering that country subsists
>> largely on grant money from other nations and such aid is of minor
>> value. [the USA is contributing $2.5 million to them in proposed
>> 1998 aid grants] It's difficult to envision a US government circuit
>> running that slow some 20 years after starting to upgrade to 100
>> WPM machinery.
>
>> >Now we get a geography lesson from Len. It was a U.S. government
>> >circuit, Len. It wasn't 75 baud CW; it was 75 baud RTTY with CW to
>> >coordinate it.
>>
>> There's LOTS of geographic, socio-political information available
>> on the Web, many site choices. ARRL publications don't carry
>> much of such information. Anyone with Web access can look them
>> up. As to "lessons," do you think everyone knows ALL the small
>> and emerging nations of the world?
>
>
>> Why does an RTTY circuit (of any speed) need "CW to
>> coordinate it?" RTTY circuits have been used on HF since the
>> 1930s without any extra CW circuit for "coordination." It's a very
>> simple task to tune in an 170 to 850 Hz shift RTTY signal and lock

>> onto mark and space with an RTTY demod. "R-Y" generators
>> were common in old 5-level days, even one-print-line "Fox Test"
>> generators. ???
>>
>> Len Anderson
>>
>> ==========
>
>
>Nope, nothing about me claiming that I originated the idea there.
>
>
>>
>> That one is more current...from January 5, 1998! :-)
>>
>> The colonel never did justify anything insofar as technical
>> procedures. On RTTY radio circuits anywhere else, the
>> TTY is used to "coordinate" things (the term "order-wire").
>> If TTY fails in "coordination" then the circuit won't be
>> any use in regular TTY traffic, will it?
>
>The Foghorn is entitled to no more of an explanation than already
>provided.
>It has been explained yet. You've just been having difficulty with the
>comprehension part.
>
>> While "CW" (common term for on-off keyed continuous
>> waves) may be "fun" to morsemen, a State Department
>> radio circuit isn't supposed to be some government-run
>> radio disneyland for its staffers, is it?
>
>Nor are Foreign Service members penalized for enjoying their work.
>The need for you to point out in an amateur radio newsgroup what "CW"
>stands for is duly noted.
>
>> >Most African countries are former colonies. Guinea-Bissau is an armpit.
>> >You missed fish, shrimp and lobster as major exports--lots and lots of
>> >fish, shrimp and lobster. As fascinating as all of this is, it does not
>> >address statements made by me regarding the use of CW by the USG.
>>
>> No matter how I "addressed it," the recipient refuses to
>> accept delivery! :-)
>
>You haven't come up with an archived quote yet? C'mon Foghorn, I'm
>pulling for you. Maybe something will come along which will allow you
>to save face.
>
>> "Armpit" or not, the colonel never technically explained ANY
>> use of OOK CW to "coordinate" an RTTY circuit which,
>> presumably, became fine for TTY message transmission

>> once CW "coordination" was done! :-)
>
>Sure I did.
>
>> >So far, the only questioning I've ever received on the issue is from
>> >you. Others seem to understand my frequent explanations.
>
>> "Others" haven't commented...except maybe voices in
>> your head. "Others" weren't there or doing comm from
>> there at the time. All we readers had was your claim.
>
>Well for one, N2EY has commented. He seems to have had no problem
>understanding. No negative comments were received from others here who
>have worked in government or military communications. There is only
>you.

I'll comment again, Dave.

It's clear to me and to everyone else (except Mr. Anderson) what was going on in G-B (my abbreviation) back when you were there: State Department communications consisted of various systems that happened to be in place and which did the job. The fact that more modern systems were available elsewhere did not mean they existed everywhere. Particularly at the time you were in G-B.

The availability of "surplus" TTY machines and other equipment in the USA means nothing if that equipment and the necessary support can't be transported to where it is wanted - in this case, G-B. So the old CW and 75 baud TTY equipment that was in place and working did the job.

Doesn't take a textbook to figure out that under certain conditions Morse/CW would sometimes get through when the other available modes using the available equipment would not get through. So in those situations Morse/CW was used - mostly to figure out how to get the TTY systems functioning again (chnage frequency, try again at a different time, etc.)

Here's another plain, simple fact:

Mr. Anderson sometimes misunderstands the postings of others. He then equates his misunderstanding as being the actual words and meaning that was posted. When that happens, it is difficult or impossible for him to acknowledge that his understanding is incorrect. He will insist that his misunderstanding is the only possible correct interpretation of what was posted. His memory exhibits the WORMI characteristic: Write Once, Read Many - Incorrectly. Google is his enemy because it exposes his misunderstanding.

For example, some time back I described Amazon.com as "unprofitable" based on its reports in Yahoo. Mr. Anderson equated "unprofitable" with "bankrupt" and has repeatedly posted that I called Amazon "bankrupt", even though "unprofitable" and "bankrupt" are not the same thing. Will Mr. Anderson recant his error? Of course not.

Your description of State Dept. comms in G-B was perfectly clear the first time, and is another example of Mr. Anderson's "WORMI" memory.

>> The alleged procedure you outlined is NOT in radio
>> communication textbooks or military manuals written
>> from the 1950s on through the 1980s and available for
>> public (declassified) reference.
>
>And you point is?

If it's not in the books he read, it can't have happened.
>
>> Perhaps some "others" can jump in on this 5-year-
>> dispute over the colonel's Honor and Claims to explain
>> that State Department procedures are highly classified
>> on a need-to-know basis? Yes, that is a good way to
>> Avenge Honor, hiding behind alleged classified-so-nobody-
>> can-say-you-are-wrong "procedures." Such excuses can
>> be airlifted in by those wonderful black helicopters by the
>> ton to buttress your argument butt.
>
>You'll have to deal with the fact that I know things which I can't tell
>you.
>You seem to be the guy seeing and hearing black helicopters. This isn't
>the first time you've been "SUSPICIOUS".
>
>> Today, last year, and some time before that the DSN has
>> and had the procedures to use along with descriptions of
>> DSN circuits through both land and radio and satellite
>> relay circuits. It's not any sort of violation of anything to
>> explain generalities in US government communications.
>
>You aren't only asking generalities. I don't know you, don't like you
>and certainly wouldn't post such information in an internet newsgroup.
>
>> It's only a serious (very serious) violation to reveal the
>> encryption keys, method of encryption, some of the
>> technical synchronization details, and the contents of
>> sensitive messages.
>
>Wrong again, Bucko. It is not only serious to reveal just information
>on the things described by you. Interesting is that you've quizzed me
>on the technical synchronization details though.

Mr. Anderson does not like the fact that he does not have the necessary "need
to know".
>
>> >I've never
>> >claimed that the use of CW for this purpose was common or worldwide.
>>
>> No...and neither have you revealed much of anything else
>> of a radio communication nature. You are not a nature lover,
>> only a self-presentation-as-expert kind of lover.
>
>Pretty funny stuff coming from a guy with your history, Len.

>
>> >You'd, of course, not have any way of knowing what is or was done by
>> >military or government HF radio users in Africa or worldwide in the
>> >present era--your being a retired fellow in California whose big claim
>> >to HF operation was half a century back.
>>
>> I claim only what is declassified. Public sources are
>> available. I've given references, can give more, even
>> repeat the title of a nice NavShips technical manual that
>> explains proper procedures for TTY and RTTY along
>> with technical details of the mechanical TTYs. It was
>> available for public sale through the US Government
>> Printing Office in the mid-1970s. It was used in all
>> military branches as a common text on TTY until the
>> conversion to electronic data terminals beginning in
>> the late 1970s.
>
>Interesting (not). I never did TTY work in the military and I really
>don't care.

State Dept. is not part of the Navy, last time I checked.
>
>> The colonel's argument was that near-equatorial
>> regions of middle Africa prevented regular use of RTTY
>> there so CW (on-off keyed continuous wave) had to be
>> used to "coordinate" things. There aren't many in here
>> who've operated anything, let alone set foot in middle
>> Africa. That's a good basis for the usual fish-story
>> snow job...hoping that nobody will burst the bubble.
>
>Hearing those black helicopters again, Foggy? Guess you'll have to
>continue your quest for information. You're kind of drifting far afield
>from your silly claims that I claimed originality for the idea. Now I
>wonder where THOSE archived messages went.
>
>> The first pin-prick in bubble-bursting is the "need" to
>> "coordinate" things using OOK CW and then switching
>> to another mode. If "coordination" through OOK CW
>> works but other modes don't, why isn't procedure stated
>> to use OOK CW for regular traffic? If RTTY would work
>> for regular traffic, why wasn't that used to "coordinate"
>> the circuit? The "explanation" was the claim to conditions
>> in equatorial Africa "prevented coordination." Circular
>> logic. Invalid. Rationalization of newsgroup message
>> statements, NOT any sort of "technical explanation."
>
>Not circular logic in the least. As previously explained on numerous
>occasions, RTTY did not always work for regular traffic. CW did--but
>your're drifting rather far afield from your statements that I claimed
>originality for its use.

>Where are those archived quotes?

Google is his enemy, Dave.
>
>> This is like another "colonel" (claimed, retired) "whose son
>> was behind enemy lines in Iraq" during the Gulf War,
>> "sending intelligence data back by CW" on HF. Another
>> snow job. Nobody in the newsgroup was IN the Gulf War
>> therefore no one could discount a claimed 'retired colonel'
>> whose SON "was there." Snow job. Fish story. No way
>> to prove the tale by public references...except to show
>> references of 1980s and 1990s US military communications
>> doctrine and equipment that were public.
>
>Don't know him. I never claimed originality for that one either.

Mr. Anderson's argument boils down to: Someone else told a fishy story,
therefore YOU cannot be telling the truth.

It's similar to the idea that since someone else named Jim disagreed with Mr.
Anderson and called him "Lennie", he is somehow authorized to call me "Jimmie"
>
>> >There is no Department of State listing of "key posts". There is the
>> >"Key Officers" listing, as you've discovered. You can assume whatever
>> >you'd like about the hours of operation. Those will remain only
>> >assumptions.
>>
>> I've seen embassy staff listings. If State wants to embelish
>> labels they can call them anything they want. :-)
>
>You, ahem, YOU brought up "Key Officers Listings" and claimed that I did
>not appear in them. It was one of those occasions when, true to N2EY's
>explanation of your behavior, you used your slim knowledge of my job to
>take a poke at me.
>You were bitten in the ass by your own words. Wanna see yourself quoted
>followed by the urls again?

Won't do any good. Google is his enemy.
>
>> I can also present DSN numbers to dial up directly many
>> embassies...if DSN connection is permitted. Such calls
>> will go through to someone on-watch is the supposition.
>> It is inconceivable that embassies and offices would lock
>> up after an 8-hour day and leave no one in contact.
>
>Is it?
>
>> It doesn't bother me that the Defense Switched Network
>> can complete a circuit on landline OR via radio circuit,
>> anywhere in the world, including equatorial Africa..
>

>Really. I'd like to see 'em put a call through to my former residence
>in Freetown. The host country phone system has to work before those
>folks can call anyone. That aside, I didn't have DSN, regular telephone
>service or anything but HF radio available to me. But we're drifting far
>afield. Do tell us if you've found an archived message confirming that
>I ever wrote what you've repeatedly said I wrote. No? I'm embarrassed
>for you.
>
>> If a communication by radio could get through other
>> world equatorial regions three decades before the colonel's
>> "armpit" time, the alleged failure of middle African radio
>> circuits for State was not explained nor reasonable.
>
>I've never been in middle Africa. I've been in west Africa. I've been
>in southern Africa. I've been in southern Africa. Just where is
>"middle Africa"?
>Oh, as the the rest of your rant, I've never stated just what place I
>was in communication with, have I? It might have solved another piece
>of your puzzle.
>If you hadn't been such a toad, I might have told you. This isn't a
>case where I can't tell you. This is one of those where I won't tell
>you.

Would probably just be misunderstood anyway.
>
>> >You are not in a position to be an expert on what the U.S. Department of
>> >State does. You could learn a great deal more from public documents.
>> >There are a great many things that you'll never know. My superiority in
>> >this case will consist merely of "I know more about it than you know".
>>
>> Heh heh heh..."there we have it."
>
>Yes, there YOU have it. I know a lot more about something than you
>know.
>Some things I can't tell you. Some things I won't tell you.
>
>> I'll never know enough. I'll never accept fish stories or snow
>> jobs or black helicopters. Just as well... :-)
>
>But you're drifting. What about those archived messages where I claimed
>originality for the CW order wire? Where are they?
>
>> The colonel is once again "superior." US Department of State
>> has and does things no one will ever know?
>
>Some one knows 'em, Len. YOU won't know 'em.
>
>> Or only known by
>> a very privileged few?
>

>Actually, if one takes the past, current and present State commo types,
>the number isn't few at all.
>
>> State uses radio in "different ways" than
>> all other radio users?
>
>I'm not in a position to know what all other radio users do. Come to
>think of it, neither are you.
>
>> Of course...apparently...just like all US
>> radio amateurs "must" test for morsemanship in order to be
>> granted an amateur license having below-30-MHz privileges.
>> The colonel has stated...he is superior...he worked for State!
>
>Oh? Did you think I originated morse testing for HF amateur radio exams
>too?
>I'm beginning to see part of your problem.
>
>> The rest of US citizens are rather familiar with what State has
>> done. It hasn't been that good in the last half century, has it?
>
>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."
>
>> Now, in truth, State Department procedures and uses aren't
>> directly related to amateur radio policies. Neither are military
>> radio communications directly related to amateur policy even
>> if Army, Navy, or USAF comm nets were each larger than the
>> whole of State's. But...they all involve RADIO and radio
>> technology, the use thereof, and they all set a base for other
>> radio services to follow or as examples of what can be done.
>
>There is no obligation on the part of the Department of State to do what
>other agencies do any more than radio amateurs are obligated to do what
>military or commercial stations do.
>
Says it all.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1536. Re: K1MAN for the 2003 Amateur Hall of Fame!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-03 20:18:01 UTC
From: channel391@juno.com
Message-ID: <ae188f77.0302031218.7b33f283@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60619
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message news:<3E3D7824.7070907@mailcity.moc>...
> K1MAN Man wrote:
> > CQ Magazine is accepting nominations for their 2003 Amateur Radio Hall
> > of Fame awards until march 1. Be sure to write to
> >
> > hall-of-fame@cq-amateur-radio.com
> >
> > and nominate Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, for this year's awards. He has
> > single handedly goten the FCC to rexamine part 97 and will probably be
> > the reason that the bad wording will be replaced by something clearer.
> > He also saved the virgin islands after the huricane, and was the only
> > one who worried about Mexico after the recent earth quake there.
>
> And the Mexicans did not want his help.
>
> >
> > He has also done lots of other public service to numerous to mention
> > here, but you can list it in the reasons part of your nomination. It
> > should have the information below.
>
>
> I would be happy to nominate Glenn for the shit-head-of-the-year
> award, and nominate you for a spelling class.

Thank you. Mr. Baxter is a true friend of all in hobby radio. Not just hams. The SoCal Good Buddies have already nominated Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, P.E., for the Radio Amateur Of The Year Award. We will now also nominate him for the CQ award.

1537. Re: MARS opinions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-03 20:27:22 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b1mj9f$64t$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 60620

Yeah...understand....how about doing what I did...move.

Dan/W4NTI

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:b1ls7t1b7p@enews2.newsguy.com...
> I was looking into that (MARS operation) a while ago myself, but do not,
and
> will not have HF capability for quite a while yet (regardless of
> licensure...) due to residency issues..... (a$$hole landlord)
>
>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF/MFR
> REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
>
> "Symbolism is for the simple minded....."
>
>
>
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:b1jrcd$rg3$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
> > Of course you must have HF capability if you want to operate MARS. That
> is
> > where the nets are that you must check into to get the proper amount of
> time
> > to keep active.
> >
> > I believe you are correct. A minimum of two frequencies are required.
> >
> > Most of the MARS freqs are just outside of the 'normal' ham bands.
> Although
> > some are quite a bit out.
> >
> > If one only has a older rig I would recommend staying away from AF MARS
> > then. Our primary is way out of the ham band ranges.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
> > news:b1htif25nq@enews2.newsguy.com...
> > > I believe you must be able to operate on AT LEAST 2 HF bands to
qualify.

> > > That is the last I knew....
> > >
> > >
> > > --
> > > Ryan, KC8PMX
> > > FF/MFR
> > > REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
> > >
> > > "Symbolism is for the simple minded....."
> > >
> > >
> > > >
> > > > From what I am told you have to have HF capability to even be
> > > > considered for MARS.
> > > >
> > > > - H. Johnson
> > > > 73, KG4WOU
> > > > ==
> > > > *** SPAM Filter in place ***
> > > > Just de-classify the e-mail address for correct reply-to
> > > > ==
> > > >
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

1538. Re: Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, FCC, Cronkite, ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-03 20:31:47 UTC
From: channel391@juno.com
Message-ID: <ae188f77.0302031231.7e9779c2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60621
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

drakeswl@hotmail.com (Paul) wrote in message
news:<c0588492.0302021818.6664c84f@posting.google.com>...
> 'X-No-archive: yes'
>
>
> Was anyone under the impression that the FCC has to "prove" anything
> in front of the ALJ? No mon freres, it is the licensee, not the FCC,
> that has the burden of proof in front of the ALJ. The licensee must
> show the ALJ why he should remain a licensee, after being hauled
> before the ALJ by the Commission.
>
> Remember we are talking about an administrative body here. It isn't
> the kind of court where we are talking about citizen's rights. The
> Commission is charged by Congess with overseeing a body of
> administrivia. They are presenting information to a Judge of
> administrivial matters, who will rule in the FCC's favor. Who knows
> more about FCC administrivia than the FCC?
>
> Here's how it works. The FCC says, "According to our records, we sent
> you a letter over a year ago about a bunch of stuff we thought was
> wrong in the operation of your station.
>
> You sent us back a letter that didn't convince us you understand our
> rules, or our right to enforce them. Now, a year later, you still
> haven't fixed what we asked you to fix about the operation of your
> station. Let's go see the Administrative Law Judge."
>
> So it's off to see the ALJ.
>
> On the happy day, the ALJ says, "OK Mr. licensee, tell me why you
> should remain a licensee? Sitting in front of me here is a pile of FCC
> monitoring info, records of trips to an apparently empty ham shack
> that was on the air at the time it was apparently empty, a bunch of
> complaints from other licensees, another list that the Compliance and
> Information Bureau says are thirty-five apparent violations, quite a
> few tape recordings of you stomping all over people who were already
> using the frequency, that were submitted by impartial OO's with
> accompanying affidavits regarding their legitimacy, and several felony
> affidavit complaints you illegally sent out to people who complained
> about your station. You may explain Sir."
>
> After the licensee explains, whether it takes five minutes or five
> hours, the ALJ says, "Thank you sir," (then he shuffles some papers

> for effect) and then he says "this body rejects your explanation,
> which is indicative of your lack of understanding of the Commission's
> rules and accordingly, your privilege to operate a ham radio station
> is hereby revoked, as is your primary ham station license. Have a nice
> day. Next case please."
>
> And that's how it goes. Don't be too upset by it. You need to remember
> it is only a hobby. It's not like the ALJ is saying he can't worship
> freely or vote in the next election.
>
> If the ALJ could speak in plain English, he would say, "Look dude, I
> hate to tell you this, but it is the Commission's game, not yours.
> They decide who is playing nicely, and following their rules, and who
> is acting like an asshole. If you can't convince them you are on the
> up-and-up, they send you to me. And I break the news as gently as I
> can. Game over, turn in your ticket, hasta la vista baby. Try stamp
> collecting or something. There are lots of fun hobbies that don't have
> as many rules. Now get out of my Court, you clown."
>
> And that my friends, is that. It really is that easy. If you don't
> believe it, obtain and read the record for any ALJ proceeding in
> Amateur Radio.
>
> -PJ

What you say is 100% correct as far as you go. But you fail to mention the remainder of the FCC administrative process that permits a ham or CB operator to appeal the decision of an Administrative Law Judge to the entire FCC and then to the federal courts up to and including the Supreme Court and continue to operate a CB or ham radio until all appeals are done.

1539. Re: K1MAN for the 2003 Amateur Hall of Fame!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-03 21:46:16 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E3EE328.5090203@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 60622
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Dave Welby wrote:

>
> Thank you. Mr. Baxter is a true friend of all in hobby radio. Not just
> hams. The SoCal Good Buddies have already nominated Glenn Baxter,
> K1MAN, P.E., for the Radio Amateur Of The Year Award. We will now also
> nominate him for the CQ award.

Baxter is a true friend to no one but himself.

1540. Thoughts on the Columbia tragedy.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-03 23:53:37 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <b1mv3t02hi5@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 60626
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Maybe I'm being cynical, but I have to vent...

On Saturday, there were seven kids killed in an avalanche in Canada. Becasue of the Columbia tragedy, this story was buried in the back pages of most newspapers, and received very little air time by broadcast media. Why are the astronauts deaths more worthy of attention than the kids who were killed? Neither group went on their journey never expecting to return, but if you think about, that's a risk every one of takes every time we get into a car, onto an airplane, etc. Why is one death or deaths worthy of so much attention, and another isn't?

1541. Re: The coders embarrass themselves on 14.275 MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 00:03:45 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v3u0qpgkts207b@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 60623
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"K1MAN Man" <Lloyd@no.spammmmm> wrote in message
news:296332854.FF1640788@taranews.net...
> On Mon, 3 Feb 2003 11:35:21 -0500, KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com> wrote:
> > BTW what's YOUR callsign there big boy?
> > The screen name K1MAN Man and email
> > address of Lloyd@no.spammmmm just don't
> > get it. Until you put YOUR name or callsign
> > on the line, your the lid here!
>
> No.
>
> I'm not going to let you change the subject.

I don't have to, you did that when you started the name calling.

>
> The subject is rude and abusive code users. My handle has nothing
> whatsoever to do with the subject matter.

In an amateur radio group it's nice to KNOW that the other person
responding to posts is a real amateur and not a wanna be. And I'm
not talking about coded vs non-coded hams either.

>
> I maintain that CW users are no different than anyone else when it
> comes to abuse, but some CW users have a very strong need to believe
> that the mere use of that mode distinguishes them from (and makes them
> better than) the rest of the amateur community.

There are jerks everywhere. Including but not limited to this NG.

>
> I used to do a lot of CW work, especially when I had limited power
> available. Believe me, there is as much crap at the low end of the
> bands as there is at the high end. There are also a lot of nice
> operators to be found at either end of the bands. But CW ops can be
> just as rude as any SSB user.
>
> Example one: Frequency grabbing.
>
> You'll be sitting on a relatively clear frequency and will call a
> general CQ. At that point, a contester comes back to you and asks you
> for confirmation and an exchange of RST reports. So you give him what
> he asked for, turn it back over to him, and then he starts to call "CQ
> contest" without ever skipping a beat. You have just been quite

> rudely shoved off frequency by a CW lid.
>
> It happens all the time. When it happens to some people, they don't
> move on. A jamming contest ensues as both stations call CQ on top of
> one another.
>
> Example two: The other station goes deaf.
>
> Some operators want to know your QTH and their RST report, and once
> they get that information, they simply move on to another QSO without
> ever saying 73. As a result, people play little coy games and don't
> give out a signal report until the other guy has been forced to listen
> to several transmissions. Once you do give out a report, too many of
> the CW gang will just turn the vfo to a new frequency and look for a
> signal report from someone else. Another sizeable minority will start
> telling you that you're fading away in order to escape the QSO.
>
> Bottom line: Too many people don't really want to get into rag chew on
> CW, and their QSOs are consequently predictable and boring.
>
> Example three: The ego dominance battle.
>
> A persistent subgroup of CW operators generally hang out in a de facto
> net, using break-in transmissions and automatic keyers of some kind.
> These guys get strange when a newcomer arrives, and keep on bumping
> their speed up until s/he can no longer copy them. At the point of
> QRS, they either admit that they were testing the newcomer or they
> deride him for not being able to keep up. In the latter case, the
> newcomer goes away. In the former case, he's on notice that he has to
> prove something to the group before he's fully accepted. Either way,
> a QSO with such stations is unpleasant, and most people don't return.
>
> All of that having been said, the rude operators are in the minority,
> and either end of the band can provide hours of enjoyable QSOs with
> the many good operators that can be found there. It's just the notion
> that CW ops are "special" that pulls my chain.
>
> And before any of you "eleet" coders start your testosterone-speak of
> being real CW operators (whatever that means), let me tell you that I
> once held an ARRL certificate for 35 wpm. While that's not blindingly
> fast, it's not slow either. I use the phrase "once held" because I
> long ago lost both that framed certificate and my interest in CW.
>
> Unlike some others, I don't think that CW ability conferred any
> special virtue upon me. Consequently I don't want to force it on
> other licensees. That is, I'm not at all impressed by code skills,
> but I am impressed by technical skills.
>
> But that's a different subject.

Since my CW skills are poor at best I can't confirm or deny
any of your claims. What started this is the statements that follow:

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:b1ke8k$m9l$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> ... -.-. .-. . .-- -.-- --- ..-
>
> Dan/W4NTI

.-- . -.-- -.-- ... .- .. -.. -.. .- -.
.-- ....- -. - .. -.. . -.- -... ----. - -- .--.
>
> "Dean Arthur" <dearthur@silverstar.com> wrote in message
> news:3E3D9BDC.9B3BD8BA@silverstar.com...
> > >...cwers making real asses of themselves [sending shit, shit, shit]
> > >
> > > c'mon give them a break. prolly due to millisec attention spans and only
> > > able to send the one word they learned to send in finishing school.
> > >
>
>

I commented on Dan's Morse code "screw you"
to Dean Authur's comment, nothing else. You
on the other hand called me a lid without knowing
anything about my "on air" operating abilitys.
If you were to have a qso with me on air you
would find out I'm a VERY polite operator and
not a lid at all. If you don't believe me ask Larry
Roll K3LT, we had a very nice qso in 4 different
modes one day. (That is if you can count a long
distance telephone call as a mode :)
--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx

1542. Re: K1MAN for the 2003 Amateur Hall of Fame!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 00:12:00 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030203191200.20514.00000669@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 60624

>Baxter is a true friend to no one but himself.
>

Bull, hes the future of Ham Radio. You should support him, hes part of the Modernization of Ham Radio for the 21st Century and beyond.

1543. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 00:15:25 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030203191525.11866.00000384@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 60625

>Subject: Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It
>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>Date: 2/3/03 1:37 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030203143709.05048.00000432@mb-cs.aol.com>

>>> The alleged procedure you outlined is NOT in radio
>>> communication textbooks or military manuals written
>>> from the 1950s on through the 1980s and available for
>>> public (declassified) reference.
>>
>>And you point is?
>
>If it's not in the books he read, it can't have happened.

This is where a lot of war-story hero's come from...Guys who claim to have done something "special" while in the Armed Forces. They can read about it, envision what they THINK it was like, and then when they are in a social setting where they THINK no one will know better, they can enthrall the unwitting with thier stories of rear area heroism.

Mr. Anderson knows tons-and-tons of what books TELL him what he thinks he SHOULD know, and then the stories get twisted here.

And not just about rear area radio...His obvious errors in here IRT Amateur Radio are case-in-point almost every day.

>>Wrong again, Bucko. It is not only serious to reveal just information
>>on the things described by you. Interesting is that you've quizzed me
>>on the technical synchronization details though.
>
>Mr. Anderson does not like the fact that he does not have the necessary "need
>to know".

Just my point.

>It's similar to the idea that since someone else named Jim disagreed with Mr.
>Anderson and called him "Lennie", he is somehow authorized to call me
>"Jimmie"

I don't think that's it, Jim. I just think he's two-faced. Some would call that a "liar".

73

Steve, K4YZ

1544. Re: The coders embarrass themselves on 14.275 MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 00:45:49 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b1n2e6vpm1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 60627
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

This guy is definetly NOT Llllloooyyyddd. Llllooooyyyddd is too ignorant to
know any of what was just said.

And he is right you know.

Dan/W4NTI

I do cw.

"K1MAN Man" <Lloyd@no.spammmmm> wrote in message
news:296332854.FF1640788@taranews.net...
> On Mon, 3 Feb 2003 11:35:21 -0500, KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com> wrote:
> > BTW what's YOUR callsign there big boy?
> > The screen name K1MAN Man and email
> > address of Lloyd@no.spammmmm just don't
> > get it. Until you put YOUR name or callsign
> > on the line, your the lid here!
>
> No.
>
> I'm not going to let you change the subject.
>
> The subject is rude and abusive code users. My handle has nothing
> whatsoever to do with the subject matter.
>
> I maintain that CW users are no different than anyone else when it
> comes to abuse, but some CW users have a very strong need to believe
> that the mere use of that mode distinguishes them from (and makes them
> better than) the rest of the amateur community.
>
> I used to do a lot of CW work, especially when I had limited power
> available. Believe me, there is as much crap at the low end of the
> bands as there is at the high end. There are also a lot of nice
> operators to be found at either end of the bands. But CW ops can be
> just as rude as any SSB user.
>
> Example one: Frequency grabbing.
>
> You'll be sitting on a relatively clear frequency and will call a
> general CQ. At that point, a contester comes back to you and asks you
> for confirmation and an exchange of RST reports. So you give him what
> he asked for, turn it back over to him, and then he starts to call "CQ
> contest" without ever skipping a beat. You have just been quite
> rudely shoved off frequency by a CW lid.

>
> It happens all the time. When it happens to some people, they don't
> move on. A jamming contest ensues as both stations call CQ on top of
> one another.
>
> Example two: The other station goes deaf.
>
> Some operators want to know your QTH and their RST report, and once
> they get that information, they simply move on to another QSO without
> ever saying 73. As a result, people play little coy games and don't
> give out a signal report until the other guy has been forced to listen
> to several transmissions. Once you do give out a report, too many of
> the CW gang will just turn the vfo to a new frequency and look for a
> signal report from someone else. Another sizeable minority will start
> telling you that you're fading away in order to escape the QSO.
>
> Bottom line: Too many people don't really want to get into rag chew on
> CW, and their QSOs are consequently predictable and boring.
>
> Example three: The ego dominance battle.
>
> A persistent subgroup of CW operators generally hang out in a de facto
> net, using break-in transmissions and automatic keyers of some kind.
> These guys get strange when a newcomer arrives, and keep on bumping
> their speed up until s/he can no longer copy them. At the point of
> QRS, they either admit that they were testing the newcomer or they
> deride him for not being able to keep up. In the latter case, the
> newcomer goes away. In the former case, he's on notice that he has to
> prove something to the group before he's fully accepted. Either way,
> a QSO with such stations is unpleasant, and most people don't return.
>
> All of that having been said, the rude operators are in the minority,
> and either end of the band can provide hours of enjoyable QSOs with
> the many good operators that can be found there. It's just the notion
> that CW ops are "special" that pulls my chain.
>
> And before any of you "eleet" coders start your testosterone-speak of
> being real CW operators (whatever that means), let me tell you that I
> once held an ARRL certificate for 35 wpm. While that's not blindingly
> fast, it's not slow either. I use the phrase "once held" because I
> long ago lost both that framed certificate and my interest in CW.
>
> Unlike some others, I don't think that CW ability conferred any
> special virtue upon me. Consequently I don't want to force it on
> other licensees. That is, I'm not at all impressed by code skills,
> but I am impressed by technical skills.
>
> But that's a different subject.

1545. Re: Thoughts on the Columbia tragedy.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 00:51:11 UTC
From: JCanar <jcanar@nosp/->
Message-ID: <Xns9317BFB5DF3CBjcanarattbicom@63.240.76.16>
Source record: 60629
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Taken from:

http://science.slashdot.org/article.pl?sid=03/02/01/1442213&mode=nested&t
id=160

"Some don't realize why their deaths in particular have such a great
magnitude on society. Sure hundreds of others will die today and any
other day. But those that lost their lives on that shuttle lead lives
dedicated to knowledge and bettering humanity as a whole. So I guess you
could say they died for their country, you could also say they died for
their world. To think otherwise, as far as I've thought it through,
would be plain ignorance."

While the deaths of the children you refer to is tragic, and I can
certainly feel for their families, I hardly think you can equate going
into space and coming back at the same risk level as going skiing,
getting into a car, onto an airplane, etc... Space flight is extremely
complex and dangerous, and as the above poster pointed out, these people
do this in the pursuit of knowledge, not for a weekend holiday.

just my .02
jeff

> Maybe I'm being cynical, but I have to vent...
>
> On Saturday, there were seven kids killed in an avalanche in Canada.
> Becasue of the Columbia tragedy, this story was buried in the back
> pages of most newspapers, and received very little air time by
> broadcast media. Why are the astronauts deaths more worthy of
> attention than the kids who were killed? Neither group went on their
> journey never expecting to return, but if you think about, that's a
> risk every one of takes every time we get into a car, onto an
> airplane, etc. Why is one death or deaths worthy of so much attention,
> and another isn't?
>
>
>

--
<--------------------------------------->
When replying via email, please
remove "nosp/-\m" from the address
header
<--------------------------------------->

1546. Re: Thoughts on the Columbia tragedy.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 00:51:35 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b1n2ou$3k8$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 60628
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Thats the way it works in todays American society. Any death is a shame, or course.

But the Shuttle was much more visible of a tragedy.

In the same way we have several miners killed in Alabama digging coal during the 9/11 events. Ever hear of it? See what I mean. Whatever sells and thats the way it is.

Dan/W4NTI

"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:b1mv3t02hi5@enews3.newsguy.com...
> Maybe I'm being cynical, but I have to vent...
>
> On Saturday, there were seven kids killed in an avalanche in Canada. Becasue
> of the Columbia tragedy, this story was buried in the back pages of most
> newspapers, and received very little air time by broadcast media. Why are
> the astronauts deaths more worthy of attention than the kids who were
> killed? Neither group went on their journey never expecting to return, but
> if you think about, that's a risk every one of takes every time we get into
> a car, onto an airplane, etc. Why is one death or deaths worthy of so much
> attention, and another isn't?
>
>

1547. Re: K1MAN for the 2003 Amateur Hall of Fame!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 00:53:33 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b1n2skhdp1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 60630

Oh come on Bruce....you cant really believe that.

MAN is nothing but a world class QRMer and liar.

Dan/W4NTI

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030203191200.20514.00000669@mb-fo.aol.com...
> >Baxter is a true friend to no one but himself.
> >
>
> Bull, hes the future of Ham Radio. You should support him, hes part of the
> Modernization of Ham Radio for the 21st Century and beyond.

1548. Re: Thoughts on the Columbia tragedy.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 00:58:22 UTC
From: Michael <md1966@optonline.net>
Message-ID: <OeE%9.65767$HG.12609873@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 60631
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Hi...

No one life is worth more then the next. And if there is judgement to be done, it's up to the "Great Architect Of The Universe".

Simple answer to your question, though. It's a matter of the facts of modern mass media.

The shuttle program, or any other space program is an "out in front media sweet heart". When milestones like the first man in space, or the first man to set foot on the moon are achieved, the world as a whole is enriched and inspired by it. We celebrate together and all share in the achievement together because we all see it together via the mass media. The same goes for mourning a tragic failure.

It's a simple matter of coverage.

For all other great accomplishments and tragic failures that we know of personally, by aren't publicized, it's up to the individual or individuals that witness them to celebrate or mourn them in our own thoughts and circles.

Because this is a short-wave ng, I've got to tie this up to short-wave listening and say that because of short-wave, I have been made aware of news, thoughts and ideas that I wouldn't have been exposed to without it.

Respectfully,

Michael

"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:b1mv3t02hi5@enews3.newsguy.com...
> Maybe I'm being cynical, but I have to vent...
>
> On Saturday, there were seven kids killed in an avalanche in Canada.
Becasue
> of the Columbia tragedy, this story was buried in the back pages of most
> newspapers, and received very little air time by broadcast media. Why are
> the astronauts deaths more worthy of attention than the kids who were
> killed? Neither group went on their journey never expecting to return, but
> if you think about, that's a risk every one of takes every time we get
into
> a car, onto an airplane, etc. Why is one death or deaths worthy of so much
> attention, and another isn't?
>
>

1549. Re: Thoughts on the Columbia tragedy.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 01:22:01 UTC
From: Al Patrick <arp@inet4u.com>
Message-ID: <3E3F15B9.2040403@inet4u.com>
Source record: 60632
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

1) The "seven kids killed in an avalanche in Canada" probably were not as well known as the astronauts,

2) They didn't affect the American "image" as much,

3) They don't affect the American (NASA) budget as much.

4) There was nothing to cover up and nothing to gain by advertising the deaths of the skiers.

The crash of the shuttle has galvanized, for now, the American people and Dubya's ratings and is supposed to make us all join hands and forces and go gung-ho after ol' Saddam!

We have laser weapons that could bring the shuttle down and needed testing - to prove it! Every time we develop a new weapon we have to "test" it on something.

We probably also have technology far superior to the shuttle but the people would find it far too expensive to add to the budget -- unless we had such an event as the disintegration of the shuttle to galvanize the people together, reinforce our commitment to the space program and soften the hearts of the American people toward the new budget -- to come soon.

Look for more catastrophic events all through this year and into the next year or two -- until we surrender every right we have to the globalists!

Sit back. Drink your fluoridated water. Have another beer, and some potato chips while you're at it. Watch another sitcom that's so funny they have to tell you when to laugh. Turn in all your guns, if you have any. Believe every politician - and most of the preachers. Buy some more stocks - your commissioned brokers wouldn't lie to you, would they? For goodness sakes don't get any real money -- paper is the rage, these days! Don't listen to those nuts on shortwave -- the controlled media is all you need! -- NOT!

Thanks. I've been considering venting a little too! Wheeeh! ;-)

Al

==========

Krell wrote:

>On Saturday, there were seven kids killed in an avalanche in Canada. Becasue
>of the Columbia tragedy, this story was buried in the back pages of most
>newspapers, and received very little air time by broadcast media. Why are
>the astronauts deaths more worthy of attention than the kids who were
>killed? Neither group went on their journey never expecting to return, but
>if you think about, that's a risk every one of takes every time we get into
>a car, onto an airplane, etc. Why is one death or deaths worthy of so much
>attention, and another isn't?
>

1550. Re: Thoughts on the Columbia tragedy.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 01:23:55 UTC
From: Fred Garvin <Garvin@Truss.net>
Message-ID: <HAE%9.681$sd5.119535@news.uswest.net>
Source record: 60633
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Mon, 03 Feb 2003 18:53:37 -0500, Krell wrote:

> Maybe I'm being cynical, but I have to vent...
>
> On Saturday, there were seven kids killed in an avalanche in Canada.
> Becasue of the Columbia tragedy, this story was buried in the back pages
> of most newspapers, and received very little air time by broadcast media.
> Why are the astronauts deaths more worthy of attention than the kids who
> were killed? Neither group went on their journey never expecting to
> return, but if you think about, that's a risk every one of takes every
> time we get into a car, onto an airplane, etc. Why is one death or deaths
> worthy of so much attention, and another isn't?

Surely the death of those chilren is very tragic as all deaths are.

If you can't figure out why the shuttle story is a bigger story then
something is wrong with you. I'd imagine that the local papers where the
children are from had it front page though. That is what's important. IF
they didn't then your issue is with those newspapers.

The shuttle tragedy is a *national* tragedy. Really a multi-national
tragedy considering that 2 other countries lost one of their best as well.

I'm sorry to hear about those children however,as I'm sure everyone here
is. Your post is the first I've heard about it. My condolences to thier
families from N.Y. State.

1551. Re: The coders embarrass themselves on 14.275 MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 01:36:58 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302031736.40cb9a0f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60634
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com> wrote in message news:<v3t6hvt2uak27d@corp.supernews.com>...

> Thank you! I've went from "CBPlusser" to "Real Ham" to
> "damned lid" in just one week. That has to be some kind of
> a record, don't it?

Slow down. You're making the rest of us look like underachievers.
Ripping through all those license classes in a week.

;^)
Brian

1552. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 01:40:55 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E3F1A1F.41515538@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60635

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E3D6E11.4C993770@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E3AF193.B187CE47@earthlink.net>...
> > > >
> > > > That isn't what happened at all. You are the individual responsible for
> > > > bringing up any of this. You were silly to do so.
> > >
> > >
> > > Much like a big run of out of band frenchmen on 6M. You were silly to
> > > bring it up. Must have been hurting for greenbacks.
> > >
> > > Maybe next time...
> >
> > ...you'll be more careful, Brian. I broke no regs in my operation from
> > any DX spot in which I operated. Your problem then as now is that you
> > chose to attack the wrong target. Len's situation is quite different.
> > He made a number of statements which were at best unfactual; at most,
> > deliberate falsehoods.
> >
> > His claims were easily refuted. It'd be trickier with something like
> > your alleged verbal permission to operate from Somalia.

> Not tricky at all. I was there, I had permission.

So you say.

> You had bad
> information, said a military commander could not give permission. You
> were wrong, but have yet to admit it. You are wrong on a number of
> matters, but cannot recognize it.

I'm sure that you believe in your heart of hearts, that just any old
"commander" will do. I'm sure you believe in your heart of hearts, that
the sum total of information about operating from Somalia is the
information contained on the ARRL's web site. I'm sure you believe in
your heart of hearts, that the T2FD and B&W folded dipole are fine
antennas. I can't come up with another way to explain these things.

Dave K8MN

1553. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 01:49:21 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.h9qsx74.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 60638

Len Over 21 wrote:

> While "CW" (common term for on-off keyed continuous
> waves) may be "fun" to morsemen, a State Department
> radio circuit isn't supposed to be some government-run
> radio disneyland for its staffers, is it?

If that's a by-product, why not?

When I reported to the San Francisco FCC office in 1967 I was amazed to find out that the intercom by which the telephone receptionist passed calls to staff members was an ancient Morse key and an equally ancient one-tube oscillator feeding several speakers around the suite.

"How medieval" I thought. After using it for several years, it almost broke my heart to find out that the Type 42 (or was it 43) tube used in the oscillator was no longer available at retail and when it finally burned out in the mid-1970s we went to a somewhat more conventional "overhead" voice paging system. Sometimes I missed feeling that old B-battery across the binding posts.... <ggg>

You may have worked for government contractors for most of your career, Len, but except for your hitch in the Army, how much time have you worked for "THE government" directly? Certainly in the non-military end of "The Government" one learms that if the toothpick is reusable, it gets reused until it is no longer usable, no matter how antiquated it becomes or how many mouths it passes through.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1554. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 01:52:20 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E3F1CCC.180E41A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60639

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3E3D6FD6.1E048EA5@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Brian wrote:
> >>
> >> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> >news:<20030201103647.29016.00000066@mb-fy.aol.com>...
> >>
> >> > Lack of experience, lack of knowledge and lack of skill are three
> >reasons.
> >>
> >> In a nutshell, N2EY dismisses the T2FD antenna, and insults anyone who
> >> might be using one. Since he has no use for it, it cannot be good.
> >>
> >If you have need for a loss antenna, go for it. I should have had one
> >this morning when chasing Johnston Island on 160m. It was far too easy
> >to nail AH3D with three calls. Maybe the broadband T2FD would have
> >permitted me to work him on 160, 80 and 40 at the same time if (and
> >here's the rub) he could have heard me.
>
> Dave,
>
> Perhaps you could point out where the imagined "insults" are in the sentence:
>
> "Lack of experience, lack of knowledge and lack of skill are three reasons."

I think it is a Brian-Len thing. Brian, who likes to read between the
lines, believes that you have stated that HE has little or no
experience, little or know knowledge or little or no skill.

> An inexperienced ham, who had not used an efficient HF dipole, might think the
> T2FD/WBFD was not much different in efficiency.
>
> A ham lacking in knowledge might not understand how the T2FD/WBFD obtains its
> broadband characteristics through the use of resistive loading, which radiates
> much of the RF power fed to the antenna as heat rather than RF.
>
> A ham lacking in skill might want to avoid having to adjust a tuner.
>
> A simple dipole that is the same size as a WBFD, fed with low loss parallel
> line and matched with a suitable a tuner will have practically identical
> patterns but much higher efficiency than a WBFD. Such a dipole is lighter and
> mechanically simpler, and when all costs are considered, is no more expensive.

> >
> >I've never had use for an antenna which requires a linear amp to break
> >even on gain when transmitting.
>
> Nor I!
>
> >I have used and do use loss antennas
> >when receiving on 160m or 80m. I can rotate them to null noise and use
> >a preamp to bring up the desired signal.
>
> Yep. Which brings up a question - could you have even heard AH3D on 160 if
> you'd had a T2FD for receiving? Unlike a directional antenna like a loop, the
> T2FD would pick up noise from all directions.

I generally have low noise here but I really having no way of knowing if
I could have heard AH3D on a T2FD without a preamp. I would not have
wanted to place my eggs in that basket given that it was the next to
last night of operation for the Johnston Island ops. I like to put my
RF up in the air through use of the most efficient antenna I can install
than to use it warming up a resistor.

Dave K8MN

1555. Montana and Florida

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 01:54:01 UTC
From: Jackie <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com>
Message-ID: <U2F%9.87447$to3.167188@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 60640

Hi guys and gals,

Well, I'm finally all rigged up and despite my really crappy antenna situation (triband trap dipole about 10 ft. off the ground), I was able to talk with my first HF contacts tonight, a guy in Orlando, Florida and a guy in Montana. I have a new Icom IC-718, which is a very nice radio and I got it very cheap. I guess it's not so bad after all, the antenna I mean. I borrowed it from a friend when I discovered that the Hy-Gain vertical strapped to my deck ain't gonna work without a ground or counterpoise. Better than nothing!

Are there any good 20 meter nets that you know of?

Jackie

1556. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 02:00:52 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E3F1ECC.A7C3BA91@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60641

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E3D66DB.A843E75A@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0301311002.27cfb6eb@posting.google.com>...
> > > > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030130211736.08181.00000271@mb-cq.aol.com>...
> > .
> > >
> > > No, no, no. Clinging to the past would be publishing tube radio
> > > CONSTRUCTION articles en leiu of publishing TODAY'S amateurs radio
> > > activities in the ARRL Sections. Hello Dave Heil! Whare are you on
> > > this???
> >
> > I'm still trying to decipher "en leiu". I'm guessing but did you mean
> > "in lieu"?
>
> Dave, you got it! Instead of being so friggin obtuse all the time,
> you used a little creative thought and figured out what I meant
> instead of sitting there completely stuck. I know it was difficult,
> but you keep trying.
>
> Bully for you!

It is really lots easier when a statement doesn't read like something
from a Mark Morgan post.

> > I used to own a backup linear amp which was solid state. All of my high
> > power linear amps use tubes. With one exception, they were all produced
> > within the last ten years.
>
> These weren't power amplifier articles.

I don't care what the articles were. Most currently produced HF power
amps sold utilize ancient, archaic, obsolete vacuum tubes technology.

> While it bothers me that contest line scores
> > and "Section News" have been removed from the pages of QST,
>
> It "bothered" you so much so that you went on a campain.

Yeah, I went on a "campain" "en leiu" of keeping mum. I even went on a
campaign.

> an article
> > on a piece of equipment using vacuum tubes doesn't upset me. It'd beat
> > "The Doctor is IN" hands down.
>
> True. No room should be devoted to novices and novice problems. We
> need more foundation information, advertisements, and letters to the
> editor about no-coders.

...or from them. The league published one of Squiggy's letters in the
recent past. I've already informed you about the dangers of comparing
ad pages to editorial pages.

> > > > Would it be better if car magazines no longer printed articles about
> > > > '65 Mustangs, because that would be "clinging to the past"? How about
> > > > listening to "oldies", or classical music - all "clinging to the
> > > > past", right? Would it be better if all vintage airplanes were
> > > > grounded and antique cars removed from the road, because those things
> > > > are all examples of "clinging to the past?
> > > >
> > > > I don't think so!
> > >
> > > It would be nice to see Jim "cling to the future" once in his amateur
> > > career.
> >
> > Why didn't you answer the question?
>
> The answer is obvious, Dave. But just for you.

But why didn't you answer the question?

> Oldies are played on Oldies Stations. No head-banging or classical.
>
> Classical music is played on Classical Stations. No Oldies or Blue
> Grass.
>
> Vintage airplane have their own format.
>
> Antique cars have their own format, and its not Motor Trend.
>
> QST is a classic in that they offer frequent trips down memory lane,
> to the exclusion of section news.

"QST" is a general interest magazine about all that hams do. You
wouldn't go looking for solid state transmitter articles in "Electric
Radio".

> > > Pretend that you like vanilla ice cream with mint chips, just once.
> >
> > Why didn't you just answer the question?
>
> Because.

That's the expected juvenile response.

> > > > > The January QST ALSO includes items on: A 222mHz transverter, computer
> > > > > interface with the TRX-Manager program, orientation to test equipment for new
> > > > > hams, product reviews on new HT's and weather station, plus the usual operating
> > > > > articles, ads and other "human interest" items.
> > > > >
> > > > > Within the first 12 pages of QST are ads for all sorts of new technology,
> > > > > INCLUDING I-Link soft and hardware. Not a single tube in sight.
> > > > >
> > > > > Whew.
> > > >
> > > > There ya go, Steve, confusing the issue with facts.
> > > >
> > > > Here's a question: Should QST refuse paid advertisements for things
> > > > like telegraph keys, because some folks consider such things to be
> > > > "clinging to the past"?
> > >
> > > Should a membership organization tell their members to go look for
> > > member information on another format so that they can devote space to
> > > paid advertisements for things like "pump telegraph keys," because
> > > some folks consider such things to be "clinging to the past"?
> >
> > It would be silly for you to confuse advertising space with editorial
> > content.
> > More ad pages pay for more editorial pages.

> Section News is an editorial? You're silly and confused.

Seek out a definition of editorial content before you make yourself look
more stupid.

Dave K8MN

1557. Re: Thoughts on the Columbia tragedy.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 02:48:59 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E3F2A1B.8030409@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 60644
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Krell wrote:
> Maybe I'm being cynical, but I have to vent...
>
> On Saturday, there were seven kids killed in an avalanche in Canada. Becasue
> of the Columbia tragedy, this story was buried in the back pages of most
> newspapers, and received very little air time by broadcast media. Why are
> the astronauts deaths more worthy of attention than the kids who were
> killed? Neither group went on their journey never expecting to return, but
> if you think about, that's a risk every one of takes every time we get into
> a car, onto an airplane, etc. Why is one death or deaths worthy of so much
> attention, and another isn't?

There were probably more people killed in auto accidents on
Saturday than on the shuttle and by avalanches combined. I would
also wager more died in other accidents as well. You want a
detailed news report on all those as well? What areas of science
were those kids advancing besides their own pleasure of skiing?
Yes, their deaths were just as tragic, even more so to their
families, but the space program is quite a bit more higher profile
than someone skiing in the back country.

1558. Re: Gary Coffman: personal information

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 02:49:49 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030203214949.00499.00000423@mb-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 60642

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.h9qn7i0.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On Mon, 03 Feb 2003 02:43:30 GMT, Gary Coffman wrote:
>
>>Gary Coffman: personal information
>
> Welcome back, Gary. Where have you been?

Same here -- LTNS, Gary! You gonna start posting here again, or are
you just hoping Kim will find your number and give you a call?

73 de Larry, K3LT

1559. Re: Thoughts on the Columbia tragedy.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 02:49:50 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030203214950.00499.00000424@mb-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 60643

In article <b1mv3t02hi5@enews3.newsguy.com>, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
writes:

>Maybe I'm being cynical, but I have to vent...
>
>On Saturday, there were seven kids killed in an avalanche in Canada. Becasue
>of the Columbia tragedy, this story was buried in the back pages of most
>newspapers, and received very little air time by broadcast media. Why are
>the astronauts deaths more worthy of attention than the kids who were
>killed? Neither group went on their journey never expecting to return, but
>if you think about, that's a risk every one of takes every time we get into
>a car, onto an airplane, etc. Why is one death or deaths worthy of so much
>attention, and another isn't?

Believe it or not, you actually have a good point here. I have also been been
in awe of the way people are going out of their way to make public displays
of largely self-serving "grief" over the loss of the Columbia astronauts. Many
times their number were killed on the nations highways that very same day,
in addition to those killed in the Canadian avalanche.

The Space Shuttle Columbia crew were people who were engaged in an
activity they knew was inherently risky. The risks were, of course, acceptably
low, and worth taking -- but the fact that they ended up having their card
drawn off the bottom of the deck doesn't make "heroes" out of them. This is
no worse a "tragedy" than the crash of a business jet with a pilot, co-pilot,
and five executives of a large corporation -- but we're making an overblown
emotional event out of it on an international scale nevertheless. Yes, they
took these risks in the interest of furthering science for the betterment of
mankind -- but they were each due to benefit from having had this
great opportunity with a lifetime of profitable speechmaking, book writing,
and other ways to make a fortune as a result.

Yes, this event is tragic. The tragedy includes not only the loss of seven
highly trained, irreplaceable astronauts, but in the loss of the progress the
space program will suffer as a result of all of the investigations and after-
action second guessing which will follow -- largely driven by power-hungry
politicians with an anti-NASA agenda.

What we should be doing is picking up the pieces, giving whatever remains
of the astronauts which can be blotted up and DNA identified a dignified
burial with full military or civilian honors, then get right back in one of
our
three remaining Space Shuttles and blast off! Along the way, we should
spend a few bucks to invent a way to inspect and repair the tiles while
in space -- maybe plan on leaving a damaged Space Shuttle double-
parked with the ISS while the repairs are being planned/accomplished,

and using a low-cost, one-shot capsule to recover the stranded crew.

If we're going to treat this accident as another reason to break out the national crying towel, then they'd damn well better start televising each and every single Space Shuttle launch/landing again, on all TV and cable channels, complete with Jules Bergman scientific reporting, just like they used to in the good old days when astronauts WERE Real Heroes (tm). And they'd better show the re-runs for a coupla days so everyone gets a chance to see it! If the space program is special enough for us to force us to endure the gauche scene of politicians, celebrities, and everyone else who can get their face in front of a camera crying crocodile tears for people they, in some cases, were barely aware of the day before, just because they were astronauts, then let's make being an astronaut just as special as it used to be in the REAL pioneering days of the space program!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1560. Re: K1MAN for the 2003 Amateur Hall of Fame!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 02:52:10 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E3F2ADA.6080408@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 60645

WA8ULX wrote:
>>Baxter is a true friend to no one but himself.
>>
>
>
> Bull, hes the future of Ham Radio. You should support him, hes part of the
> Modernization of Ham Radio for the 21st Century and beyond.

If Baxter is the future of ham radio, then ham radio has no
future. Wonder why I would expect you to like Baxter? Two of a
kind I guess. You, blusterous Baxter, and Lloyd should make a
great threesome.

1561. Re: K1MAN for the 2003 Amateur Hall of Fame!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 02:52:57 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E3F2B09.8010206@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 60646

Lloyd, N0VFP wrote:

>>
>
> Glenn Baxter is a good man, doing God's work around the world. Sam Voron,
> does God's work too.

That has to be the understatement of the year.

1562. Re: K1MAN for the 2003 Amateur Hall of Fame!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 03:44:40 UTC
From: "Lloyd, N0VFP" <brother_lloyd_99@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3e3f178f_1@corp-goliath.newsgroups.com>
Source record: 60636

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:b1n2skhdp1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net...
> Oh come on Bruce....you cant really believe that.
>
> MAN is nothing but a world class QRMer and liar.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> "WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030203191200.20514.00000669@mb-fo.aol.com...
> > >Baxter is a true friend to no one but himself.
> > >
> >
> > Bull, hes the future of Ham Radio. You should support him, hes part of
the
> > Modernization of Ham Radio for the 21st Century and beyond.
>
>

Glenn Baxter is a good man, doing God's work around the world. Sam Voron,
does God's work too.

Leave both of them alone, Dan, or you will suffer greatly!

"Glenn Baxter for President, 2004"

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

1563. Re: Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, FCC, Cronkite, ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 03:46:39 UTC
From: "Lloyd, N0VFP" <brother_lloyd_99@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3e3f1805$1_1@corp-goliath.newsgroups.com>
Source record: 60637
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Paul" <drakeswl@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:c0588492.0301300804.69039ba9@posting.google.com...
> I'm new to this topic so don't flame me, but if W1AW has a bulletin,
> why can't Baxter have one? What is Baxter doing that is so bad that
> the FCC would want to shut him down? He has been on a long time and
> they haven't done anything... so doesn't that mean he is perfectly
> legal as far as the FCC goes? Last question. If Cronkite gave Baxter
> that announcement he uses, why should Baxter have to stop using it
> now? I heard Baxter used to call people and the government names and
> sent out some felony complaints, but isn't interfering with Baxter's
> show illegal?
>
> I know I'm new and I'm not a ham, but I started to listen to Baxter's
> show this month, and it just sounds like he is trying to help minority
> kids and some kind of peace corp, plus he is putting other people's
> material on, like newsline and arrl and rain and the like. So where's
> the beef?
>
> Please, no flames, I'm just trying to learn and keep an open mind.
>
> Paul

You have made good points. Baxter has been given "all systems go" from
Robert H. Macamera, back in 1989.

--
"Glenn Baxter for President, 2004"

------------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

1564. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL support it ??)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 04:07:35 UTC
From: Bill B <leakylinkie@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3e3f3c8a@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 60647
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

If the ARRL even REMOTLY offers ANY SUPPORT
WHATSOEVER to this Orwellian proposal by K8AD
than it will signal the **DEATH KNELL** for ARRL.

Anyone (...and I mean anyone) who would lend their
support to this insane proposal is aiding totalitarian
style controls to the private ownership of a radio
transmitter.

I wonder if K8AD went to the "Soviet Gulag School" of
Ham Radio? The Govt. or anyone else has no damm
business AT ALL knowing what makes and models of radios
I may purchase or own G-DDAMMIT!

What the frig? Are we to now have HANDGUN STYLE
Registration Requirements for Ham Radio and CB Equipment???

IF THE ARRL GOES ALONG WITH THIS PROPOSAL -
IN ANY CAPACITY WHATSOEVER, YOU WILL SEE THE
BIGGEST ABANDONMENT OF ARRL MEMBERSHIP
SINCE THE INCENTIVE LICENSING DISASTER OF
THE 60's and 70's.

-----> Do not support or touch this proposal W1AW - unless you
want to go the way of the Spark Transmitter and Rotary Dial Telephone.

"RadioGuy" <nospam@nospam.com> wrote in message
news:b1mrgo$s1a$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> SB QST @ ARL $ARLB011
> ARLB011 FCC Invites Comments on Amateur-Related Petition
>
> ZCZC AG11
> QST de W1AW
> ARRL Bulletin 11 ARLB011
> From ARRL Headquarters
> Newington CT January 31, 2003
> To all radio amateurs
>
> SB QST ARL ARLB011
> ARLB011 FCC Invites Comments on Amateur-Related Petition
>
> Dale Reich, K8AD has petitioned the FCC to require sellers of
> two-way voice or data equipment to keep on file a buyer's name,

> address, telephone number and "any future information when selling a
> radio that required licensing under the current FCC rules." Comments
> on the petition, RM-10641, are due February 28.
>
> Information collected would remain private, available only to the
> FCC or law enforcement. Reich said in his petition that any retail
> vendor would be able to ask local police for an investigation if the
> retailer suspected the radios were not going to be used in
> compliance with the law.
>
> Included in the petition is a requirement for "ownership and license
> tagging" for gear operating under Parts 5, 15, 18, 74, 80, 90, 95
> and 97. In his petition, Reich said such tagging used to be an FCC
> requirement and that his proposed change was a needed tool for local
> law enforcement.
>
> The full text of Reich's petitions is available on the FCC Web site.
> Search for the petition number.
> NNNN
> /EX
>
>

1565. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 04:07:39 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E3F3CB3.41A5E2D3@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60648

Brian wrote:
>
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030202180532.16280.00001373@mb-mo.aol.com>...
> > In article <f45722ac.0302011836.7d34e6c5@posting.google.com>,
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> >
> > >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> > >news:<20030131152454.03820.00000302@mb-fr.aol.com>...
> > >> In article <f45722ac.0301301530.198cb3a3@posting.google.com>,
> > >> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

> > >
> > > >L Cebik is waaay out in front of the Worlds Greatest DXer.
> > >
> > > Has a nicer and more informed source of information website
> > > on antennas and other things about amateur radio. W4RNL
> > > regularly posts at Antennex, a website devoted to antenna
> > > experimentation around the world. www.antennex.com
> > >
> > > New article viewing requires a subscription but Jack Stone
> > > (editor-publisher) is liberal about letting non-subscribers
> > > view older articles freely. "Older" meaning two to three
> > > months old.
>
> Wow. Not a quarter of half a century old?

If you're going to discount antenna theory material less than a few
years old, you'll have to abandon the Yagi, the cubical quad, the
windom, the log periodic and much more. You'd be left with not much
more than a guy forced to ask questions about how to build an end fed
antenna for 5 MHz.

> The interesting thing is that there were accidental discoveries in
> applied radio, but since the T2FD was engineered to be tilted, no
> other contemporary deployment of the antenna can be called a T2FD.

A delta loop is simply a full wave loop design. It wasn't designed
until 1968 by Harry Habig K8ANV. It had the same basic operating
characteristics as the cubical quad. It isn't called a cubical quad.

Good luck on your search for knowledge.

Dave K8MN

1566. Re: K1MAN for the 2003 Amateur Hall of Fame!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 04:09:47 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030203230947.10210.00000829@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 60649

>Oh come on Bruce....you cant really believe that.
>
>MAN is nothing but a world class QRMer and liar.
>
>Dan/W4NTI

Dan you know I dont believe that, Im just trying to get under radiobuffs skin.

1567. Re: K1MAN for the 2003 Amateur Hall of Fame!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 04:11:42 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030203231142.10210.00000830@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 60650

>If Baxter is the future of ham radio, then ham radio has no
>future.

Well put

>Wonder why I would expect you to like Baxter?

Because it pisses you off

1568. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 04:15:31 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E3F3EAD.8B2E83E1@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60652

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E3D7156.DF1BB4C0@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Unless you're willing to concede that there are contemporary uses of
> > > the T2FD for which the 1949 QST article could never have forseen.
> >
> > or what? This isn't even a sentence, much less a paragraph.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Don't be so thick.

Why not try writing English as most folks comprehend it?

Y'know, Brian--you could be right. There might be contemporary uses for
the T2FD. For example, it might be just the ticket for high power
spread spectrum.
Your use of high power could overcome the loss of the big honkin'
resistor. I guess the other guy would need high power too, reciprocity
considered.

Dave K8MN

1569. Re: Thoughts on the Columbia tragedy.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 04:15:34 UTC
From: John Barnard <jfjb@shaw.ca>
Message-ID: <3E3F3E6D.6F1232BA@shaw.ca>
Source record: 60651
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Both tradgedies made the front page of Monday's Edmonton Journal. The reason being that the kids were from a private school in Alberta and the shuttle, of course, being a high-profile incidence. The paper did a good job of giving equal coverage to both.

John Barnard

Krell wrote:

> Maybe I'm being cynical, but I have to vent...
>
> On Saturday, there were seven kids killed in an avalanche in Canada. Becasue
> of the Columbia tragedy, this story was buried in the back pages of most
> newspapers, and received very little air time by broadcast media. Why are
> the astronauts deaths more worthy of attention than the kids who were
> killed? Neither group went on their journey never expecting to return, but
> if you think about, that's a risk every one of takes every time we get into
> a car, onto an airplane, etc. Why is one death or deaths worthy of so much
> attention, and another isn't?

1570. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 04:27:44 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E3F419B.8F2C92C9@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60653

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E3D66DB.A843E75A@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0301311002.27cfb6eb@posting.google.com>...
> > > > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030130211736.08181.00000271@mb-cq.aol.com>...
> > .
> > >
> > > No, no, no. Clinging to the past would be publishing tube radio
> > > CONSTRUCTION articles en leiu of publishing TODAY'S amateurs radio
> > > activities in the ARRL Sections. Hello Dave Heil! Whare are you on
> > > this???
> >
> > I'm still trying to decipher "en leiu". I'm guessing but did you mean
> > "in lieu"?
>
> Dave, I just collected the following quote from friend Jim/KH2D:
>
> "The 'problem' is not who the DX is working or not working. The problem
> is that hams are whiners, and the ones who collect post cards whine
> the loudest...."
>
> Sort of sums up your inability to leap beyond life's little problems.

Your attempt at a one-liner is pretty laughable coming from a guy who
has whined endlessly about the inequity of morse testing during which
time thousands of others upgraded without complaint.

Dave K8MN

1571. Re: arrl article on echolink - impress a non ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 04:41:04 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030203234104.04497.00000013@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 60654

Yes, but the challenge was to impress a non-Ham.

So, invite a non-Ham to a Hamfest and/or club meeting (preferably Hamfest).
Then, lets see if the non-Ham is impressed.

In order to be not biased, the non-Ham must not be related to a Ham or have
longtime association with a Ham.

I'm up to the challenge if anyone else is.
I will invite a non-Ham to a Hamfest. Anyone else?

1572. Re: Thoughts on the Columbia tragedy.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 04:45:25 UTC
From: Evets <themtx@foo.yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <8uH%9.12527$sm3.9938@news.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 60655
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

For an interesting viewpoint, check out Uncle Bob's thoughts:
http://unclebob.diaryland.com/ , and for those who view this link after 02/03, check out that day's entry, as the url above is for his current posting only. It makes you think. This guy is just an average joe who happens to have some media exposure as a tv journalist, but he may be onto something, as callous as his perspective may seem at first. Worth a look and some consideration, IMO.

Steve

"John Barnard" <jfjb@shaw.ca> wrote in message
news:3E3F3E6D.6F1232BA@shaw.ca...
> Both tradgedies made the front page of Monday's Edmonton Journal. The
reason
> being that the kids were from a private school in Alberta and the shuttle,
of
> course, being a high-profile incidence. The paper did a good job of giving
equal
> coverage to both.
>
> John Barnard
>
> Krell wrote:
>
> > Maybe I'm being cynical, but I have to vent...
> >
> > On Saturday, there were seven kids killed in an avalanche in Canada.
Becasue
> > of the Columbia tragedy, this story was buried in the back pages of most
> > newspapers, and received very little air time by broadcast media. Why
are
> > the astronauts deaths more worthy of attention than the kids who were
> > killed? Neither group went on their journey never expecting to return,
but
> > if you think about, that's a risk every one of takes every time we get
into
> > a car, onto an airplane, etc. Why is one death or deaths worthy of so
much
> > attention, and another isn't?
>

1573. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL support it ??)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 05:00:58 UTC
From: Dean Arthur <dearthur@silverstar.com>
Message-ID: <3E3F4915.C50E530E@silverstar.com>
Source record: 60656
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

Was polishing motorcycle in driveway one day. Car drives up and couple get out. Look at motorcycle then fellow asks if peculiar antenna on roof is mine. I say "Yes." Out comes papers. "You have been served." Went to court with Order for judge to sign requiring Plaintiff to reimburse me for time off and costs of researching law at law library plus travel and meals and listed miscellaneous expenses. Judge signed, they balked. I said, "Pay up or I freeze all accounts and assets." The rep of company asked judge if I could do that. Judge answered in the affirmative. They paid.

It's so much fun when you know the law and they don't!

1574. Re: ARS License Numbers (quantity vs quality)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 05:02:36 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030204000236.04497.00000014@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 60657

What is this obsession with license numbers?

Don't forget quality is as important as quantity.

Tied to this is the elimination of tying the Morse code requirement to the license class.(*1) With the elimination of this irrelevant metric, the hobby will change. Then, pride in the license and achievement will follow.

Morse code does not necessarily lead to a dumbing down of the license - it is merely a shift in emphasis. However, some do use Morse code as a substitute for "real" achievement, which dumbs down the hobby.

The narrow focus on Morse and antennas is not bad, but the expansion of all aspects will be good for the hobby.

(*1) Please note: I am biased, I will admit it. I will not use rationalizations as the pro-coders do and pretend there is no agenda behind it. My agenda is to expand the technical aspects: homebrewing, antenna setups, and so on. So, you know where I'm coming from.

1575. Re: Shortwave KOOKS comment on Shuttle 12.160

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 05:08:09 UTC
From: alan Marinaro <hotlineservu@msn.com>
Message-ID: <ZUH%9.89143$to3.230391@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 60658
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

Conspiracy is latent in all of man even the US Government.. been going on for years.. so stop bein illogical and saying conspiracy is impossible.. conspiracy is the root cause of all wars.. allthough Alex went a little far on the spaceshuttle thing i must admit. But the New World Order is real.. it has been quotes by multiple politicians.. and Gary Hart even talked about it on C-Span the day after Sept.11th. He said this disaster would help bring in a "New World Order" at the council on foreign relations meeting

"shortwave woowoo" <greenfields@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:3e3c1e8f@snipnews.snip.net...
>
> <Him Again@anonymous.com (Sew Lil a Kwe)> wrote in message
> news:v3o4cu7s8dam66@corp.supernews.com...
>
>
> FLASH!!!!!!!
>
> ALEX JONES AND JOHN STADTMELLER - TWO VETERAN SHORTWAVE
> KOOKS COMMENTING ON COLUMBIA LOSS AS ALL BEING PART
> OF A MASSIVE CONSPIRACY TO BOOST BUSH'S RATINGS INTHE
> POLLS AS A PRELUDE TO THE IRAQ WAR !
>
>
> BROADCASTING LIVE RIGHT NOW ON 12.160 TOOOON IN TO
> THESE TWO FUC-ING SCREWBALLS ON A PSYCHOTIC RANT !!
>
> ***** I AM NOT KIDDING YOU FOLKS********
>
> THESE TWO GOLD PLATED SHORTWAVE KOOKS JUST SAYING THIS
> RIGHT NOW ON 12.160 MHZ AS I AM TYPING THIS !
>
> HW FUC-ING PREDICTABLE!!!!!
>
> SEND IN THE PAY-TRIOT KOOKS!!!!!
>
>
>
> > This Shuttle was destroyed over the State of Texas, George Bush's home
> state.
> >
> > In summary, I would be interested in hearing from others about the
> paranoid
> > reactions that we will hear from Alex Jones et al,

> >
> > Alex will make the points as follows.
> > 1. The first Israeli Astronaut.
> > 2. The presence of an Indian Woman (PhD), a country that we are
currently
> > courting favor with in our "war" against Iraq, and the possibility of
> > incensing this country into a high degree of cooperation if they feel
that
> > Iraq was somehow involved.
> > 3. The coincidence in time (the Jan 28 versus Feb 01) and of the
memorial.
> > 4. The coincidence of the crash area (over Texas, Bush's own)
> > 5. He will probably play the New World Order angle, suggesting that
> "elements"
> > in the U.S. government arranged for this to promote the Iraq war.
> >
> > As an afterthought, remember that people in Islamic countries will
likely
> be
> > seen celebrating this disaster for the U.S. and Israel. The mere act of
> idiots
> > celebrating a disaster is not justification to begin a war or other acts
> of
> > aggression.
> >
> > God Bless.
> >
> > Never say never.
> > Nothing is absolute.
>
>

1576. Re: The coders embarrass themselves on 14.275 MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 05:41:42 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v3ukkirnj1i794@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 60659
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0302031736.40cb9a0f@posting.google.com...
> "KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com> wrote in message
news:<v3t6hvt2uak27d@corp.supernews.com>...
>
> > Thank you! I've went from "CBPlusser" to "Real Ham" to
> > "damned lid" in just one week. That has to be some kind of
> > a record, don't it?
>
> Slow down. You're making the rest of us look like underachievers.
> Ripping through all those license classes in a week.
>
> ;^)
> Brian

Hey you know what they say; "You snooze, you lose!".
Besides all that I can't really be a lid, I have NEVER
used the term "I'm destinated now" on the air ;^)
--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx

1577. Re: MARS opinions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 05:49:55 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b1of3m21tsr@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 60670

Yeah... thats in the plans.... living at where I am now to save money
towards the house I am hopefully gonna buy in 2005 and have already saved up
almost $4000 in the past 2.5 years for the down payment. Guess this is a
worthwile reason to "suffer." :)

I can however work mobile and slowly building that as my "station."

73's,
--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

"Symbolism is for the simple minded....."

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:b1mj9f$64t$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net...
> Yeah...understand....how about doing what I did...move.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
> news:b1ls7t1b7p@enews2.newsguy.com...
> > I was looking into that (MARS operation) a while ago myself, but do not,
> and
> > will not have HF capability for quite a while yet (regardless of
> > licensure...) due to residency issues..... (a$$hole landlord)
> >
> >
> > --
> > Ryan, KC8PMX
> > FF/MFR
> > REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
> >
> > "Symbolism is for the simple minded....."
> >
> >
> >
> >
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:b1jrcd$rg3$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
> > > Of course you must have HF capability if you want to operate MARS.
That
> > is
> > > where the nets are that you must check into to get the proper amount

```
of
> > time
> > > to keep active.
> > >
> > > I believe you are correct. A minimum of two frequencies are required.
> > >
> > > Most of the MARS freqs are just outside of the 'normal' ham bands.
> > Although
> > > some are quite a bit out.
> > >
> > > If one only has a older rig I would recommend staying away from AF
MARS
> > > then. Our primary is way out of the ham band ranges.
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > > "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
> > > news:b1htif25nq@enews2.newsguy.com...
> > > > I believe you must be able to operate on AT LEAST 2 HF bands to
> qualify.
> > > > That is the last I knew....
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > --
> > > > Ryan, KC8PMX
> > > > FF/MFR
> > > > REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
> > > >
> > > > "Symbolism is for the simple minded....."
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > From what I am told you have to have HF capability to even be
> > > > > considered for MARS.
> > > > >
> > > > > - H. Johnson
> > > > > 73, KG4WOU
> > > > > ============================================
> > > > > *** SPAM Filter in place ***
> > > > > Just de-classify the e-mail address for correct reply-to
> > > > > ============================================
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
>
>
```

1578. Re: Thoughts on the Columbia tragedy.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 06:06:04 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v3um23l19o4jda@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 60660
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Evets" <themtx@foo.yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:8uH%9.12527$sm3.9938@news.bellsouth.net...
> For an interesting viewpoint, check out Uncle Bob's thoughts:
> http://unclebob.diaryland.com/ , and for those who view this link after
> 02/03, check out that day's entry, as the url above is for his current
> posting only. It makes you think.

Yes it does mostly about revenge.

> This guy is just an average joe

An above average jerk is more like it!

> who
> happens to have some media exposure as a tv journalist, but he may be onto
> something, as callous as his perspective may seem at first.

It seems pretty callous after a while also.

> Worth a look
> and some consideration, IMO.
>
> Steve

Sorry Steve, that link just proves to me that my
Mama was right when she said "this world is going
to hell in a hand basket" and people like Uncle
Bob are the proof of it. If he don't like it here
let him move to Mexico or Canada, that is if
they'd take the old grouch!

Needless to say I did NOT add his page to
my favorites list.
--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx

<SNIP>

1579. Re: K1MAN for the 2003 Amateur Hall of Fame!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 06:27:10 UTC
From: skuld-chan <skuld@mail.ru>
Message-ID: <23J%9.160984$AV4.4464@sccrnsc01>
Source record: 60661
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I say we nominate him for the nobel prize for his research in time travel
and anti-gravity - as well as the amateur radio hall of fame for the same
reasons.

http://members.aol.com/_ht_a/baxtassoc/myhomepage/business.html

sc

"K1MAN Man" <Lloyd@no.spammmmm> wrote in message
news:38750135FA.47559255A9@taranews.net...
> CQ Magazine is accepting nominations for their 2003 Amateur Radio Hall
> of Fame awards until march 1. Be sure to write to
>
> hall-of-fame@cq-amateur-radio.com
>
> and nominate Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, for this year's awards. He has
> single handedly goten the FCC to rexamine part 97 and will probably be
> the reason that the bad wording will be replaced by something clearer.
> He also saved the virgin islands after the huricane, and was the only
> one who worried about Mexico after the recent earth quake there.
>
> He has also done lots of other public service to numerous to mention
> here, but you can list it in the reasons part of your nomination. It
> should have the information below.
>
> ====
> Name of person nominated:
>
> Callsign:
>
> Mailing Address:
>
> Phone: Fax:
>
> E-mail address:
>
> One or two paragraph reason for nomination:
>
> Your own name, callsign, mailing address, and email address:
> ====
>
> GLENN BAXTER FOR THE HALL OF FAME!!!!!!!!!!!!

1580. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL support it ??)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 10:17:29 UTC
From: 'Doc <w5lz@cwis.net>
Message-ID: <3E3F9339.53BDB9F1@cwis.net>
Source record: 60662
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

Bill,
Don't hold back, tell us what you
~really~ think! Try doing it without
all the loaded buz-words while you're
at it, you come off sounding like more
of a fool that you probably are.
'Doc

1581. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 11:36:16 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030204063616.05048.00000443@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 60664

In article <3E3F1CCC.180E41A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> In article <3E3D6FD6.1E048EA5@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >Brian wrote:
>> >>
>> >> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>> >news:<20030201103647.29016.00000066@mb-fy.aol.com>...
>> >>
>> >> > Lack of experience, lack of knowledge and lack of skill are three
>> >reasons.
>> >
>> >> In a nutshell, N2EY dismisses the T2FD antenna, and insults anyone who
>> >> might be using one. Since he has no use for it, it cannot be good.
>> >
>> >If you have need for a loss antenna, go for it. I should have had one
>> >this morning when chasing Johnston Island on 160m. It was far too easy
>> >to nail AH3D with three calls. Maybe the broadband T2FD would have
>> >permitted me to work him on 160, 80 and 40 at the same time if (and
>> >here's the rub) he could have heard me.
>>
>> Dave,
>>
>> Perhaps you could point out where the imagined "insults" are in the
>sentence:
>>
>> "Lack of experience, lack of knowledge and lack of skill are three
>reasons."
>
>I think it is a Brian-Len thing. Brian, who likes to read between the
>lines, believes that you have stated that HE has little or no
>experience, little or know knowledge or little or no skill.

That was not my intention. I have no idea hw much experience, knowledge or
skill he has with HF antennas.
>
>> An inexperienced ham, who had not used an efficient HF dipole, might think
>> the
>> T2FD/WBFD was not much different in efficiency.

Is the above untrue? I don't see how it's an insult. I don't have much
experience playing jazz guitar, so I might think there's little difference
between the various guitars used by jazz musicians.
>>
>> A ham lacking in knowledge might not understand how the T2FD/WBFD
>>obtains
>>its
>> broadband characteristics through the use of resistive loading, which
>>radiates
>> much of the RF power fed to the antenna as heat rather than RF.

Is the above untrue? I don't see how it's an insult. I don't have much
knowledge of ancient Chinese pottery.
>
>> A ham lacking in skill might want to avoid having to adjust a tuner.

Is the above untrue? I don't see how it's an insult. I lack skill in flying
aircraft, so I might want to start out with one that required less skill than,
say, a P-51 Mustang.

Some folks see insults where there are only plain, simple facts.
>>
>> A simple dipole that is the same size as a WBFD, fed with low loss parallel
>> line and matched with a suitable a tuner will have practically identical
>> patterns but much higher efficiency than a WBFD. Such a dipole is lighter
>>and
>> mechanically simpler, and when all costs are considered, is no more
>>expensive.

Note the following part from the above: "practically identical patterns but
much higher efficiency than a WBFD" So whether it's for NVIS or DX work, or
anything in between, pattern is NOT a reason to use a WBFD rather than a dipole
of equal size.

Just a plain, simple fact.

>> >I've never had use for an antenna which requires a linear amp to break
>> >even on gain when transmitting.
>>
>> Nor I!
>>
>> >I have used and do use loss antennas
>> >when receiving on 160m or 80m. I can rotate them to null noise and use
>> >a preamp to bring up the desired signal.
>>
>> Yep. Which brings up a question - could you have even heard AH3D on 160 if
>> you'd had a T2FD for receiving? Unlike a directional antenna like a loop,
>the
>> T2FD would pick up noise from all directions.
>
>I generally have low noise here but I really having no way of knowing if
>I could have heard AH3D on a T2FD without a preamp.

How far above the noise was he? WVA to Johnston Island is a fur piece on 160.

>I would not have
>wanted to place my eggs in that basket given that it was the next to
>last night of operation for the Johnston Island ops.

And that's the bottom line!

> I like to put my
>RF up in the air through use of the most efficient antenna I can install
>than to use it warming up a resistor.
>
Yup. Look up the efficiency of a WBFD at 2 MHz compared to a dipole of equal
size. It's not a pretty sight.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1582. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 11:36:17 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030204063617.05048.00000444@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 60663

In article <3e3f3c8a@snipnews.snip.net>, "Bill B" <leakylinkie@yahoo.com>
writes:

>If the ARRL even REMOTLY offers ANY SUPPORT
>WHATSOEVER to this Orwellian proposal by K8AD
>than it will signal the **DEATH KNELL** for ARRL.

Then let ARRL and FCC know that it's a bad idea.
>
>Anyone (...and I mean anyone) who would lend their
>support to this insane proposal is aiding totalitarian
>style controls to the private ownership of a radio
>transmitter.
>
And such a rule simply won't work. External RF power amplifiers for the 27 MHz range have been heavily regulated for 25 years now. Has that stopped their illegal manufacture, sale or use? Not that I can see. All the proposed rule will do is add an unnecessary level of paperwork and regulation to law-abiding radio owners while doing little or nothing to stop violators.

>IF THE ARRL GOES ALONG WITH THIS PROPOSAL -
>IN ANY CAPACITY WHATSOEVER, YOU WILL SEE THE
>BIGGEST ABANDONMENT OF ARRL MEMBERSHIP
>SINCE THE INCENTIVE LICENSING DISASTER OF
>THE 60's and 70's.

Actually, the ARRL did not lose significant membership back then.
>
>-----> Do not support or touch this proposal W1AW - unless you
>want to go the way of the Spark Transmitter and Rotary Dial Telephone.
>
ARRL is actually doing ham radio a great service by publishing this proposal so that we know it's out there and can oppose it by comments to the FCC and ARRL.

Did you know about the proposal before you got the ARRL letter? I didn't.

Have YOU commented to the FCC? It's really easy using ECFS.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1583. Re: ARS License Numbers (quantity vs quality)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 11:36:18 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030204063618.05048.00000445@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 60665

In article <20030204000236.04497.00000014@mb-fx.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>What is this obsession with license numbers?

It's not an obsession - just a small bit of service to the ARS. By posting the current license numbers every two weeks, it will be possible to document the growth or decline of the ARS in the USA for a long as someone maintains Usenet archives.

>Don't forget quality is as important as quantity.

Many of us procode- and procodetest folks have been saying that for years.

One of the reasons often given for restructuring and code test reduction/elimination has been that it would help the ARS grow. Reduction to the minimum test that reasonably meets the treaty requirement doesn;t seem to have had much effect on growth in the past 32 months. Perhaps total code test elimination will help growth - or maybe it won't.
>
>Tied to this is the elimination of tying the Morse code requirement to the
>license class.(*1)

Vipul, do you understand the meaning of the words "treaty requirement"?

Do you understand what "S25.5" means?

>With the elimination of this irrelevant metric,

It's not irrelevant. If hams did not use Morse code, it would be irrelevant.

> the hobby
>will change.

Maybe. Reduction from 3 code tests to 1 hasn't caused much change in the past 32 months except for large numbers of already-licensed hams getting higher class licenses. It has not caused lots of new hams, nor a surge in homebrewing, technical innovation, etc.

>Then, pride in the license and achievement will follow.

Why isn't that happening now?
>
>Morse code does not necessarily lead to a dumbing down of the license - it is
>merely a shift in emphasis. However, some do use Morse code as a substitute
>for
>"real" achievement, which dumbs down the hobby.

Let's see if I have this straight....

You're saying that if the remaining 5 wpm code test is eliminated, and no other changes are made, lots of hams will suddenly start homebrewing, experimenting and doing things they aren't doing now. All because of a 5 wpm code receiving test.
>
>The narrow focus on Morse and antennas is not bad, but the expansion of all
>aspects will be good for the hobby.

See above.
>
>---
>(*1) Please note: I am biased, I will admit it.

Good.

> I will not use
>rationalizations
>as the pro-coders do and pretend there is no agenda behind it.

What rationilizations?

>My agenda is
>to
>expand the technical aspects: homebrewing, antenna setups, and so on. So, you
>know where I'm coming from.

And how, exactly, will eliminating the 5 wpm code test do that?

Do you understand why FCC can't just drop the code test right now?

--

Suppose the treaty changes (very likely) and the code test is dropped (also very likely). But suppose amateur radio doesn't change the way Vipul wants. Will he then say he was wrong and ask for the code test to be put back? Very unlikely.

N2EY

1584. Re: The coders embarrass themselves on 14.275 MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 11:43:36 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302040343.5de586b6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60666
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com> wrote in message news:<v3ukkirnj1i794@corp.supernews.com>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0302031736.40cb9a0f@posting.google.com...
> > "KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:<v3t6hvt2uak27d@corp.supernews.com>...
> >
> > > Thank you! I've went from "CBPlusser" to "Real Ham" to
> > > "damned lid" in just one week. That has to be some kind of
> > > a record, don't it?
> >
> > Slow down. You're making the rest of us look like underachievers.
> > Ripping through all those license classes in a week.
> >
> > ;^)
> > Brian
>
> Hey you know what they say; "You snooze, you lose!".
> Besides all that I can't really be a lid, I have NEVER
> used the term "I'm destinated now" on the air ;^)

Fer shure!

1585. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 11:51:11 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302040351.741c3fdd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60667

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E3F3CB3.41A5E2D3@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030202180532.16280.00001373@mb-mo.aol.com>...
> > > In article <f45722ac.0302011836.7d34e6c5@posting.google.com>,
> > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> > >
> > > >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> > > >news:<20030131152454.03820.00000302@mb-fr.aol.com>...
> > > >> In article <f45722ac.0301301530.198cb3a3@posting.google.com>,
> > > >> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
>
> > > >L Cebik is waaay out in front of the Worlds Greatest DXer.
> > >
> > > Has a nicer and more informed source of information website
> > > on antennas and other things about amateur radio. W4RNL
> > > regularly posts at Antennex, a website devoted to antenna
> > > experimentation around the world. www.antennex.com
> > >
> > > New article viewing requires a subscription but Jack Stone
> > > (editor-publisher) is liberal about letting non-subscribers
> > > view older articles freely. "Older" meaning two to three
> > > months old.
> >
> > Wow. Not a quarter of half a century old?
>
> If you're going to discount antenna theory material less than a few
> years old, you'll have to abandon the Yagi, the cubical quad, the
> windom, the log periodic and much more. You'd be left with not much
> more than a guy forced to ask questions about how to build an end fed
> antenna for 5 MHz.

I was commenting on the recency of antennex archives that you're
allowed to view w/o being a member.

> > The interesting thing is that there were accidental discoveries in
> > applied radio, but since the T2FD was engineered to be tilted, no
> > other contemporary deployment of the antenna can be called a T2FD.
>
> A delta loop is simply a full wave loop design. It wasn't designed
> until 1968 by Harry Habig K8ANV. It had the same basic operating
> characteristics as the cubical quad. It isn't called a cubical quad.
>

> Good luck on your search for knowledge.

I lean something new each day - like how Len isn't that far off the mark. Thanks for jumping in and proving it.

1586. Re: Montana and Florida

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 13:36:36 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030204083636.03273.00000344@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 60668

In article <U2F%9.87447$to3.167188@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net>, "Jackie"
<buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> writes:

>Hi guys and gals,
>
>Well, I'm finally all rigged up and despite my really crappy antenna
>situation (triband trap dipole about 10 ft. off the ground), I was able to
>talk with my first HF contacts tonight, a guy in Orlando, Florida and a guy
>in Montana. I have a new Icom IC-718, which is a very nice radio and I got
>it very cheap. I guess it's not so bad after all, the antenna I mean. I
>borrowed it from a friend when I discovered that the Hy-Gain vertical
>strapped to my deck ain't gonna work without a ground or counterpoise.
>Better than nothing!
>
Way cool and congrats, Jackie!

Particulalry impressive considering the antenna went up during a Minnesota
winter.

See you on the bands!

73 de Jim, N2EY

1587. Re: Thoughts on the Columbia tragedy.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 13:49:25 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030204084925.23989.00000127@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 60669

>Subject: Re: Thoughts on the Columbia tragedy.
>From: "Michael" md1966@optonline.net
>Date: 2/3/03 6:58 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <OeE%9.65767$HG.12609873@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>

>The shuttle program, or any other space program is an "out in front media
>sweet heart".

I beg to mildly disagree for two reasons.

First of all is how much "media coverage" did the LAUNCH of the Columbia and it's subsequent mission get? The answer is, of course, "not much". They COULD have spent a lot of time discussing the scientific mission of STS-107 (and hence important to all those starving millions the liberals are quick to remind us of when the "cost" of the space program is once again brought into question.)

They didn't.

Secondly, why doesn't "the media" spend any significant time showing Americans (and subsequently the whole world) just how much thier lives ARE impacted by the space program? People shouldn't have to go to the Discovery or TLC channels to see what's being done for them. Too many people still think the space program is there JUST to show that IT (flying in space) can be done.

They don't.

>It's a simple matter of coverage.

Change "coverage" to "sensationalism" and I'll agree wholeheartedly.

>For all other great accomplishments and tragic failures that we know of
>personally, by aren't publicized, it's up to the individual or individuals
>that witness them to celebrate or mourn them in our own thoughts and
>circles.

I know it's morbid to say "only" when we are discussing people's deaths, but the truth is there have only been 17 deaths in America's space program since 1968. That averages out to less than two people a year.

Now, consider that the benefits of the space program touch millions of people every day. In my case I am an ER nurse, and I know for a fact at least a dozen items I use on a near-daily basis are spin-offs of or were directly developed for the space program. Now multiply my experiences by 30,000 (just a rough number of ER nurses) and it's easy to see how it truly DOES benefit millions.

The medium we share these comments on...while not directly created for the space program, was certainly a significant factor in it's proliferation.

Now we're up to billions.

It's astounding.

My prayers to their Families, Godspeed to NASA in finding out what happened, and time to go forward.

73

Steve, K4YZ

1588. Re: arrl article on echolink - impress a non ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 14:09:05 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030204090905.23989.00000128@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 60671

>Subject: Re: arrl article on echolink - impress a non ham
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 2/3/03 10:41 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030203234104.04497.00000013@mb-fx.aol.com>

>I'm up to the challenge if anyone else is.
>I will invite a non-Ham to a Hamfest. Anyone else?

I do it all the time, and have been for years...sorry.

And since you "suggest" certain parameters to not "bias" the newbie, let's NOT allow one to go with YOU, Vipul. We want the guy/gal to LIKE Amateur Radio...

Steve, K4YZ

1589. Re: ARS License Numbers (quantity vs quality)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 14:16:01 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030204091601.23989.00000129@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 60672

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers (quantity vs quality)
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 2/3/03 11:02 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030204000236.04497.00000014@mb-fx.aol.com>

>What is this obsession with license numbers?

What's your obsession with "cults"..?!?! At least Amateur Radio licenses
are quantifyable.

>Don't forget quality is as important as quantity

To whom? If Amateur Radio licenses suddenly dropped from 650,000 to
50,000, how long to you think it would take the FCC to pull the plug
altogether?

>Tied to this is the elimination of tying the Morse code requirement to the
>license class.(*1) With the elimination of this irrelevant metric, the hobby
>will change. Then, pride in the license and achievement will follow.

Too late again. I am proud of what I ahe achieved and what I can do with
MY Amateur license, and I did it with the old 20WPM code test.

How could THAT be? (BTW, Vipul, you are welcome to see my logbook and see
just how many QSO's are CW-vs-phone)

>(*1) Please note: I am biased, I will admit it. I will not use
>rationalizations
>as the pro-coders do and pretend there is no agenda behind it.

You're eitehr very naieve or lying.

>My agenda is
>to
>expand the technical aspects: homebrewing, antenna setups, and so on. So, you
>know where I'm coming from.

Yeah, and I wish you'd flush before you came out of there, too.

Steve, K4YZ

1590. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 14:18:48 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030204091848.23989.00000130@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 60673

>Subject: Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 2/4/03 5:47 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0302040347.778f0043@posting.google.com>

>You still won't get a T5 card from me...(SNIP)

Neither will anyone else.

>but I'll send you a T2FD card when you quit whining.

I see Lennie has taken a break while you do his trolling and ranting for
him. Is this a paid job, or are you volunteering?

Steve, K4YZ

1591. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 14:26:02 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030204092602.23989.00000131@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 60674

>Subject: Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 2/3/03 7:33 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0302031733.53b738c0@posting.google.com>

>> Sometimes, Brain. WZYP intermixes "oldies" with current urban and
>hip-hop
>> rather nicely.
>
>Oranges and bananas. I guess they haven't found their market.

And I guess you don't know what you are talking about...again.

>>They they have the same FAA airworthiness papers as a "contemporary"
>> aircraft and require the same airman's certifications to operate as
>> "contemprorary aircraft.
>
>For passenger craft? Or flying museums?

Unless I am carrying passengers for hire, it doesn't matter. My private SEL let's me fly a whole bunch of aircraft.

>Some of you OFs would stand in a long line to get one of those, and
>pay big bucks in the process.

I changed in my old call for an "antique" license and didn't pay any more than a Technician Class licensee doing the same thing.

>If you want to look at it as a waste, its only a 4 year waste in Ohio.

I see...rolled off of Sis long eonugh to take the accellerated course, eh...???

>You just bring up lunch.

And you're....wearing it...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

1592. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 14:28:08 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030204092808.23989.00000132@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 60675

>Subject: Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 2/3/03 7:40 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3E3F1A1F.41515538@earthlink.net>

>> Not tricky at all. I was there, I had permission.
>
>So you say.

Well of COURSE he had permission, Dave...Why, just the other day my
girlfriend, Morgan Fairchild, told me he did...

Yeah...yeah...THAT'S the ticket!

Steve, K4YZ

1593. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL support it ??)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 14:51:26 UTC
From: I've been spammed! <spammed@covad.net>
Message-ID: <b1ok2lkoc1@sun-news.laserlink.net>
Source record: 60676
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

Freaking morons. They just cannot stand to see people being free. Register your guns. Register your radio. Register Register Register. Left wing totalitarian maggots is what they are.

"Bill B" <leakylinkie@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:3e3f3c8a@snipnews.snip.net...
> If the ARRL even REMOTLY offers ANY SUPPORT
> WHATSOEVER to this Orwellian proposal by K8AD
> than it will signal the **DEATH KNELL** for ARRL.
>
> Anyone (...and I mean anyone) who would lend their
> support to this insane proposal is aiding totalitarian
> style controls to the private ownership of a radio
> transmitter.
>
> I wonder if K8AD went to the "Soviet Gulag School" of
> Ham Radio? The Govt. or anyone else has no damm
> business AT ALL knowing what makes and models of radios
> I may purchase or own G-DDAMMIT!
>
> What the frig? Are we to now have HANDGUN STYLE
> Registration Requirements for Ham Radio and CB Equipment???
>
> IF THE ARRL GOES ALONG WITH THIS PROPOSAL -
> IN ANY CAPACITY WHATSOEVER, YOU WILL SEE THE
> BIGGEST ABANDONMENT OF ARRL MEMBERSHIP
> SINCE THE INCENTIVE LICENSING DISASTER OF
> THE 60's and 70's.
>
> -----> Do not support or touch this proposal W1AW - unless you
> want to go the way of the Spark Transmitter and Rotary Dial Telephone.
>
>
> "RadioGuy" <nospam@nospam.com> wrote in message
> news:b1mrgo$s1a$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> > SB QST @ ARL $ARLB011
> > ARLB011 FCC Invites Comments on Amateur-Related Petition
> >
> > ZCZC AG11
> > QST de W1AW
> > ARRL Bulletin 11 ARLB011

> > From ARRL Headquarters
> > Newington CT January 31, 2003
> > To all radio amateurs
> >
> > SB QST ARL ARLB011
> > ARLB011 FCC Invites Comments on Amateur-Related Petition
> >
> > Dale Reich, K8AD has petitioned the FCC to require sellers of
> > two-way voice or data equipment to keep on file a buyer's name,
> > address, telephone number and "any future information when selling a
> > radio that required licensing under the current FCC rules." Comments
> > on the petition, RM-10641, are due February 28.
> >
> > Information collected would remain private, available only to the
> > FCC or law enforcement. Reich said in his petition that any retail
> > vendor would be able to ask local police for an investigation if the
> > retailer suspected the radios were not going to be used in
> > compliance with the law.
> >
> > Included in the petition is a requirement for "ownership and license
> > tagging" for gear operating under Parts 5, 15, 18, 74, 80, 90, 95
> > and 97. In his petition, Reich said such tagging used to be an FCC
> > requirement and that his proposed change was a needed tool for local
> > law enforcement.
> >
> > The full text of Reich's petitions is available on the FCC Web site.
> > Search for the petition number.
> > NNNN
> > /EX
> >
> >
>
>
>
>

1594. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL support it ??)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 15:20:02 UTC
From: cheesecutter@webhideout.com
Message-ID: <fef386d5.0302040720.71b56dab@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60677
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

Dean Arthur <dearthur@silverstar.com> wrote in message
news:<3E3F4915.C50E530E@silverstar.com>...
> Was polishing motorcycle in driveway one day. Car drives up and couple
> get out. Look at motorcycle then fellow asks if peculiar antenna on roof
> is mine. I say "Yes." Out comes papers. "You have been served." Went to
> court with Order for judge to sign requiring Plaintiff to reimburse me
> for time off and costs of researching law at law library plus travel and
> meals and listed miscellaneous expenses. Judge signed, they balked. I
> said, "Pay up or I freeze all accounts and assets." The rep of company
> asked judge if I could do that. Judge answered in the affirmative. They
> paid.
>
> It's so much fun when you know the law and they don't!

speaking of law things.......are you the same dean arthur that has
been known to rip people off ????????? hmmmm????

1595. Re: K1MAN for the 2003 Amateur Hall of Fame!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 15:24:45 UTC
From: cheesecutter@webhideout.com
Message-ID: <fef386d5.0302040724.1cd16b2f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60678
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"skuld-chan" <skuld@mail.ru> wrote in message news:<23J%9.160984$AV4.4464@sccrnsc01>...
> I say we nominate him for the nobel prize for his research in time travel
> and anti-gravity - as well as the amateur radio hall of fame for the same
> reasons.
>
> http://members.aol.com/_ht_a/baxtassoc/myhomepage/business.html
>
> sc
>
> "K1MAN Man" <Lloyd@no.spammmmm> wrote in message
> news:38750135FA.47559255A9@taranews.net...
> > CQ Magazine is accepting nominations for their 2003 Amateur Radio Hall
> > of Fame awards until march 1. Be sure to write to
> >
> > hall-of-fame@cq-amateur-radio.com
> >
> > and nominate Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, for this year's awards. He has
> > single handedly goten the FCC to rexamine part 97 and will probably be
> > the reason that the bad wording will be replaced by something clearer.
> > He also saved the virgin islands after the huricane, and was the only
> > one who worried about Mexico after the recent earth quake there.
> >
> > He has also done lots of other public service to numerous to mention
> > here, but you can list it in the reasons part of your nomination. It
> > should have the information below.
> >
> > ====
> > Name of person nominated:
> >
> > Callsign:
> >
> > Mailing Address:
> >
> > Phone: Fax:
> >
> > E-mail address:
> >
> > One or two paragraph reason for nomination:
> >
> > Your own name, callsign, mailing address, and email address:
> > ====
> >
> > GLENN BAXTER FOR THE HALL OF FAME!!!!!!!!!!!!

well if he is so great, then i ask you.....has he ever locked down
texas or dropped the maul on a pimp???? i don't think so pal,
ok.............

1596. Re: The coders embarrass themselves on 14.275 MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 15:50:00 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0302040750.1436445b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60679
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<b1n2e6vpm1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>...
> This guy is definetly NOT Llllloooyyyddd. Llllooooyyyddd is too ignorant to
> know any of what was just said.
>
> And he is right you know.

I'm not sure what he's right about, Dan. Please explain.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> I do cw.

Me, too.
>
>
> "K1MAN Man" <Lloyd@no.spammmmm> wrote in message
> news:296332854.FF1640788@taranews.net...
> > On Mon, 3 Feb 2003 11:35:21 -0500, KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com> wrote:
> > > BTW what's YOUR callsign there big boy?
> > > The screen name K1MAN Man and email
> > > address of Lloyd@no.spammmmm just don't
> > > get it. Until you put YOUR name or callsign
> > > on the line, your the lid here!
> >
> > No.
> >
> > I'm not going to let you change the subject.
> >
> > The subject is rude and abusive code users.

I'm sure some exist, but I haven't run into many.

> > My handle has nothing
> > whatsoever to do with the subject matter.
> >
> > I maintain that CW users are no different than anyone else when it
> > comes to abuse, but some CW users have a very strong need to believe
> > that the mere use of that mode distinguishes them from (and makes them
> > better than) the rest of the amateur community.

I maintain that abuse is very rare among hams using CW in the
CW/digital subbands. Such abuse happens far more often on voice modes.
> >
> > I used to do a lot of CW work, especially when I had limited power

> > available.

When did you stop?

> > Believe me, there is as much

[expletive deleted]
> > at the low end of the
> > bands as there is at the high end.

My experience has been quite different.

> > There are also a lot of nice
> > operators to be found at either end of the bands.

That I can agree on.

> > But CW ops can be just as rude as any SSB user.

In theory, yes. In practice, no.
> >
> > Example one: Frequency grabbing.
> >
> > You'll be sitting on a relatively clear frequency and will call a
> > general CQ.

Hold on - "relatively clear frequency"? What's that mean? Nobody
within 10 Hz, 100 Hz, 1000 Hz?

> > At that point, a contester comes back to you and asks you
> > for confirmation and an exchange of RST reports. So you give him what
> > he asked for, turn it back over to him, and then he starts to call "CQ
> > contest" without ever skipping a beat. You have just been quite
> > rudely shoved off frequency by a CW lid.

What contest requires RST? Not SS, not FD, not the DX tests I know of.

Contest exchanges are quick and short. If you wait for more than a few
seconds after a QSO the other folks think you moved and they pounce on
the freq. CW contest ops use sharp filters, so to them a few hundred
unoccupied Hz is a clear spot. To someone trying to work CW with an
SSB filter, it sounds like a mess o' QRM.
> >
> > It happens all the time.

When was the last time it happened to you?

> > When it happens to some people, they don't
> > move on. A jamming contest ensues as both stations call CQ on top of
> > one another.

See above. How wide was your filter when this allegedly happened to
you?
> >
> > Example two: The other station goes deaf.

> >
> > Some operators want to know your QTH and their RST report, and once
> > they get that information, they simply move on to another QSO without
> > ever saying 73.

In 35+ years of HF CW ragchewing, this has never happened to me. A few
folks want fast QSOs, others want nice 'chews, but they all say 73 and
sign off rather than just disappearing.

> > As a result, people play little coy games and don't
> > give out a signal report until the other guy has been forced to listen
> > to several transmissions.

Not me.

> > Once you do give out a report, too many of
> > the CW gang will just turn the vfo to a new frequency and look for a
> > signal report from someone else.

Never had that happen to me. Sorry.

> > Another sizeable minority will start
> > telling you that you're fading away in order to escape the QSO.

How do you know you're not?
> >
> > Bottom line: Too many people don't really want to get into rag chew on
> > CW, and their QSOs are consequently predictable and boring.

Hmmm - could it be that you don't make the conversation interesting?
> >
> > Example three: The ego dominance battle.
> >
> > A persistent subgroup of CW operators generally hang out in a de facto
> > net, using break-in transmissions and automatic keyers of some kind.

Is that bad? Same sort of thing is common on 'phone.

But I have rarely heard this on CW. The CW nets I've been part of have
been very formal.

> > These guys get strange when a newcomer arrives, and keep on bumping
> > their speed up until s/he can no longer copy them. At the point of
> > QRS, they either admit that they were testing the newcomer or they
> > deride him for not being able to keep up. In the latter case, the
> > newcomer goes away. In the former case, he's on notice that he has to
> > prove something to the group before he's fully accepted. Either way,
> > a QSO with such stations is unpleasant, and most people don't return.

Whoa, hold on a sec.

Some hams who obviously know each other are having a QSO and you just
butt in without invitation? Would you do that on HF 'phone?
> >

> > All of that having been said, the rude operators are in the minority,
> > and either end of the band can provide hours of enjoyable QSOs with
> > the many good operators that can be found there.

And those are the ones to focus on.

> > It's just the notion
> > that CW ops are "special" that pulls my chain.

When's the last time FCC cited a ham using CW in the CW bands for a
violation involving jamming, obscenity/profanity, etc.? (Yes, folks,
FCC CAN copy what's being sent on CW.)
> >
> > And before any of you "eleet" coders start your testosterone-speak of
> > being real CW operators (whatever that means), let me tell you that I
> > once held an ARRL certificate for 35 wpm.

When?

> > While that's not blindingly
> > fast, it's not slow either. I use the phrase "once held" because I
> > long ago lost both that framed certificate and my interest in CW.

When was that? If you don't use the mode these days, how can you tell
what the behavior today is like?
> >
> > Unlike some others, I don't think that CW ability conferred any
> > special virtue upon me.

That's fine.

> > Consequently I don't want to force it on
> > other licensees.

That's fine, too.

Others have different opinions.

> > That is, I'm not at all impressed by code skills,
> > but I am impressed by technical skills.

Did technical skills confer special virtue on anyone?
> >
> > But that's a different subject.

Not really. Some of the worst (and best) stuff I've heard on the ham
bands has come from folks who were technically very skilled. But why
should technical knowledge beyond the level needed to understand and
comply with the rules & regs be "forced on other licensees"?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1597. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL support it ??)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 16:41:42 UTC
From: bpnjensen@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <37af7e1c.0302040841.34efd011@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60680
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

Dean Arthur <dearthur@silverstar.com> wrote in message
news:<3E3F4915.C50E530E@silverstar.com>...
> Was polishing motorcycle in driveway one day. Car drives up and couple
> get out. Look at motorcycle then fellow asks if peculiar antenna on roof
> is mine. I say "Yes." Out comes papers. "You have been served." Went to
> court with Order for judge to sign requiring Plaintiff to reimburse me
> for time off and costs of researching law at law library plus travel and
> meals and listed miscellaneous expenses. Judge signed, they balked. I
> said, "Pay up or I freeze all accounts and assets." The rep of company
> asked judge if I could do that. Judge answered in the affirmative. They
> paid.
>
> It's so much fun when you know the law and they don't!

This sounds interesting,but please explain, For what alleged civil
violation were you served, and by whom?

Thanks,
Bruce Jensen

1598. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL support it ??)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 17:04:38 UTC
From: glineberry@prodigy.net
Message-ID: <b234376e.0302040904.9f358d9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60681
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

Talk about killing the messenger. The ARRL let you and everyone else
know what is being filed with the FCC. Their announcment in no way
indicated support. I would think you would be thanking the ARRL for
letting you know. I am sure that you have filed your comments with
the FCC concerning this issue. I suggest you send a thank you note
and contribution to the ARRL for keeping you informed. N4VOX

1599. Re: Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, FCC, Cronkite, ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 17:17:56 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b1osim$uf7$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 60682
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Baxter is NOT transmitting bulletins. He is sending 1 1/2 hours of taped talk show and copied stuff from RAIN and the ARRL. Never intended for HF use.

He is also in violation of the 'control operator' rules. Plus countless other alleged offenses.

Oh and don't pay any attention to Llllooooyyydd he supports all idiotic causes. You know like bro Stair, BARF, etc.

Dan/W4NTI

> "Paul" <drakeswl@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> news:c0588492.0301300804.69039ba9@posting.google.com...
> > I'm new to this topic so don't flame me, but if W1AW has a bulletin,
> > why can't Baxter have one? What is Baxter doing that is so bad that
> > the FCC would want to shut him down?

1600. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL support it ??)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 17:19:30 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b1oslk$7na$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 60683
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

Have you heard of the ARRL supporting this? Or is your imagination taking
over ?

Dan/W4NTI

"Bill B" <leakylinkie@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:3e3f3c8a@snipnews.snip.net...
> If the ARRL even REMOTLY offers ANY SUPPORT
> WHATSOEVER to this Orwellian proposal by K8AD
> than it will signal the **DEATH KNELL** for ARRL.
>
> Anyone (...and I mean anyone) who would lend their
> support to this insane proposal is aiding totalitarian
> style controls to the private ownership of a radio
> transmitter.
>
> I wonder if K8AD went to the "Soviet Gulag School" of
> Ham Radio? The Govt. or anyone else has no damm
> business AT ALL knowing what makes and models of radios
> I may purchase or own G-DDAMMIT!
>
> What the frig? Are we to now have HANDGUN STYLE
> Registration Requirements for Ham Radio and CB Equipment???
>
> IF THE ARRL GOES ALONG WITH THIS PROPOSAL -
> IN ANY CAPACITY WHATSOEVER, YOU WILL SEE THE
> BIGGEST ABANDONMENT OF ARRL MEMBERSHIP
> SINCE THE INCENTIVE LICENSING DISASTER OF
> THE 60's and 70's.
>
> -----> Do not support or touch this proposal W1AW - unless you
> want to go the way of the Spark Transmitter and Rotary Dial Telephone.
>
>
> "RadioGuy" <nospam@nospam.com> wrote in message
> news:b1mrgo$s1a$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> > SB QST @ ARL $ARLB011
> > ARLB011 FCC Invites Comments on Amateur-Related Petition
> >
> > ZCZC AG11
> > QST de W1AW
> > ARRL Bulletin 11 ARLB011

> > From ARRL Headquarters
> > Newington CT January 31, 2003
> > To all radio amateurs
> >
> > SB QST ARL ARLB011
> > ARLB011 FCC Invites Comments on Amateur-Related Petition
> >
> > Dale Reich, K8AD has petitioned the FCC to require sellers of
> > two-way voice or data equipment to keep on file a buyer's name,
> > address, telephone number and "any future information when selling a
> > radio that required licensing under the current FCC rules." Comments
> > on the petition, RM-10641, are due February 28.
> >
> > Information collected would remain private, available only to the
> > FCC or law enforcement. Reich said in his petition that any retail
> > vendor would be able to ask local police for an investigation if the
> > retailer suspected the radios were not going to be used in
> > compliance with the law.
> >
> > Included in the petition is a requirement for "ownership and license
> > tagging" for gear operating under Parts 5, 15, 18, 74, 80, 90, 95
> > and 97. In his petition, Reich said such tagging used to be an FCC
> > requirement and that his proposed change was a needed tool for local
> > law enforcement.
> >
> > The full text of Reich's petitions is available on the FCC Web site.
> > Search for the petition number.
> > NNNN
> > /EX
> >
> >
>
>
>
>

1601. Re: The coders embarrass themselves on 14.275 MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 17:28:14 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b1ot5t$e8c$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 60684
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

He is right about how 'some' CW operaters act. Everything he said I have
seen happen. Well actually heard happen.

I believe his point would be that its not the mode that makes a lid...its
the person. And he is right.

Dan/W4NTI

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0302040750.1436445b@posting.google.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<b1n2e6vpm1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>...
> > This guy is definetly NOT Llllloooyyyddd. Llllooooyyyddd is too
ignorant to
> > know any of what was just said.
> >
> > And he is right you know.
>
> I'm not sure what he's right about, Dan. Please explain.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > I do cw.
>
> Me, too.

1602. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 17:31:46 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E3FF95C.CC9EFC00@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60685

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E3F1CCC.180E41A@earthlink.net>...
> > N2EY wrote:
>
> > > Yep. Which brings up a question - could you have even heard AH3D on 160 if
> > > you'd had a T2FD for receiving? Unlike a directional antenna like a loop, the
> > > T2FD would pick up noise from all directions.
> >
> > I generally have low noise here but I really having no way of knowing if
> > I could have heard AH3D on a T2FD without a preamp. I would not have
> > wanted to place my eggs in that basket given that it was the next to
> > last night of operation for the Johnston Island ops. I like to put my
> > RF up in the air through use of the most efficient antenna I can install
> > than to use it warming up a resistor.
>
> AH3D must have had a whopping signal for it to warm up a resistor.

Reading between the lines again? Please see the portion beginning, "my
RF".

Dave K8MN

1603. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL support it ??)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 17:33:45 UTC
From: Andy KC2SSB <nospam@nospam.com>
Message-ID: <4buv3v86o6p1l3vt7pb26vvqlqkgiebj44@4ax.com>
Source record: 60686
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

On Tue, 04 Feb 2003 04:17:29 -0600, 'Doc <w5lz@cwis.net> wrote:

>Bill,
> Don't hold back, tell us what you
>~really~ think! Try doing it without
>all the loaded buz-words while you're
>at it, you come off sounding like more
>of a fool that you probably are.
> 'Doc

Kind of sounded like a Russion speaking broken English.. :)
=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-
73! de Andy KC2SSB (ex: KF4KHC/HL9HCT)
Beachwood, NJ USA Grid FM29vw
http://vhfradiobuff.tripod.com

1604. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 17:36:01 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E3FFA5C.831165F0@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60688

Brian wrote:

> You still won't get a T5 card from me, but I'll send you a T2FD card
> when you quit whining.

Either one will be as valid for DXCC purposes.*

Dave K8MN

*Note for Brian, Len and others who routinely read between the lines:
The above comment does not indicate that the writer believes that the
ARRL determines legality of any amateur radio operation.

1605. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 17:37:27 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0302040937.1f2d78d6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60687

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E3F1ECC.A7C3BA91@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E3D66DB.A843E75A@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0301311002.27cfb6eb@posting.google.com>...
> > > > > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030130211736.08181.00000271@mb-cq.aol.com>...
> .
> > > >
> > > > No, no, no. Clinging to the past would be publishing tube radio
> > > > CONSTRUCTION articles en leiu of publishing TODAY'S amateurs radio
> > > > activities in the ARRL Sections. Hello Dave Heil! Whare are you on
> > > > this???
> > >
> > > I'm still trying to decipher "en leiu". I'm guessing but did you mean
> > > "in lieu"?
> >
> > Dave, you got it! Instead of being so friggin obtuse all the time,
> > you used a little creative thought and figured out what I meant
> > instead of sitting there completely stuck. I know it was difficult,
> > but you keep trying.
> >
> > Bully for you!
>
> It is really lots easier when a statement doesn't read like something
> from a Mark Morgan post.
>
> > > I used to own a backup linear amp which was solid state. All of my high
> > > power linear amps use tubes. With one exception, they were all produced
> > > within the last ten years.
> >
> > These weren't power amplifier articles.
>
> I don't care what the articles were. Most currently produced HF power
> amps sold utilize ancient, archaic, obsolete vacuum tubes technology.

Tubes are also used in many if not most HF power amplifiers
home-brewed by hams. More watts-per-dollar, particularly if you can
get some of the parts at discount prices.

But wait, Dave...

If most HF RF power amplifiers currently produced and sold for amateur
radio use tubes, how can they, or the technology, be "obsolete"?

Does anyone make "solid state" microwave ovens without a tube inside?
> > While it bothers me that contest line scores
> > > and "Section News" have been removed from the pages of QST,
> > >
> > > It "bothered" you so much so that you went on a campain.
> >
> > Yeah, I went on a "campain" "en leiu" of keeping mum. I even went on a
> > campaign.

Is it "wrong" for ARRL members to express their opinions to Hq? I
don't think so!
> > an article
> > > on a piece of equipment using vacuum tubes doesn't upset me. It'd beat
> > > "The Doctor is IN" hands down.
> > >
> > > True. No room should be devoted to novices and novice problems. We
> > > need more foundation information, advertisements, and letters to the
> > > editor about no-coders.
> >
> > ...or from them. The league published one of Squiggy's letters in the
> > recent past. I've already informed you about the dangers of comparing
> > ad pages to editorial pages.

I don't have any problems with "The Doctor" or the vintage articles.

> > > > > Would it be better if car magazines no longer printed articles about
> > > > > '65 Mustangs, because that would be "clinging to the past"? How about
> > > > > listening to "oldies", or classical music - all "clinging to the
> > > > > past", right? Would it be better if all vintage airplanes were
> > > > > grounded and antique cars removed from the road, because those things
> > > > > are all examples of "clinging to the past?
> > > > >
> > > > > I don't think so!
> > > >
> > > > It would be nice to see Jim "cling to the future" once in his amateur
> > > > career.

Who gets to define what is "the future"? Does it include homebrewing
or kitbuilding, or must I buy all my equipment ready-made by
electropolitically correct manufacturers?
> > >
> > > Why didn't you answer the question?
> > >
> > The answer is obvious, Dave. But just for you.
> >
> But why didn't you answer the question?

Perhaps the answer is too embarrassing.
>
> > Oldies are played on Oldies Stations. No head-banging or classical.
> >
> > Classical music is played on Classical Stations. No Oldies or Blue
> > Grass.

Ah - so QST must emulate commercial broadcast practice?

Besides, the question was about listening to oldies and classical. Why
isn't listening to, and broadcasting, such stuff "clinging to the
past"?
> >
> > Vintage airplane have their own format.

For several years I subscribed to "Air And Space". Lots of vintage
aircraft and spacecraft in there, ranging from Wright Brothers stuff
to what it would take to go to Mars - and beyond.

Vintage aircraft use the same airspace and rules as current
production.

Besides, the question was about flying vintage aircraft. Why isn't
flying a vintage airplane "clinging to the past"?

> > Antique cars have their own format, and its not Motor Trend.

The question was about driving them.

Seems to me this is all about what some folks don't want to see in
QST.
> >
> > QST is a classic in that they offer frequent trips down memory lane,
> > to the exclusion of section news.
>
> "QST" is a general interest magazine about all that hams do. You
> wouldn't go looking for solid state transmitter articles in "Electric
> Radio".
>
> > > > Pretend that you like vanilla ice cream with mint chips, just once.

Why? I much prefer Rocky Road. What is wrong with live and let live?

> > > Why didn't you just answer the question?
> >
> > Because.
>
> That's the expected juvenile response.
>
> > > > > > The January QST ALSO includes items on: A 222mHz transverter, computer
> > > > > > interface with the TRX-Manager program, orientation to test equipment for new
> > > > > > hams, product reviews on new HT's and weather station, plus the usual operating
> > > > > > articles, ads and other "human interest" items.
> > > > > >

> > > > > > Within the first 12 pages of QST are ads for all sorts of new technology,
> > > > > > INCLUDING I-Link soft and hardware. Not a single tube in sight.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Whew.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > There ya go, Steve, confusing the issue with facts.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Here's a question: Should QST refuse paid advertisements for things
> > > > > > like telegraph keys, because some folks consider such things to be
> > > > > > "clinging to the past"?
> > > > >
> > > > > Should a membership organization tell their members to go look for
> > > > > member information on another format so that they can devote space to
> > > > > paid advertisements for things like "pump telegraph keys," because
> > > > > some folks consider such things to be "clinging to the past"?

Interesting. Perhaps a quote from a long-time poster to this newsgroup
would be appropriate at this point.

"You cannot answer a question with another question."

Guess who wrote that?

Here's the google quote:

BEGIN QUOTE:

From: Len Over 21 (lenover21@aol.com)
Subject: Re: fill-in questions (was:New Blood Yea Right)
View: Complete Thread (186 articles)
Original Format
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-09-04 19:57:38 PST

In article <20010904194709.17446.00002756@mb-fb.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
(Steve
Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Why should CW survive?
>
> Why shouldn't it?

You cannot answer a question with another question.

END GOOGLE QUOTE

Let's repeat that one all together, folks. It's a classic:

"You cannot answer a question with another question."

73 de Jim, N2EY

1606. Re: GROL vs Amateur Privileges

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 18:54:07 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030204135407.03943.00000166@mb-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 60693

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.h9qoss1.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 3 Feb 2003 16:24:13 GMT, Alun Palmer wrote:
>
>>The GROL is not really a licence anymore.
>
> The GROL is in fact a real license. See FCC Rules Part 13.
> What you probably mean is that it no longer carries all the
> benefits and privileges that it or its predecessors once did.
>
> On that I agree.

Some in here cannot abide any sort of commercial ties so
any sort of commercial license has "no meaning" to
amateur activities, therefore amateurism is "superior" to
anything commercial, professional, etc. :-)

No matter that once there were classes of radiotelephone
licenses whose examinations were given in real regional
FCC field offices by FCC personnel, some feel that the
"only worth" in any radio licensing is trudging barefoot
through the snow uphill both ways, laboring intensely at
the test session while full of worry, anxiety, and near-
mental-trauma that they would fail the virtual Nobel award
signified by The Ticket.

Some even go so far as to redefine "interest" as demanding
one Take The Test! :-) This signifies "commitment and
dedication to the amateur community." They virtually
"enlisted in the service" thereby becoming "heroes of the
something or other" and thus entitled, like nobility, to the
utmost respect for their supreme commitment and dedication.

All that for a hobby activity. Oh, my... :-)

>>I'm not aware of anything that specifically needs it.
>
> It's required for operation and servicing/adjustment of certain
> classes of maritime and aviation stations. See Parts 80 and 87 of
> the FCC Rules.

A legislative sort of thing. Human-made for aviation and maritime
services, not necessary for safety of life at sea nor in the air.

>>It's just an optional qualification for BC engineers.
>

> Not any more. The Society of Broadcast Engineers has their (our)
> own Certifcation program, as does several organizations dealing with
> land-mobile, microwave, and EMC technologies and licensees. Those
> "industry certification exams" are much tougher and more detailed
> than the FCC exams ever were.

Cannot be! Isn't the amateur radio license test the absolute
toughest of all?

> There are no qualifications whatsoever for hiring BC engineers - the
> B/C licensee can, and in some cases has, hire Joe Baboon to do the
> job. Reputable broadcasters will insist on SBE Certification or
> equivalent proven experience.

"Joe Baboon" can get an amateur license. A few of them have
and have appeared in here. :-)

Those same "reputable broadcasters" had been stuck with some
legislative paperwork regulations that required outside PEs to do
carrier frequency measurements to required accuracies, LESS
accuracy than required by routine engineering measurements
done in labs by non-PE engineers. The consultants have
"certification," that magic wand label signifying expertise.

Amateurs in here lately have been in a "spec fight" on antennas
where they use only the words of others as "measurement"
tools, demanding that only certain types of antennas are
acceptible. Off-hand, I'd say those are wonderful examples of
"baboon-ism." :-)

>>PS: I have a Bachelor's degree in EE, and have worked in jobs related to
>>RF, so I'm not just saying I could pass it on the strength of my Amateur
>>Extra licence, although IMHO most Extras could get their GROL, if they
>>wanted to be BC engineers, or just to show off! (And many do. That is, get
>>it to show off!).
>
> Broadcast material is no longer on the GROL exam, at least for the
> last 10 years or so since the FCC privatized that exam process
> and rewrote the exams.

Most in here don't seem to be aware that ALL radio operator
license examinations are privatized. The acronym "COLEM"
to them is a nonsense word on par with "Gollem." :-)

What is absolutely Most Important to too many amateurs is
that one piece of printed paper that gives them title, status,
nobility, and intrinsic self-importance. To them it isn't a
legislative gateway to an enjoyable hobby, they've become
a SOMEBODY "superior" to ordinary folks.

It's like a "Lord of the Rings" thing, the certificate replacing
the Ring. A fantasy world of imagination, glory, honor, and
conflict where They must triumph always. It isn't fun or

recreation to them, but a virtual Triumph of good v. evil
where they self-define what is "good" and what is "evil." :-)

Makes for some comfortable billing revenue for a few
communication attorneys though, so it can't be all bad...

1607. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 18:54:08 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030204135408.03943.00000168@mb-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 60689

In article <f45722ac.0302030734.a15d323@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3E3D7156.DF1BB4C0@earthlink.net>...
>> Brian wrote:
>> >
>> > Unless you're willing to concede that there are contemporary uses of
>> > the T2FD for which the 1949 QST article could never have forseen.
>>
>> or what? This isn't even a sentence, much less a paragraph.
>>
>> Dave K8MN
>
>Don't be so thick.

Brian, he's another "pedantic parson." He parses everything
hoping for the slightest chance to "get even" if the poor baby
feels his "honor" has been sullied. If he finds something, he
has to preach offensively to sully his "attacker's" person.
PCTAs are like that to a fault. It's a fault bigger than the
San Andreas. :-)

1608. Re: arrl article on echolink - impress a non ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 18:54:08 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030204135408.03943.00000167@mb-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 60691

In article <3E3E0480.1ED5E3F7@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>You can't win for losing. I do not hold a vanity callsign. I've been K8MN
>for twenty five years now. By the way, what'd your amateur call, Len?

"What'd your amateur call?" :-) :-) :-) :-)

Who "called?" The next Tom Clancy CIA operative out of exotic
middle-somewhere Africa? :-)

1609. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 18:54:09 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030204135409.03943.00000169@mb-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 60692

In article <f45722ac.0302030728.34025c95@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20030203063617.23598.00000079@mb-fz.aol.com>...
>> In article <3E3D6FD6.1E048EA5@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >Brian wrote:
>> >>
>> >> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>> news:<20030201103647.29016.00000066@mb-fy.aol.com>...
>> >>
>> >> > Lack of experience, lack of knowledge and lack of skill are three
>> >reasons.
>> >
>> >> In a nutshell, N2EY dismisses the T2FD antenna, and insults anyone who
>> >> might be using one. Since he has no use for it, it cannot be good.
>> >
>> >If you have need for a loss antenna, go for it. I should have had one
>> >this morning when chasing Johnston Island on 160m. It was far too easy
>> >to nail AH3D with three calls. Maybe the broadband T2FD would have
>> >permitted me to work him on 160, 80 and 40 at the same time if (and
>> >here's the rub) he could have heard me.
>>
>> Dave,
>>
>> Perhaps you could point out where the imagined "insults" are in the
>sentence:
>>
>> "Lack of experience, lack of knowledge and lack of skill are three
>reasons."
>>
>> An inexperienced ham, who had not used an efficient HF dipole, might think
the
>> T2FD/WBFD was not much different in efficiency.
>>
>> A ham lacking in knowledge might not understand how the T2FD/WBFD obtains
>its
>> broadband characteristics through the use of resistive loading, which
>radiates
>> much of the RF power fed to the antenna as heat rather than RF.
>>

>> A ham lacking in skill might want to avoid having to adjust a tuner.
>>
>> A simple dipole that is the same size as a WBFD, fed with low loss parallel
>> line and matched with a suitable a tuner will have practically identical
>> patterns but much higher efficiency than a WBFD. Such a dipole is lighter
>and
>> mechanically simpler, and when all costs are considered, is no more
>expensive.
>
>And an amateur that also participates in MARS, CAP, and/or maritime
>communications, regardless of experience, knowledge, or skill MUST
>comply with your one world view.

I'd like to see a valid record of Miccolis' experience in
actually measuring antenna gains...or even an engineering
analysis of such gains (he IS a BSEE he say, gave "talks
to industry" too, but I dunno on what...).

>> >I've never had use for an antenna which requires a linear amp to break
>> >even on gain when transmitting.
>>
>> Nor I!
>>
>> >I have used and do use loss antennas
>> >when receiving on 160m or 80m. I can rotate them to null noise and use
>> >a preamp to bring up the desired signal.
>>
>> Yep. Which brings up a question - could you have even heard AH3D on 160 if
>> you'd had a T2FD for receiving? Unlike a directional antenna like a loop,
the
>> T2FD would pick up noise from all directions.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>Your and Dave's example is absurd. The T2FD supports local/regional
>communications and frequency switching. Its not a DX antenna. Get
>over it.

"Amateur radio is all about working DX on HF with CW."

That's a mantra those two sing at the drop of a dipole.
Off key, too, more's the pity.

In antenna analysis, there's the 'method of moments.' With
those two it's the "method OF the moment" in here... :-)

1610. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 18:54:12 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030204135412.03943.00000170@mb-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 60690

In article <20030203143709.05048.00000432@mb-cs.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>In article <3E3E038F.E094CA94@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>writes:

<snip of long jeremiad of rationalization by Heil>

>I'll comment again, Dave.

No problem. You can't talk direct to me. :-)

>It's clear to me and to everyone else (except Mr. Anderson) what was going on
>in G-B (my abbreviation) back when you were there: State Department
>communications consisted of various systems that happened to be in place and
>which did the job. The fact that more modern systems were available elsewhere
>did not mean they existed everywhere. Particularly at the time you were in
>G-B.

Oh, WOW. Rev. Jimmie done TOLD (someone)!

Rev. Jimmie (N2EY) was never in government employ.
Rev. Jimmie (N2EY) was never involved in government or
military radio communications.
It's unknown whether or not Rev. Jimmie Callsign ever
knew any countries in middle Africa or anything else
except morsemanship and the mantra "CW gets
through when nothing else will."

>The availability of "surplus" TTY machines and other equipment in the USA
means
>nothing if that equipment and the necessary support can't be transported to
>where it is wanted - in this case, G-B. So the old CW and 75 baud TTY
>equipment that was in place and working did the job.

Rev. Jimmie seems to think that State Department of the US
of A uses surplus communications equipment. :-)

Rev. Jimmie KNOWS that the described State radio circuits
"did the job," not on technical terms but on the WORD of
another morseman. ["he's a 1x2 extra so he's okay"...chorus
of a pet M. Python skit...:-)]

>Doesn't take a textbook to figure out that under certain conditions Morse/CW
>would sometimes get through when the other available modes using the available
>equipment would not get through. So in those situations Morse/CW was used -
>mostly to figure out how to get the TTY systems functioning again (chnage
>frequency, try again at a different time, etc.)

Bullshit squared. If OOK CW was "the only mode that would work
for 'coordination' then it should have been used for regular traffic."
If regular traffic was possible by TTY then TTY should have been
used for 'coordination.'

Good grief, Charlie Brown...that wasn't rocket science in the 1950s
and the US military managed to get through in nearly all parts of
the world then...including equatorial regions. No "textbook"
needed, just a check of date, time, sunspot cycle, and published
charts of probable MUFs and other propagation things ALREADY
KNOWN. [some were laminated in plastic and hanging at military
control centers in the 1950s] Ionosondes were coming out and
some were used in the 1950s...by the 1980s (three decades later
for the deficient-in-simple-arithmetic) there were enough to confirm
the old charts. Was the US Department of State so damn
stingy in their budgets then that they couldn't afford copies of
information? Rev. Jimmie, YOU answer...you have extensive
experience in government comms to KNOW, don't you?

>Here's another plain, simple fact:

Error! Error! Danger, Will Robinson! :-)

Jimmie Miccolis posts a PERSONAL OPINION.

He no like somebody, he try for puerile-ism in masquerading
personal opinion for "fact." That "plain simple fact" is just
a disguised personal nastygram he's trying to send.

>For example, some time back I described Amazon.com as "unprofitable" based on
>its reports in Yahoo. Mr. Anderson equated "unprofitable" with "bankrupt" and
>has repeatedly posted that I called Amazon "bankrupt", even though
>"unprofitable" and "bankrupt" are not the same thing. Will Mr. Anderson recant
>his error? Of course not.

Will Jimmie Miccolis ever label things correctly or acknowledge
his information source for his first comment on the non-profit
of amazon.com?

Tune in tomorrow for the next episode in this on-going soap
opera of outraged egos with callsigns demanding their honor
to be avenged!

This sort of misdirection happens often when ARRL Believers
see ARRL sullied in any way...such as no shipping charges
at amazon.com for $25 or more to buy ARRL publications
while ARRL charged extra for shipping the SAME items. :-)

Rev. Jimmie hasn't yet acknowledged newspaper business
news nationwide of nearly two weeks ago. He may be
waiting for Google to make it available (Jimmie may live in
there...who knows?). :-)

>Your description of State Dept. comms in G-B was perfectly clear the first
>time, and is another example of Mr. Anderson's "WORMI" memory.

Whatever you say, Ourobouros, you turned there... :-)

>If it's not in the books he read, it can't have happened.

If NOBODY else did it but Heil, then EVERYBODY else
is "wrong." :-)

>Mr. Anderson does not like the fact that he does not have the necessary "need
>to know".

Not a problem here, Rev. Jimmie. I've been ON a "need to
know" and OFF a "need to know" for as long as I've had
a security clearance...like 30+ years worth.

Heil can use whatever statements he used in rationalizing
what he wrote in here. If a "need to know" lends an aura of
"mystery" to his writings, it's an UNCONFIRMABLE
statement. Fish story, really. It's like the "my son was
behind Iraqi lines [in Gulf War] sending intel by CW"
nonsense posted by another.

>State Dept. is not part of the Navy, last time I checked.

Rev. Jimmie had to "check?!?" :-)

>Google is his enemy, Dave.

Google (was DejaNews) may be a nice place to visit.
Unlike Rev. Jimmie, I don't want to live there... :-)

So, Rev. Jimmie wants to keep on and keep on and
keep on with five-year-old squabbles to defend his
honor and righteousness? No problem here. The
good Reverend can grab his time machine and go
back to his beloved past.

Meanwhile, I'll just wait for Heil to acknowledge he
can't do simple arithmetic. Hello? 7 x 24 = 168.
It isn't "148." A recent gaffe. It's probably in Google
now, though. Go, go, go Google! :-)

>Mr. Anderson's argument boils down to: Someone else told a fishy story,
>therefore YOU cannot be telling the truth.

"Fish story" is a colloquial phrase meaning something
told that appears an exaggeration or an untruth. I say
Heil made up a story as rationalization for his previous
statement about "using CW for 'coordination.'"

The pedantic parson should correct himself. I never said
"fishy story." I said SNOW JOB and FISH STORY.

Pedantry is slipping with Rev. Jimmie.

>It's similar to the idea that since someone else named Jim disagreed with Mr.
>Anderson and called him "Lennie", he is somehow authorized to call me

>"Jimmie"

Awwwww...poor baby. Should we all salute and call you sir?

No problem, sirce. [the siren sounded]

>Won't do any good. Google is his enemy.

No, just PCTAs who think they are hotshots in radio comms
because they've had fancy titles and credentials.

>>If you hadn't been such a toad, I might have told you. This isn't a
>>case where I can't tell you. This is one of those where I won't tell
>>you.
>
>Would probably just be misunderstood anyway.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. This isn't a case of Heil "not telling," this was
a case of Heil making up a story and hiding behind some
"need to know" bullshit.

HF radio propagation has been known fairly well since before
WW2 and was better known after WW2, several decades
before the 1980s and the celebrated case of "CW for
'coordination' because nothing else could get through."
[PCTA snow job to attempt proving some CW worth back
before NPRM 98-143 was released]

Heil has yet to prove anything other than attempting to hide
behind some State protocol/procedure bullshit of "need to
know." HF propagation is NOT some government secret.
It wasn't secret in the 1950s and it wasn't classified as a
security thing after the 1950s.

>>There is no obligation on the part of the Department of State to do what
>>other agencies do any more than radio amateurs are obligated to do what
>>military or commercial stations do.
>>
>Says it all.

Doesn't say anything except Heil can't validly rationalize a five-
year-old statement about radio procedures or HF radio
propagation. He uses misdirection and obfuscation to attempt
dodging a question on radio procedure that was different than
any other radio service procedure since before WW2.

Miccolis seems to be "obligated" to support the claims (really
rationalizations) of Heil's because both are PCTAs, both are
1x2 extras, both make false statements and try to weasel out
of them by interpretive rationalizations. :-)

<no signature need, sender identified in header>

1611. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 18:54:14 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030204135414.03943.00000171@mb-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 60694

In article <f45722ac.0302030406.31b72569@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20030202180532.16280.00001373@mb-mo.aol.com>...
>> In article <f45722ac.0302011836.7d34e6c5@posting.google.com>,
>> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>>
>> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>> >news:<20030131152454.03820.00000302@mb-fr.aol.com>...
>> >> In article <f45722ac.0301301530.198cb3a3@posting.google.com>,
>> >> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>> >>
>> >> >Tube technology, Steve, tube technology. Clinging to the past, Steve,
>> >> >clinging to the past.
>> >>
>> >> Go easy, Brian, it's probably all he knows. :-)
>> >
>> >No kidding. DXpert Dave/K8MN thinks I'm going to manufacture DIODES
>> >for a cub scout (BSA) radio project, but he cannot envision an antenna
>> >NOT tilted as in a 1949 QST report.
>>
>> If it wasn't in an ARRL publication it can't be any good...
>>
>> >L Cebik is waaay out in front of the Worlds Greatest DXer.
>>
>> Has a nicer and more informed source of information website
>> on antennas and other things about amateur radio. W4RNL
>> regularly posts at Antennex, a website devoted to antenna
>> experimentation around the world. www.antennex.com
>>
>> New article viewing requires a subscription but Jack Stone
>> (editor-publisher) is liberal about letting non-subscribers
>> view older articles freely. "Older" meaning two to three
>> months old.
>
>Wow. Not a quarter of half a century old?

Nope. Antennex hasn't been around that long...neither has
the Internet (went public in 1991). :-)

>> >> Several years ago I was in a discussion of RF circuits and
>> >> mentioned a "2N918."
>> >
>> >Whatever you do, don't mention a discrete component as the HEIRARCHY

>> >of OF's will demand that you manufacture it.
>>
>> Please forgive me. Lost my head and mentioned a technical
>> thing, a transistor that appeared over three decades ago and is
>> still available and still used. :-)
>
>Retro-Only need apply.

Retro-grade at that... :-)

>> >> A long-time ham overheard that and asked, with a straight
>> >> face, "What country is that? A little island?"
>> >
>> >Yes, K8MN has been assinged there.
>>
>> He's been roasted rather well in here. :-)
>>
>> >> Another turned to him and explained it was a transistor,
>> >> one of the first to have a transition frequency (f-sub-t)
>> >> close to microwave region, first appearing in the early
>> >> 1960s. [about three decades before that discussion]
>> >> The 2N918 and its cousin the 2N2222 are still on the
>> >> market and available today. :-)
>> >
>> >Hey, none of that damned f-sub-t microwave talk around here!!!
>>
>> Sorry. :-)
>
> :-)
>>
>> >This is AMATEUR Radio, bubba.
>>
>> Yup. Professionals are hated. CBers are hated. Anyone
>> not loving morse is hated. Anyone not loving OF morsemen
>> are hated.
>>
>> So much for the upcoming Valentine's Day...
>>
>> <signature here, in the shape of a heart symbolising love>
>
>The interesting thing is that there were accidental discoveries in
>applied radio, but since the T2FD was engineered to be tilted, no
>other contemporary deployment of the antenna can be called a T2FD.

Amateurs are "not supposed to use it" or "it's a loss gain
antenna" the "engineers" in here say...as if any of them
ever made ANY antenna gain measurements in their
lives. They've only been propagating the WORDS of others
and especially the holy words in the pages of QST.

The rationalization (about never doing any hands-on antenna gain measurement) is that "they earned DXCC" or other DX awards and Their antenna "has reach" (OF USN types will say "it has legs" from sea-going parlance). That's not measurement of any kind, just bragging and telling fish stories again.

The same sort of attitude applies to the "need" for morse-manship testing. More fish story telling but this time with They Did It (so everyone else must do it too).

Their "technical expertise" in antenna work as well as "knowledge of theory" comes from memorizing antenna makers' ad flyers. They really don't know feces from boot polish on the real "gain" of their antennas...but everyone MUST obey Their Word.

Those "technical experts" ought to invest in EZNEC from Roy Lewallen or another polished version of the totally-free NEC computer core analysis program. Cebik uses that and a couple other programs for his monthly columns in Antennex.

<no signature here, Jimmie Callsign can go look in header>

1612. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 19:44:19 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302041144.378f540@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60695

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030204091848.23989.00000130@mb-fz.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 2/4/03 5:47 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0302040347.778f0043@posting.google.com>
>
> >You still won't get a T5 card from me...(SNIP)
>
> Neither will anyone else.
>
> >but I'll send you a T2FD card when you quit whining.
>
> I see Lennie has taken a break while you do his trolling and ranting for
> him. Is this a paid job, or are you volunteering?

Americorps.

1613. Re: Thoughts on the Columbia tragedy.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 20:48:32 UTC
From: Peter <pierre.vachon@rogers.com>
Message-ID: <AGV%9.222065$ej1.172077@news02.bloor.is.net.cable.rogers.com>
Source record: 60696
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

It's all about selling newspapers and ratings, unfortunately!

"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:b1mv3t02hi5@enews3.newsguy.com...
> Maybe I'm being cynical, but I have to vent...
>
> On Saturday, there were seven kids killed in an avalanche in Canada.
Becasue
> of the Columbia tragedy, this story was buried in the back pages of most
> newspapers, and received very little air time by broadcast media. Why are
> the astronauts deaths more worthy of attention than the kids who were
> killed? Neither group went on their journey never expecting to return, but
> if you think about, that's a risk every one of takes every time we get
into
> a car, onto an airplane, etc. Why is one death or deaths worthy of so much
> attention, and another isn't?
>
>

1614. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 20:50:50 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030204155050.26864.00001217@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 60697

In article <20030204063616.05048.00000443@mb-cs.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>That was not my intention. I have no idea hw much experience, knowledge or
>skill he has with HF antennas.

Since when has actual knowledge of anyone stopped Rev.
Jimmie from making uneducated guesses about technical
knowledge of others? He will presuppose anything to make
his message case.

>Is the above untrue? I don't see how it's an insult. I don't have much
>experience playing jazz guitar, so I might think there's little difference
>between the various guitars used by jazz musicians.

Don't music and guitars have their own newsgroups? Go there.

"Jazz guitar?!?" Get "with it," downbeat. :-)

>Is the above untrue? I don't see how it's an insult. I don't have much
>knowledge of ancient Chinese pottery.

Pottery and ceramics is another newsgroup. Go there.

>Is the above untrue? I don't see how it's an insult. I lack skill in flying
>aircraft, so I might want to start out with one that required less skill
>than, say, a P-51 Mustang.

Har!

>Some folks see insults where there are only plain, simple facts.

Yes, Rev. Jimmie comes unglued when FACTS are presented
in front of him in public.

What Rev. Jimmie calls "facts" ("plain, simple facts") are just
his own interpretation and his personal opinion of others.

>Note the following part from the above: "practically identical patterns but
>much higher efficiency than a WBFD" So whether it's for NVIS or DX work, or
>anything in between, pattern is NOT a reason to use a WBFD rather than a
>dipole of equal size.

Ah, a CAUSE CELEBRE' to start another misdirection over
quibbling. Focus on details, forget Biot & Savart or Maxwell,
"curl" up with calculated nastygrams about others' writings
instead of calculus.

>Just a plain, simple fact.

Sigh...

>How far above the noise was he? WVA to Johnston Island is a fur piece on 160.

"Fur pieces" is an INCORRECT measure of distance.

Go thee to a furrier newsgroup, reverend.

>And that's the bottom line!

The "bottom line" is where the "signature" is according to
the reverend. Wrong description.

>Yup. Look up the efficiency of a WBFD at 2 MHz compared to a dipole of equal
>size. It's not a pretty sight.

There is NO amateur band at 2 MHz.

A 234 foot long dipole is NOT a pretty sight in a residential
neighborhood. Go take your 2 MHz dipole out in the
country.

1615. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 20:50:53 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030204155053.26864.00001218@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 60699

In article <c2356669.0302040937.1f2d78d6@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>If most HF RF power amplifiers currently produced and sold for amateur
>radio use tubes, how can they, or the technology, be "obsolete"?
>
>Does anyone make "solid state" microwave ovens without a tube inside?

No...but then consumer electronics microwave ovens are sold at retail prices of $50US each, making a profit for the retailer, the distributer, the manufacturer. Each one has a nice little microcontroller (a specialized microprocessor with some added on-chip circuitry) that controls that RF-generating magnetron.

Have any hams home-brewed a vacuum tube micro-controller to take the place of that integrated circuit? :-)

>Is it "wrong" for ARRL members to express their opinions to Hq? I
>don't think so!

Yes, Reverend Jimmie Callsign absolutely thinks it is WRONG to express negative criticsm of beloved ARRL in here. QED.

>I don't have any problems with "The Doctor" or the vintage articles.

Anything "vintage" is acceptible, sometimes venerated. :-)

>Who gets to define what is "the future"? Does it include homebrewing
>or kitbuilding, or must I buy all my equipment ready-made by
>electropolitically correct manufacturers?

"Electropolitically correct?!?" :-)

Elecraft is electropolitically correct? SGC is electropolitically correct? Ten-Tec is electropolitically correct? :-)

>Perhaps the answer is too embarrassing.

For whom? The questioner? :-)

>Ah - so QST must emulate commercial broadcast practice?
>
>Besides, the question was about listening to oldies and classical. Why
>isn't listening to, and broadcasting, such stuff "clinging to the
>past"?

There's a separate newsgroup for broadcasting and "oldies" (the music term, the oldies in ham radio live here and in

Google).

>For several years I subscribed to "Air And Space". Lots of vintage
>aircraft and spacecraft in there, ranging from Wright Brothers stuff
>to what it would take to go to Mars - and beyond.

Goodie for the Smithsonian, they made a couple bucks
profit from a subscription.

Ever help build an experimental aircraft, Jimmie?

>Vintage aircraft use the same airspace and rules as current
>production.

Careful, pedantic parson. Check FARs before you state
anything more...

>Besides, the question was about flying vintage aircraft. Why isn't
>flying a vintage airplane "clinging to the past"?

Oh? I thought this newsgroup was about AMATEUR RADIO
POLICY. !

>> > Antique cars have their own format, and its not Motor Trend.
>
>The question was about driving them.

Automobiling and driving are concerns for another newsgroup,
too. Go there with that.

>Seems to me this is all about what some folks don't want to see in
>QST.

Shame on them! QST is promotion of "what is good for ham
radio" directly from the Church of St. Hiram in Newington.

>Why? I much prefer Rocky Road. What is wrong with live and let live?

It would seem NONE are allowed to "live" except by the
Commandments of the Church of St. Hiram.

>Interesting. Perhaps a quote from a long-time poster to this newsgroup
>would be appropriate at this point.

None are so long-timed or prolific as Rev. Jimmie Callsign,
pedantic parson of the newsgroup, regularly preaching his
Sermon on the Antenna Mount.

>Here's the google quote:

Google is his witness. He would be lost without it. :-)

Here's another little gem, Jimmie:

"US ham radio is all about working DX on HF with CW."

No Google needed.

1616. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 20:50:55 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030204155055.26864.00001219@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 60698

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.h9qsx74.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

> Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>> While "CW" (common term for on-off keyed continuous
>> waves) may be "fun" to morsemen, a State Department
>> radio circuit isn't supposed to be some government-run
>> radio disneyland for its staffers, is it?
>
> If that's a by-product, why not?
>
> When I reported to the San Francisco FCC office in 1967 I was amazed
> to find out that the intercom by which the telephone receptionist
> passed calls to staff members was an ancient Morse key and an
> equally ancient one-tube oscillator feeding several speakers around
> the suite.

Are you SURE you want that as an "example of modern,
efficient US government?"

> "How medieval" I thought. After using it for several years, it
> almost broke my heart to find out that the Type 42 (or was it 43)
> tube used in the oscillator was no longer available at retail and
> when it finally burned out in the mid-1970s we went to a somewhat
> more conventional "overhead" voice paging system. Sometimes I
> missed feeling that old B-battery across the binding posts.... <ggg>

Then stick your finger in an empty light socket...it will revive
your "nostalgia."

> You may have worked for government contractors for most of your
> career, Len, but except for your hitch in the Army, how much time
> have you worked for "THE government" directly?

I never worked for any "THE government," Phil, only the
USA government during an 8-year "hitch" (colloquial
expression referring to an enlistment period, not to be
confused as having anything to do with horses or cavalry).
Four years active, four more years reserves.

Do you think DoD contractors are somehow divorced from
seeing where their work is used or applied? I can assure you
that no other USA government facility after 1960 ever had, or
venerated, a type 42 or 43 vacuum tube. I did once see a
manual morse key on a desk...nice gold-plated one used as

an ornament and paperweight on an officer's desk. No wire
connection to anything.

Ever see a brigade or regimental level field signal center in
operation, Phil? I did about a year before the Gulf War.
Not ONE circuit using morse code. Everyone was busy
doing communicating, getting the messages through
anyway. I don't think that their nostalgia was about ancient
6-pin tubes, just getting out of dry sand and heat at Fort
Irwin.

> Certainly in the
> non-military end of "The Government" one learms that if the toothpick
> is reusable, it gets reused until it is no longer usable, no matter
> how antiquated it becomes or how many mouths it passes through.

Should I pass that "suggestion" on to my congressperson
to forward to Health and Human Services?!?

Phil, the solid-state era began in all electronics roughly at the
beginning of the 1960s. That's 4 decades ago. Manual
telegraphy is NOT a protected species and conserving it is
NOT an environmental issue. Feel free to disregard asepsis
in your dental hygiene if you wish, those are your teeth.

1617. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL support it ??)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 21:21:23 UTC
From: 'Doc <w5lz@cwis.net>
Message-ID: <3E402ED3.8C328EDB@cwis.net>
Source record: 60700
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

Andy,
No, most Russians are better educated than 'Bill',
and write a more coherent sentence. 'Bill' is a typical
American excitable fool who can't seem to string a few
words together intelligently. Just another example of
our great school system who seems to be trying for a
political career. In other words, just a manipulative
politician 'wannabe'. Or even in more simple terms,
he's stupid...
'Doc

1618. Re: GROL vs Amateur Privileges

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 21:32:34 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.h9sqdb7.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 60701

On 04 Feb 2003 18:54:07 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:

> Those same "reputable broadcasters" had been stuck with some
> legislative paperwork regulations that required outside PEs to do
> carrier frequency measurements to required accuracies, LESS
> accuracy than required by routine engineering measurements
> done in labs by non-PE engineers. The consultants have
> "certification," that magic wand label signifying expertise.

Sorry to burst your bubble but the requirement for periodic
frequency and transmitter performance measurements went away a
long time ago. The licensee is responsible for keeping the
station's parameters in tolerance at all times without the FCC
Rules telling him how and when. Modern transmitters have alarm
circuitry which warn of out-of-tolerance operation which, if
not corrected after three hours, is supposed to dump the
transmitter.

Anyone could and still can make measurments for compliance
purposes. The main reason that "consultants" and "frequency
measurement services" got the job was that they had the
necessary instruments and experience to do the job adequately
with no exertion by station staff and their measurements served
as a calibration check of the station's own instruments, but
they never were required to be PEs or otherwise "certified". We
knew whose work products to trusr and whose not to.

> Makes for some comfortable billing revenue for a few
> communication attorneys though, so it can't be all bad...

In your dreams, brother. Most of the comm attorneys whom I know
that take amateur cases do so for very mimimal or no fee if the
case has merit.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1619. Re: ARS License Numbers (quantity vs quality)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 22:06:26 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E403967.5090700@adelphia.net>
Source record: 60702

Vshah101 wrote:

> (*1) Please note: I am biased, I will admit it. I will not use rationalizations
> as the pro-coders do and pretend there is no agenda behind it. My agenda is to
> expand the technical aspects: homebrewing, antenna setups, and so on. So, you
> know where I'm coming from.

Cool! How much homebrewing have you done?

- Mike KB3EIA -

1620. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 23:14:21 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.h9sw7o9.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 60703

[No readable article body recovered]

1621. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-04 23:48:18 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302041548.21274c4a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60704

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030204092808.23989.00000132@mb-fz.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It
> >From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
> >Date: 2/3/03 7:40 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <3E3F1A1F.41515538@earthlink.net>
>
> >> Not tricky at all. I was there, I had permission.
> >
> >So you say.
>
> Well of COURSE he had permission, Dave...Why, just the other day my
> girlfriend, Morgan Fairchild, told me he did...
>
> Yeah...yeah...THAT'S the ticket!
>
> Steve, K4YZ

So now you're calling Morgan Fairchild a liar?

1622. Re: Montana and Florida

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-05 00:11:50 UTC
From: Jackie <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com>
Message-ID: <aFY%9.166405$VU6.133133@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 60705

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030204083636.03273.00000344@mb-mb.aol.com...

> Particulalry impressive considering the antenna went up during a Minnesota
> winter.

No doubt, Jim... and in the middle of a snowstorm... really (we got 8" of
snow last Sunday!)

Going to check out 20 meters now... see ya!

Jackie

1623. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-05 00:35:18 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.h9szsfa.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 60706

(Try this one again)

On 04 Feb 2003 20:50:55 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:

>> When I reported to the San Francisco FCC office in 1967 I was amazed
>> to find out that the intercom by which the telephone receptionist
>> passed calls to staff members was an ancient Morse key and an
>> equally ancient one-tube oscillator feeding several speakers around
>> the suite.
>
> Are you SURE you want that as an "example of modern,
> efficient US government?"

Did I ever use the phrase "modern and efficient" when I wrote about
it? Those words in Federal-speak mean "adequately funded". No way
that "adequately funded" can be applied to the FCC then or now.

Take THAT to your Congressrep.

>> "How medieval" I thought. After using it for several years, it
>> almost broke my heart to find out that the Type 42 (or was it 43)
>> tube used in the oscillator was no longer available at retail and
>> when it finally burned out in the mid-1970s we went to a somewhat
>> more conventional "overhead" voice paging system. Sometimes I
>> missed feeling that old B-battery across the binding posts.... <ggg>
>
> Then stick your finger in an empty light socket...it will revive
> your "nostalgia."

Nah - 120 VAC feels much different from 67.5 VDC - been there
with both, not by intent, and have no desire to repeat either.
>
> Do you think DoD contractors are somehow divorced from
> seeing where their work is used or applied?

My seven years working for "DoD contractors" (including one that we
both worked for at about the same time) led me to believe "yes"
which is why I finally decided to leave that field of endeavor
a.k.a. ratrace.

> I can assure you
> that no other USA government facility after 1960 ever had, or
> venerated, a type 42 or 43 vacuum tube.

I do know that equipment of that vintage and home-brew manufacture
was in use at other agency installations well past 1960. Ditto for
WW-II furniture. "If it's still usable, use it" was the slogan of

the day. My office safe was built in 1884 and was finally passed to the Customs Service when we moved in 1990.

> I did once see a
> manual morse key on a desk...nice gold-plated one used as
> an ornament and paperweight on an officer's desk. No wire
> connection to anything.

There were plenty of working Morse keys in every FCC office. All the technical staff members were required to be Morse-qualified although only a few were hams, so it was natural to use Morse as a communivations tool. We even had Morse HF CW fixed and mobile communications capability up through the 1970s, primarily as a backup for our wireline comms and RTTY.

I have a personally-owned J-38 (WW-II vintage) still-working key sitting on top of my Pentiun-III (obviously ancient) computer, also without wires to anything else. What's so unique about that?

> Ever see a brigade or regimental level field signal center in
> operation, Phil? I did about a year before the Gulf War.

Does the three years that I spent (as a contractor's on-site rep) at the USAF HQ 15 AF (SAC) comm center before the Vietnam fandango count? Or the orientation tour at USN Atlantic Fleet HQ comm center before the Gulf War?

> Not ONE circuit using morse code. Everyone was busy
> doing communicating, getting the messages through
> anyway. I don't think that their nostalgia was about ancient
> 6-pin tubes, just getting out of dry sand and heat at Fort Irwin.

Isn't it great to be with an agency with an open checkbook? That never happened at my agency. Then again, none of them were ham radio operations anyhow.

It's your tax money too.....

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1624. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-05 01:36:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030204203627.29016.00000127@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 60707

In article <b1oslk$7na$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:

>Have you heard of the ARRL supporting this?

Nope.

Best thing to do is surf on over to FCC's ECFS system and voice opposition. The comments I read were almost all against the whole idea.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1625. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL support it ??)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-05 01:56:45 UTC
From: Chuck/KE4ETH <chuck_hawks@hotmailNOSPAMORAMA.com>
Message-ID: <84_%9.2186$fl5.1591@news.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 60708
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

More eroding of civil liberties in the name of national security.

--
73,
Chuck
KE4ETH
USA-NA
Remove the obvious from Email.

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:b1oslk$7na$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net...
> Have you heard of the ARRL supporting this? Or is your imagination taking
> over ?
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> "Bill B" <leakylinkie@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:3e3f3c8a@snipnews.snip.net...
> > If the ARRL even REMOTLY offers ANY SUPPORT
> > WHATSOEVER to this Orwellian proposal by K8AD
> > than it will signal the **DEATH KNELL** for ARRL.
> >
> > Anyone (...and I mean anyone) who would lend their
> > support to this insane proposal is aiding totalitarian
> > style controls to the private ownership of a radio
> > transmitter.
> >
> > I wonder if K8AD went to the "Soviet Gulag School" of
> > Ham Radio? The Govt. or anyone else has no damm
> > business AT ALL knowing what makes and models of radios
> > I may purchase or own G-DDAMMIT!
> >
> > What the frig? Are we to now have HANDGUN STYLE
> > Registration Requirements for Ham Radio and CB Equipment???
> >
> > IF THE ARRL GOES ALONG WITH THIS PROPOSAL -
> > IN ANY CAPACITY WHATSOEVER, YOU WILL SEE THE
> > BIGGEST ABANDONMENT OF ARRL MEMBERSHIP
> > SINCE THE INCENTIVE LICENSING DISASTER OF
> > THE 60's and 70's.
> >
> > -----> Do not support or touch this proposal W1AW - unless you

> > want to go the way of the Spark Transmitter and Rotary Dial Telephone.
> >
> >
> > "RadioGuy" <nospam@nospam.com> wrote in message
> > news:b1mrgo$s1a$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> > > SB QST @ ARL $ARLB011
> > > ARLB011 FCC Invites Comments on Amateur-Related Petition
> > >
> > > ZCZC AG11
> > > QST de W1AW
> > > ARRL Bulletin 11 ARLB011
> > > From ARRL Headquarters
> > > Newington CT January 31, 2003
> > > To all radio amateurs
> > >
> > > SB QST ARL ARLB011
> > > ARLB011 FCC Invites Comments on Amateur-Related Petition
> > >
> > > Dale Reich, K8AD has petitioned the FCC to require sellers of
> > > two-way voice or data equipment to keep on file a buyer's name,
> > > address, telephone number and "any future information when selling a
> > > radio that required licensing under the current FCC rules." Comments
> > > on the petition, RM-10641, are due February 28.
> > >
> > > Information collected would remain private, available only to the
> > > FCC or law enforcement. Reich said in his petition that any retail
> > > vendor would be able to ask local police for an investigation if the
> > > retailer suspected the radios were not going to be used in
> > > compliance with the law.
> > >
> > > Included in the petition is a requirement for "ownership and license
> > > tagging" for gear operating under Parts 5, 15, 18, 74, 80, 90, 95
> > > and 97. In his petition, Reich said such tagging used to be an FCC
> > > requirement and that his proposed change was a needed tool for local
> > > law enforcement.
> > >
> > > The full text of Reich's petitions is available on the FCC Web site.
> > > Search for the petition number.
> > > NNNN
> > > /EX
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
> >
> >
>
>

1626. Re: GROL vs Amateur Privileges

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-05 02:20:12 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E407523.6B393F50@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60709

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <cuvyxnansvbet.h9qoss1.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
> <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:
>
> >On 3 Feb 2003 16:24:13 GMT, Alun Palmer wrote:
> >
> >>The GROL is not really a licence anymore.
> >
> > The GROL is in fact a real license. See FCC Rules Part 13.
> > What you probably mean is that it no longer carries all the
> > benefits and privileges that it or its predecessors once did.
> >
> > On that I agree.
>
> Some in here cannot abide any sort of commercial ties so
> any sort of commercial license has "no meaning" to
> amateur activities, therefore amateurism is "superior" to
> anything commercial, professional, etc. :-)

Nope. It is just that a commercial license doesn't convey amateur radio
privileges. I don't recall anyone writing anything about amateur radio
ops being superior to those in commercial or professional radio.
Ooops--better add a smiley :-)

> No matter that once there were classes of radiotelephone
> licenses whose examinations were given in real regional
> FCC field offices by FCC personnel, ...

Now that you mention it, Leonard, amateur radio license exams were also
given in real regional FCC field offices by FCC personnel. Life's
funny, isn't it?

(the rest of your ravings snipped)

Dave K8MN

1627. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-05 02:22:59 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E4075D8.5744CA93@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60710

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <f45722ac.0302030734.a15d323@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >news:<3E3D7156.DF1BB4C0@earthlink.net>...
> >> Brian wrote:
> >> >
> >> > Unless you're willing to concede that there are contemporary uses of
> >> > the T2FD for which the 1949 QST article could never have forseen.
> >>
> >> or what? This isn't even a sentence, much less a paragraph.
> >>
> >> Dave K8MN
> >
> >Don't be so thick.
>
> Brian, he's another "pedantic parson." He parses everything
> hoping for the slightest chance to "get even" if the poor baby
> feels his "honor" has been sullied.

Don't look now but the parsing was done by Brian, you poor baby.
Allow me to add, Tsk tsk tsk.

> If he finds something, he
> has to preach offensively to sully his "attacker's" person.
> PCTAs are like that to a fault. It's a fault bigger than the
> San Andreas. :-)

Oh, by the way--didn't you just do the very same thing over a simple
typo, poor baby?

Dave K8MN

1628. Re: arrl article on echolink - impress a non ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-05 02:25:22 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E407667.75BD00B4@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60711

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E3E0480.1ED5E3F7@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >You can't win for losing. I do not hold a vanity callsign. I've been K8MN
> >for twenty five years now. By the way, what'd your amateur call, Len?
>
> "What'd your amateur call?" :-) :-) :-) :-)

Go "such" an 807 plate cap. :-) ;-) :<

> Who "called?" The next Tom Clancy CIA operative out of exotic
> middle-somewhere Africa? :-)

Did you have another comment on my "vanity" callsign?

Dave K8MN

1629. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-05 02:29:11 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E40773F.16D904AA@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60712

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <f45722ac.0302030728.34025c95@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> >news:<20030203063617.23598.00000079@mb-fz.aol.com>...
> >> In article <3E3D6FD6.1E048EA5@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >Brian wrote:
> >> >>
> >> >> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> >> news:<20030201103647.29016.00000066@mb-fy.aol.com>...
> >
> >
> > I'd like to see a valid record of Miccolis' experience in
> > actually measuring antenna gains...or even an engineering
> > analysis of such gains (he IS a BSEE he say, gave "talks
> > to industry" too, but I dunno on what...).

"he say"? :-) :-) :-(

> >> >I've never had use for an antenna which requires a linear amp to break
> >> >even on gain when transmitting.
> >>
> >> Nor I!
> >>
> >> >I have used and do use loss antennas
> >> >when receiving on 160m or 80m. I can rotate them to null noise and use
> >> >a preamp to bring up the desired signal.
> >>
> >> Yep. Which brings up a question - could you have even heard AH3D on 160 if
> >> you'd had a T2FD for receiving? Unlike a directional antenna like a loop,
> > the
> >> T2FD would pick up noise from all directions.
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >Your and Dave's example is absurd. The T2FD supports local/regional
> >communications and frequency switching. Its not a DX antenna. Get
> >over it.
>
> "Amateur radio is all about working DX on HF with CW."

You haven't read the orginal QST and CQ articles either, huh?

I worked the Johnston Island station on 75m SSB too. :-) :-) :-(

Dave K8MN

1630. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-05 02:59:18 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E407DF5.386A8592@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60713

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20030203143709.05048.00000432@mb-cs.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:
>
> >In article <3E3E038F.E094CA94@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >writes:
>
> <snip of long jeremiad of rationalization by Heil>
>
> >I'll comment again, Dave.
>
> No problem. You can't talk direct to me. :-)
>
> >It's clear to me and to everyone else (except Mr. Anderson) what was going on
> >in G-B (my abbreviation) back when you were there: State Department
> >communications consisted of various systems that happened to be in place and
> >which did the job. The fact that more modern systems were available elsewhere
> >did not mean they existed everywhere. Particularly at the time you were in
> >G-B.
>
> Oh, WOW. Rev. Jimmie done TOLD (someone)!
>
> Rev. Jimmie (N2EY) was never in government employ.

It is a cinch that you never worked in commo for State.

> Rev. Jimmie (N2EY) was never involved in government or
> military radio communications.

> It's unknown whether or not Rev. Jimmie Callsign ever
> knew any countries in middle Africa or anything else
> except morsemanship and the mantra "CW gets
> through when nothing else will."

Where is this "middle Africa", Len? If you don't know the regions of
Africa, you likely don't know much about the countries.

> >The availability of "surplus" TTY machines and other equipment in the USA
> means
> >nothing if that equipment and the necessary support can't be transported to
> >where it is wanted - in this case, G-B. So the old CW and 75 baud TTY
> >equipment that was in place and working did the job.
>
> Rev. Jimmie seems to think that State Department of the US
> of A uses surplus communications equipment. :-)

Take some time and read your own post. You know, the one that brings up
the topic of "surplus" equipment.

> Rev. Jimmie KNOWS that the described State radio circuits
> "did the job," not on technical terms but on the WORD of
> another morseman. ["he's a 1x2 extra so he's okay"...chorus
> of a pet M. Python skit...:-)]

Oh, I get it. Two Masons get together and start exchanging the secret
handshake and that sort of thing.

> >Doesn't take a textbook to figure out that under certain conditions Morse/CW
> >would sometimes get through when the other available modes using the available
> >equipment would not get through. So in those situations Morse/CW was used -
> >mostly to figure out how to get the TTY systems functioning again (chnage
> >frequency, try again at a different time, etc.)
>
> Bullshit squared. If OOK CW was "the only mode that would work
> for 'coordination' then it should have been used for regular traffic."
> If regular traffic was possible by TTY then TTY should have been
> used for 'coordination.'

Wish we'd had you around, Len. You could have straightened out the
Department of State's Office of Communication and Africa Bureau much
like you've straightened out the radio amateurs here.

> Good grief, Charlie Brown...that wasn't rocket science in the 1950s
> and the US military managed to get through in nearly all parts of
> the world then...including equatorial regions. No "textbook"
> needed, just a check of date, time, sunspot cycle, and published
> charts of probable MUFs and other propagation things ALREADY
> KNOWN. [some were laminated in plastic and hanging at military
> control centers in the 1950s] Ionosondes were coming out and
> some were used in the 1950s...by the 1980s (three decades later
> for the deficient-in-simple-arithmetic) there were enough to confirm
> the old charts. Was the US Department of State so damn
> stingy in their budgets then that they couldn't afford copies of
> information? Rev. Jimmie, YOU answer...you have extensive
> experience in government comms to KNOW, don't you?
>
> >Here's another plain, simple fact:
>
> Error! Error! Danger, Will Robinson! :-)
>
> Jimmie Miccolis posts a PERSONAL OPINION.
>
> He no like somebody, he try for puerile-ism in masquerading
> personal opinion for "fact." That "plain simple fact" is just
> a disguised personal nastygram he's trying to send.
>
> >For example, some time back I described Amazon.com as "unprofitable" based on
> >its reports in Yahoo. Mr. Anderson equated "unprofitable" with "bankrupt" and
> >has repeatedly posted that I called Amazon "bankrupt", even though

> >"unprofitable" and "bankrupt" are not the same thing. Will Mr. Anderson recant
> >his error? Of course not.
>
> Will Jimmie Miccolis ever label things correctly or acknowledge
> his information source for his first comment on the non-profit
> of amazon.com?
>
> Tune in tomorrow for the next episode in this on-going soap
> opera of outraged egos with callsigns demanding their honor
> to be avenged!
>
> This sort of misdirection happens often when ARRL Believers
> see ARRL sullied in any way...such as no shipping charges
> at amazon.com for $25 or more to buy ARRL publications
> while ARRL charged extra for shipping the SAME items. :-)
>
> Rev. Jimmie hasn't yet acknowledged newspaper business
> news nationwide of nearly two weeks ago. He may be
> waiting for Google to make it available (Jimmie may live in
> there...who knows?). :-)
>
> >Your description of State Dept. comms in G-B was perfectly clear the first
> >time, and is another example of Mr. Anderson's "WORMI" memory.
>
> Whatever you say, Ourobouros, you turned there... :-)
>
> >If it's not in the books he read, it can't have happened.
>
> If NOBODY else did it but Heil, then EVERYBODY else
> is "wrong." :-)
>
> >Mr. Anderson does not like the fact that he does not have the necessary "need
> >to know".
>
> Not a problem here, Rev. Jimmie. I've been ON a "need to
> know" and OFF a "need to know" for as long as I've had
> a security clearance...like 30+ years worth.
>
> Heil can use whatever statements he used in rationalizing
> what he wrote in here. If a "need to know" lends an aura of
> "mystery" to his writings, it's an UNCONFIRMABLE
> statement. Fish story, really. It's like the "my son was
> behind Iraqi lines [in Gulf War] sending intel by CW"
> nonsense posted by another.
>
> >State Dept. is not part of the Navy, last time I checked.
>
> Rev. Jimmie had to "check?!?" :-)
>
> >Google is his enemy, Dave.

>
> Google (was DejaNews) may be a nice place to visit.
> Unlike Rev. Jimmie, I don't want to live there... :-)
>
> So, Rev. Jimmie wants to keep on and keep on and
> keep on with five-year-old squabbles to defend his
> honor and righteousness? No problem here. The
> good Reverend can grab his time machine and go
> back to his beloved past.
>
> Meanwhile, I'll just wait for Heil to acknowledge he
> can't do simple arithmetic. Hello? 7 x 24 = 168.
> It isn't "148." A recent gaffe. It's probably in Google
> now, though. Go, go, go Google! :-)

Go "such" an 807 plate cap :-)

> >Mr. Anderson's argument boils down to: Someone else told a fishy story,
> >therefore YOU cannot be telling the truth.
>
> "Fish story" is a colloquial phrase meaning something
> told that appears an exaggeration or an untruth. I say
> Heil made up a story as rationalization for his previous
> statement about "using CW for 'coordination.'"

You can say it until your face turns purple, Foggy. I'll give you a
project if you like. Contact Daniel Donohue, last known address was in
Takoma Park, MD.
Ask him about CW operation from Bissau.

> >Won't do any good. Google is his enemy.
>
> No, just PCTAs who think they are hotshots in radio comms
> because they've had fancy titles and credentials.

Uhhhh, you've entertained us with your fancy titles and credentials (and
even entire histories of places where you've worked). Watch that double
edged sword.

> >>If you hadn't been such a toad, I might have told you. This isn't a
> >>case where I can't tell you. This is one of those where I won't tell
> >>you.
> >
> >Would probably just be misunderstood anyway.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. This isn't a case of Heil "not telling," this was
> a case of Heil making up a story and hiding behind some
> "need to know" bullshit.

Look, Bozo, I told you what I could tell you. I did not tell you what I
couldn't tell you. There are other things I could probably relate
without giving away the store but I don't like your attitude. That it

irks you to not be "in the know" doesn't really phase me.

> HF radio propagation has been known fairly well since before
> WW2 and was better known after WW2, several decades
> before the 1980s and the celebrated case of "CW for
> 'coordination' because nothing else could get through."
> [PCTA snow job to attempt proving some CW worth back
> before NPRM 98-143 was released]

Wanna get "Googled" again? My statement was in response to a claim that there was no government use of morse code. How're you making out in finding those archived posts where I supposedly claim originality for the idea of using the CW order wire? Nothin' yet?

> Heil has yet to prove anything other than attempting to hide
> behind some State protocol/procedure bullshit of "need to
> know." HF propagation is NOT some government secret.
> It wasn't secret in the 1950s and it wasn't classified as a
> security thing after the 1950s.

1) I'm not obligated to prove anything to you. 2) The things I cannot tell you have very little to do with HF propagation. You weren't told because you have no clearance, no need to know and because this is usenet.

> >>There is no obligation on the part of the Department of State to do what
> >>other agencies do any more than radio amateurs are obligated to do what
> >>military or commercial stations do.
> >>
> >Says it all.
>
> Doesn't say anything except Heil can't validly rationalize a five-
> year-old statement about radio procedures or HF radio
> propagation. He uses misdirection and obfuscation to attempt
> dodging a question on radio procedure that was different than
> any other radio service procedure since before WW2.

There's been no misdirection. There has been no obfuscation. There have been things which I could tell you and things which I cannot tell you. My statement above means exactly what it says.

> Miccolis seems to be "obligated" to support the claims (really
> rationalizations) of Heil's because both are PCTAs, both are
> 1x2 extras, both make false statements and try to weasel out
> of them by interpretive rationalizations. :-)

Don't forget the possible Freemasonry connection!

Dave K8MN

1631. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-05 03:47:04 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b1q1jhfuj1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 60714

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030204063617.05048.00000444@mb-cs.aol.com...
> In article <3e3f3c8a@snipnews.snip.net>, "Bill B" <leakylinkie@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
> >If the ARRL even REMOTLY offers ANY SUPPORT
> >WHATSOEVER to this Orwellian proposal by K8AD
> >than it will signal the **DEATH KNELL** for ARRL.
>
> Then let ARRL and FCC know that it's a bad idea.
> >
> >Anyone (...and I mean anyone) who would lend their
> >support to this insane proposal is aiding totalitarian
> >style controls to the private ownership of a radio
> >transmitter.
> >
> And such a rule simply won't work. External RF power amplifiers for the 27
MHz
> range have been heavily regulated for 25 years now. Has that stopped their
> illegal manufacture, sale or use? Not that I can see. All the proposed
rule
> will do is add an unnecessary level of paperwork and regulation to
law-abiding
> radio owners while doing little or nothing to stop violators.
>
> >IF THE ARRL GOES ALONG WITH THIS PROPOSAL -
> >IN ANY CAPACITY WHATSOEVER, YOU WILL SEE THE
> >BIGGEST ABANDONMENT OF ARRL MEMBERSHIP
> >SINCE THE INCENTIVE LICENSING DISASTER OF
> >THE 60's and 70's.
>
> Actually, the ARRL did not lose significant membership back then.
> >
> >-----> Do not support or touch this proposal W1AW - unless you
> >want to go the way of the Spark Transmitter and Rotary Dial Telephone.
> >
> ARRL is actually doing ham radio a great service by publishing this
proposal so
> that we know it's out there and can oppose it by comments to the FCC and
ARRL.
>
> Did you know about the proposal before you got the ARRL letter? I didn't.
>

> Have YOU commented to the FCC? It's really easy using ECFS.

Jim's comments are right on....and let's be serious here...this idea is dead on arrival other than going through the mechanics of the process.

The FCC is just letting the process run its course.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1632. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-05 04:01:25 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E408CDA.35C3536B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60715

Brian wrote:
>
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030204063616.05048.00000443@mb-cs.aol.com>...
> > In article <3E3F1CCC.180E41A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > writes:

> > >I generally have low noise here but I really having no way of knowing if
> > >I could have heard AH3D on a T2FD without a preamp.
> >
> > How far above the noise was he? WVA to Johnston Island is a fur piece on 160.
>
> Jim, Johnston Island is the same distance regardless of band.

Wow! If I'd only had your substantive knowledge, I could have skipped
that 160m QSO and just been satisified with working 'em on 10m SSB.

Dave K8MN

1633. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-05 04:14:54 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E409005.BD650A22@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60716

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20030204063616.05048.00000443@mb-cs.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:
>
> >That was not my intention. I have no idea hw much experience, knowledge or
> >skill he has with HF antennas.
>
> Since when has actual knowledge of anyone stopped Rev.
> Jimmie from making uneducated guesses about technical
> knowledge of others? He will presuppose anything to make
> his message case.

Whew! Thanks for the yuks, Len. When were you ever stopped from making uneducated guesses about the technical knowledge of others or about another's job? I've always assumed that you'll write anything to make a case (I didn't know what the hell a "message case" is). Did you ever, for example, misquote someone and keep repeating the same falsehood for years? Did you ever make any blanket statements about N2EY's technical ability? W0EX's technical ability? my technical ability? I'd have to call those statements uneducated guesses.

Your uneducated guess on the Key Officers listings didn't pan out very well, did it?

How're you coming along finding those archived posts which will no doubt prove you right? *snicker* I'm a patient fellow. Go on with your research.

Dave K8MN

1634. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-05 06:46:27 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b1rahd7q05@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 60728

I do not support any measure of registration for ham gear in the manner similar to the way guns are registered but I do support any legislation supporting the sale of transmitting equipment to those that hold the appropriate licensure for that equipment. (I said transmitting, not recieving equipment)

IMHO, I think places like Radio Shack should have to ask for your license before you are allowed to purchase transmitting equipment. There definitely needs to be done with the sale of amateur equipment to non-licensed persons. (reference the problem with 10 meters for starters.)

If this is not the answer, what is? What allows us to normally purchase stuff we have a right to, by licensure, but keeps the transmitting equipment out of the hands of unlicensed persons?? A better way I would like to see this thread go.... Maybe there might actually be some positive suggestions.

Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

> >Anyone (...and I mean anyone) who would lend their
> >support to this insane proposal is aiding totalitarian
> >style controls to the private ownership of a radio
> >transmitter.
> >
> And such a rule simply won't work. External RF power amplifiers for the 27 MHz
> range have been heavily regulated for 25 years now. Has that stopped their
> illegal manufacture, sale or use? Not that I can see. All the proposed rule
> will do is add an unnecessary level of paperwork and regulation to law-abiding
> radio owners while doing little or nothing to stop violators.

1635. Re: The coders embarrass themselves on 14.275 MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-05 06:58:44 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b1rahe8q05@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 60727
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Ya know.... most of the terminology like "for ID" or "destinated" or "first personal" and many other terminology/phrases that I have heard being used have been used by the "old timers" in my area, people who have been licensed at least 20 years or more.... If anything they are setting a bad example for the newbies coming into the hobby as they may have a tendancy to think that is the way it is supposed to be done since the "old timers" are doing it that way. Prime example, the use of "for ID" was a learning experience for me. I listened (and still do) to the ham bands on scanners for quite a while and heard that particular phrase quite often. Therefore I deduced it must be a standard practice since I have not seen a book that truly handles how a QSO should be handled on voice modes. The ARRL text barely covers it. Maybe someone will write a book about that eh??

Another one is the usage of the word "clear." In other services the word is used often, and there is no problem with it. I view it as a courtesy to others who were courteous enough to wait until you were done trying to call the person you were trying to call and letting them know you were done.... But I am sure there are others with a different opinion. In the absence of text or rulebooks covering a particular issue, I guess a person needs to make their best common sense guess.

Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

(snippage)
>
> Hey you know what they say; "You snooze, you lose!".
> Besides all that I can't really be a lid, I have NEVER
> used the term "I'm destinated now" on the air ;^)
> --
> '73' From KB9TMP
> "The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
> if you can fake that, you've got it made."
> -Groucho Marx
>
>
>

1636. Re: Thoughts on the Columbia tragedy.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-05 07:00:41 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b1rahe9q05@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 60730
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

It's the assmunches in the media, which is where the problem is located.....

Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:b1mv3t02hi5@enews3.newsguy.com...
> Maybe I'm being cynical, but I have to vent...
>
> On Saturday, there were seven kids killed in an avalanche in Canada.
Becasue
> of the Columbia tragedy, this story was buried in the back pages of most
> newspapers, and received very little air time by broadcast media. Why are
> the astronauts deaths more worthy of attention than the kids who were
> killed? Neither group went on their journey never expecting to return, but
> if you think about, that's a risk every one of takes every time we get
into
> a car, onto an airplane, etc. Why is one death or deaths worthy of so much
> attention, and another isn't?
>
>

1637. Re: Thoughts on the Columbia tragedy-A different twist...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-05 07:03:58 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b1rahf0q05@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 60729
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Anyone here that was lucky enough to make any contact with the shuttle crew
or the ISS crew involved with this last mission? (any mode or frequency)

I would like to hear those thought from the people that may have.....

Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

1638. Re: arrl article on echolink - impress a non ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-05 07:27:54 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030205022754.17159.00000019@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 60718

In article <3E407667.75BD00B4@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> Who "called?" The next Tom Clancy CIA operative out of exotic
>> middle-somewhere Africa? :-)
>
>Did you have another comment on my "vanity" callsign?

Only that Heil appears to be ALL vanity... :-)

1639. Re: GROL vs Amateur Privileges

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-05 07:27:54 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030205022754.17159.00000018@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 60721

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.h9sqdb7.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 04 Feb 2003 18:54:07 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>> Those same "reputable broadcasters" had been stuck with some
>> legislative paperwork regulations that required outside PEs to do
>> carrier frequency measurements to required accuracies, LESS
>> accuracy than required by routine engineering measurements
>> done in labs by non-PE engineers. The consultants have
>> "certification," that magic wand label signifying expertise.
>
> Sorry to burst your bubble but the requirement for periodic
> frequency and transmitter performance measurements went away a
> long time ago. The licensee is responsible for keeping the
> station's parameters in tolerance at all times without the FCC
> Rules telling him how and when. Modern transmitters have alarm
> circuitry which warn of out-of-tolerance operation which, if
> not corrected after three hours, is supposed to dump the
> transmitter.

Careful, councelor, I used past tense in "had." I don't insist
that broadcasters "still do it." Relax, you are too tense...

> Anyone could and still can make measurments for compliance
> purposes. The main reason that "consultants" and "frequency
> measurement services" got the job was that they had the
> necessary instruments and experience to do the job adequately
> with no exertion by station staff and their measurements served
> as a calibration check of the station's own instruments, but
> they never were required to be PEs or otherwise "certified". We
> knew whose work products to trusr and whose not to.

I never said the feds "required PEs." :-)

>> Makes for some comfortable billing revenue for a few
>> communication attorneys though, so it can't be all bad...
>
> In your dreams, brother. Most of the comm attorneys whom I know
> that take amateur cases do so for very mimimal or no fee if the
> case has merit.

No revenue? For an attorney?!? Incroyable! :-)

1640. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-05 07:27:56 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030205022756.17159.00000020@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 60719

In article <3E409005.BD650A22@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <20030204063616.05048.00000443@mb-cs.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>> writes:
>>
>> >That was not my intention. I have no idea hw much experience, knowledge or
>> >skill he has with HF antennas.
>>
>> Since when has actual knowledge of anyone stopped Rev.
>> Jimmie from making uneducated guesses about technical
>> knowledge of others? He will presuppose anything to make
>> his message case.
>
>
>Whew! Thanks for the yuks, Len. When were you ever stopped from making
>uneducated guesses about the technical knowledge of others or about
>another's job?

This is an unmoderated newsgroup permitting anyone to
access it. Nobody has stopped me physically or electrically
from using it. Some individual ethnic cleansers have been
continually trying to scrub away those wanting amateur
radio to get out of the last century and into the new millennium.
All of those ethnic cleansers are PCTAs. They turn it into a
weird soap opera trying to do all that cleansing. :-)

>Did you ever,
>for example, misquote someone and keep repeating the same falsehood for
>years?

What "falsehood," Ma Perkins? :-)

>Did you ever make any blanket statements about N2EY's technical
>ability?

Yes. He "designs and builds his own radio equipment" just
like that Elecraft K2 he has described. He must have
"designed" it. :-)

Now Jimmie will just have to jump in here and say "he never
said that and everyone go back to Google, now, now." :-)

I don't recall ANY statement about blankets, though. Better
get right over to Google and search and search until you
find one.

>W0EX's technical ability?

No. I don't think he has much. I remember well his trying
to make intelligent remarks with Cecil Moore. He might
have tried real hard, but nothing much came out, would up
just being trying.

>my technical ability?

I'm not too fond of yours, either. Hard to tell if you have some
since so much time is spent in here attacking the persons
of your "opponents." :-)

Remember, 7 x 24 = 168, nor 148?

>I'd have to call those statements uneducated guesses.

You MUST disparage them. You are obsessed with
conservative-traditionalist "ethnic cleansing" in here
in order to portray the guru and elder statesman among
the PCTAs.

>Your uneducated guess on the Key Officers listings didn't pan out very
>well, did it?

I would expect "key lists" to be a listing of encryption keys,
the master listing of keys to be used. That's how it was
in older times before CWO Walker did his treasonous
work in the USN.

"Key officers" are normally the corporate or government lists
of "key people," the "key" referring to important/valuable
persons and liberally used to inflate egos of the named "keys."
No doubt State thinks ALL its embassy staff are "key players."

Call them what you will. I say staff listings are just staff
listings regardless of the fancy list heading.

>How're you coming along finding those archived posts which will no doubt
>prove you right? *snicker* I'm a patient fellow. Go on with your
>research.

Why? I don't live in Google trying to find the least bit of
FIVE YEAR OLD POSTINGS to avenge some perceived
slight. Went there once recently, that was that.

I'm still waiting for a technically-valid reason for switching
to CW to "coordinate" schedules and comm data, then
going back to TTY for regular messages. If TTY works, a
common-sense radio person would use TTY to
"coordinate" skeds. If CW is needed for "coordination"
then TTY won't work for regular traffic.

No doubt Heil is going to bitch and moan and issue misdirection nastygrams for ANOTHER 5 years without giving a technical justification. :-)

Scrub, scrub, scrub...

1641. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-05 07:27:58 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030205022758.17159.00000021@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 60717

In article <f45722ac.0302041531.596103b4@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> In antenna analysis, there's the 'method of moments.' With
>> those two it's the "method OF the moment" in here... :-)
>
>Finally an antenna that won't get through even on CW. And I thought
>that was an impossibility.
>
>Where's Aaron Jones and his Morse Myth's list?

I don't know but I'd bet that some PCTAs are 'lythping'
trying to bite their tongues... :-)

1642. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-05 07:28:00 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030205022800.17159.00000022@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 60720

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.h9szsfa.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 04 Feb 2003 20:50:55 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>>> When I reported to the San Francisco FCC office in 1967 I was amazed
>>> to find out that the intercom by which the telephone receptionist
>>> passed calls to staff members was an ancient Morse key and an
>>> equally ancient one-tube oscillator feeding several speakers around
>>> the suite.
>>
>> Are you SURE you want that as an "example of modern,
>> efficient US government?"
>
> Did I ever use the phrase "modern and efficient" when I wrote about
> it? Those words in Federal-speak mean "adequately funded". No way
> that "adequately funded" can be applied to the FCC then or now.
>
> Take THAT to your Congressrep.

This ain't no courtroom, councillor. If you need help with
"proper word useage," use Strunk and White, not Black's.

>>> "How medieval" I thought. After using it for several years, it
>>> almost broke my heart to find out that the Type 42 (or was it 43)
>>> tube used in the oscillator was no longer available at retail and
>>> when it finally burned out in the mid-1970s we went to a somewhat
>>> more conventional "overhead" voice paging system. Sometimes I
>>> missed feeling that old B-battery across the binding posts.... <ggg>
>>
>> Then stick your finger in an empty light socket...it will revive
>> your "nostalgia."
>
> Nah - 120 VAC feels much different from 67.5 VDC - been there
> with both, not by intent, and have no desire to repeat either.

Couldn't afford a 90 V "B" battery? Tsk, tsk, tsk.

How about one of the 135 V batteries? :-)

>> Do you think DoD contractors are somehow divorced from
>> seeing where their work is used or applied?
>
> My seven years working for "DoD contractors" (including one that we
> both worked for at about the same time) led me to believe "yes"
> which is why I finally decided to leave that field of endeavor

> a.k.a. ratrace.

Not my problem that you left.

>> I can assure you
>> that no other USA government facility after 1960 ever had, or
>> venerated, a type 42 or 43 vacuum tube.
>
> I do know that equipment of that vintage and home-brew manufacture
> was in use at other agency installations well past 1960. Ditto for
> WW-II furniture. "If it's still usable, use it" was the slogan of
> the day. My office safe was built in 1884 and was finally passed to
> the Customs Service when we moved in 1990.

Nice to know that HGTV got a start for all those "appraisal"
programs!

The USAF got its birth courtesy of the US Army Signal Corps
and the contract purchase of a Wright Flyer years ago. How
long did the spruce-wire-fabric aircraft last? They had 100 W
airborne spark transmitters, too, but got around to using
vacuum tubes soon enough.

>> I did once see a
>> manual morse key on a desk...nice gold-plated one used as
>> an ornament and paperweight on an officer's desk. No wire
>> connection to anything.
>
> There were plenty of working Morse keys in every FCC office. All
> the technical staff members were required to be Morse-qualified
> although only a few were hams, so it was natural to use Morse as a
> communivations tool. We even had Morse HF CW fixed and mobile
> communications capability up through the 1970s, primarily as a
> backup for our wireline comms and RTTY.

Whoopee. I remember lots of morse equipment at the Chicago
FCC field office...they were giving radiotelegraph tests the day
I took and passed my radiotelephone (commercial) license in
1956. Chicago is on the edge of Lake Michigan, remember?

> I have a personally-owned J-38 (WW-II vintage) still-working key
> sitting on top of my Pentiun-III (obviously ancient) computer, also
> without wires to anything else. What's so unique about that?

I would expect nothing else from a devout morseman.

>> Ever see a brigade or regimental level field signal center in
>> operation, Phil? I did about a year before the Gulf War.
>
> Does the three years that I spent (as a contractor's on-site rep) at
> the USAF HQ 15 AF (SAC) comm center before the Vietnam fandango count?
> Or the orientation tour at USN Atlantic Fleet HQ comm center before
> the Gulf War?

Please...the glare from your medals is blinding...

Fort Irwin is the US Desert Warfare training center. Training
there helped the US Army do a panzerfaust on Iraqi tanks
during 73 Easting in the 100-hour land war. Better than
Rommel could muster.

Did you think that modern tankers used knee keys inside
those M1A1 Abrams tanks? At 30 MPH over rough terrain?
Tankers were using VOICE in the field back in WW2, and,
worse yet, on VHF with FM, 10 channels crystal controlled
selectable by push-button! :-)

>> Not ONE circuit using morse code. Everyone was busy
>> doing communicating, getting the messages through
>> anyway. I don't think that their nostalgia was about ancient
>> 6-pin tubes, just getting out of dry sand and heat at Fort Irwin.
>
> Isn't it great to be with an agency with an open checkbook?

Not my problem. No DoD contracting office lab had any
"ancient" equipment that I saw anywhere coast-to-coast.

As I said, Fort Irwin's training doctrine was pretty damn
good in the Gulf War. They didn't NEED manual morse for
anydamnthing.

> That
> never happened at my agency. Then again, none of them were ham radio
> operations anyhow.

So, by that veiled inference, you WANT amateur radio to
retain old, outmoded manual morse testing? Why?

> It's your tax money too.....

I'm not complaining about government spending on radio
things. Why are you?

1643. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-05 09:16:41 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0302050116.5942e715@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60722

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E40773F.16D904AA@earthlink.net>...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > In article <f45722ac.0302030728.34025c95@posting.google.com>,
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> >
> > >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> > >news:<20030203063617.23598.00000079@mb-fz.aol.com>...
> > >> In article <3E3D6FD6.1E048EA5@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > >> writes:
> > >>
> > >> >Brian wrote:
> > >> >>
> > >> >> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> > >> news:<20030201103647.29016.00000066@mb-fy.aol.com>...
> > >
> > >
> > > I'd like to see a valid record of Miccolis' experience in
> > > actually measuring antenna gains...or even an engineering
> > > analysis of such gains (he IS a BSEE he say, gave "talks
> > > to industry" too, but I dunno on what...).

>
> "he say"? :-) :-) :-(

I say. WRONG as usual *PUTZ*, big surprise that. Jimbo has an MSEE,
you gots nothing even close, NOTHING and you never will, at the height
of your self-pronounced glory you were just a lameass aerospace
dime-a-dozen bench tech jobbie floundering around yer keyboard today
in a time warp.

Jimbo's record in his industry more than speaks for itself and the
fact that you "dunno on what" is just one more example of your
fundamental cluelessness.

> > >Your and Dave's example is absurd. The T2FD supports local/regional
> > >communications and frequency switching. Its not a DX antenna. Get
> > >over it.
> >
> > "Amateur radio is all about working DX on HF with CW."
>
> You haven't read the orginal QST and CQ articles either, huh?
>
> I worked the Johnston Island station on 75m SSB too. :-) :-) :-(

Yee Haw! Good show!

Check this one: The word just came down thru the club reflector that "Delmarva Jon" AA1K nailed JT1CO for the first ever 160 WAZ. Stew Perry would be amazed if he was still amongst us. Jon done it all with high loss antennas around the compass.

>
> Dave K8MN

w3rv

1644. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-05 12:03:28 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030205070328.12173.00000403@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 60723

In article <3E40773F.16D904AA@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Subject: Re: NR-1 Book
>From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>Date: Wed, 05 Feb 2003 02:29:11 GMT
>
>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <f45722ac.0302030728.34025c95@posting.google.com>,
>> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>>
>> >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>> >news:<20030203063617.23598.00000079@mb-fz.aol.com>...
>> >> In article <3E3D6FD6.1E048EA5@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
>> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> >> writes:
>> >>
>> >> >Brian wrote:
>> >> >>
>> >> >> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>> >> news:<20030201103647.29016.00000066@mb-fy.aol.com>...
>> >>
>> >>
>> I'd like to see a valid record of

(N2EY's)

>> experience in
>> actually measuring antenna gains...or even an engineering
>> analysis of such gains (he IS a BSEE he say, gave "talks
>> to industry" too, but I dunno on what...).
>
>"he say"? :-) :-) :-(

"That dog, I say, that dog is about as sharp as a bowlin' ball!"

W4RNL has modeled at least two variations of the WBFD/T2FD design and put the
results on his website for all to see. No need to repeat that exercise unless
someone can show that 'RNL's model and analysis contains significant error.

One of the interesting things that results is that the WBFD/T2FD patterns are
virtually identical to those of a dipole of the same size, EXCEPT that the
WBFD/T2FD field strengths are lower. In some cases, much lower.
>
>> >> >I've never had use for an antenna which requires a linear amp to break

>> >> >even on gain when transmitting.
>> >>
>> >> Nor I!
>> >>
>> >> >I have used and do use loss antennas
>> >> >when receiving on 160m or 80m. I can rotate them to null noise and use
>> >> >a preamp to bring up the desired signal.
>> >>
>> >> Yep. Which brings up a question - could you have even heard AH3D on 160
>if
>> >> you'd had a T2FD for receiving? Unlike a directional antenna like a
>loop,
>> the
>> >> T2FD would pick up noise from all directions.
>> >>
>> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>> >
>> >Your and Dave's example is absurd.

No, it isn't. One of the limiting factors in hearing weak signals on the 160, 80 and 40 meter bands is the received noise level. Often the signal-to-noise ratio of a weak signal can be improved if a directional antenna is used for receiving, particularly if significant noise is coming from directions other than the direction of the desired signal. Because internally-generated receiver noise is usually not a limiting factor at these frequencies, it often works out that the use of a low-efficiency directional receiving antenna can improve the signal-to-noise ratio of weak signals on 160, 80, and even 40. This method is not limited to DX. This is why many ham rigs have a separate receiver antenna input.

The T2FD/WBFD is a low-efficency antenna, but it's not very directional.

>> >The T2FD supports local/regional
>> >communications and frequency switching.

The WBFD/T2FD patterns are virtually identical to those of a dipole of the same size, EXCEPT that the WBFD/T2FD field strengths are lower. In some cases, much lower.

The T2FD/WBFD is simply a dipole implementation that has broadband SWR characteristics - and lower efficiency. A dipole of identical size and height as a T2FD/WBFD will support local/regional communications better than the T2FD/WBFD it replaces IF it is properly matched.

>> >Its not a DX antenna.
Get
>> >over it.

Sounds like someone has a strong emotional investment in the T2FD/WBFD antenna. Must be sacred or something...
>>
>> "Amateur radio is all about working DX on HF with CW."

Who wrote that? Not me. Amateur radio is all about a lot of things - DX and CW are just two of them.
>
>You haven't read the orginal QST and CQ articles either, huh?
>
>I worked the Johnston Island station on 75m SSB too. :-) :-) :-(
>
OH MAMA!

I am delighted but not surprised.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1645. Re: Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, FCC, Cronkite, ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-05 13:07:18 UTC
From: Haaaynorton@aol.com
Message-ID: <999c58d3.0302050507.235363ea@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60724
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<b1osim$uf7$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>...
> Baxter is NOT transmitting bulletins. He is sending 1 1/2 hours of taped
> talk show and copied stuff from RAIN and the ARRL. Never intended for HF
> use.
>
> He is also in violation of the 'control operator' rules. Plus countless
> other alleged offenses.
>
> Oh and don't pay any attention to Llllooooyyydd he supports all idiotic
> causes. You know like bro Stair, BARF, etc.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> > "Paul" <drakeswl@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> > news:c0588492.0301300804.69039ba9@posting.google.com...
> > > I'm new to this topic so don't flame me, but if W1AW has a bulletin,
> > > why can't Baxter have one? What is Baxter doing that is so bad that
> > > the FCC would want to shut him down?

Man, isn't that the truth Dan! The next thing lloyd da toid will be
supporting is that bunch of Raelian wackos who claim to have cloned a
human. Could you imagine a cloned lloyd da toid? Now, that's scary!!

Ed Norton
(not at Ft. McPherson)

1646. Re: Thoughts on the Columbia tragedy.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-05 13:41:59 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <b1r42j02pvh@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 60725
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Evets" <themtx@foo.yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:8uH%9.12527$sm3.9938@news.bellsouth.net...
> For an interesting viewpoint, check out Uncle Bob's thoughts:
> http://unclebob.diaryland.com/ , and for those who view this link after
> 02/03, check out that day's entry, as the url above is for his current
> posting only. It makes you think. This guy is just an average joe who
> happens to have some media exposure as a tv journalist, but he may be onto
> something, as callous as his perspective may seem at first. Worth a look
> and some consideration, IMO.
>
> Steve

My original post was intended to generate a discussion as to why the media sensationalizes certain tragedies, while leaving others virtually untouched. "Uncle Bob" is a first rate jerk. Let's all go live in caves and dig for worms every day. Stop researching medicine and new energy sources and engine design. Toss out all the computers and TV's and burn down all the homes. Then we could all run through the forests and hop skip and jump and... die an early death from diseases we could no longer cure and watch people starve because we don't have technology anymore!
Just because this asshole dosen't know the benefits of space research doesn't
mean they haven't affected his life in more ways than could ever be dreamed. We have all benefitted from Space Exploration. Life has to move forward or it stagnates.

1647. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-05 14:23:10 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0302050623.2524b556@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60726

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0302050116.5942e715@posting.google.com>...
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E40773F.16D904AA@earthlink.net>...
> > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > >
> > > In article <f45722ac.0302030728.34025c95@posting.google.com>,
> > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> > > >
> > > > >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> > > > >news:<20030203063617.23598.00000079@mb-fz.aol.com>...
> > > > >> In article <3E3D6FD6.1E048EA5@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > > > >> writes:
> > > > >>
> > > > >> >Brian wrote:
> > > > >> >>
> > > > >> >> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> > > > >> news:<20030201103647.29016.00000066@mb-fy.aol.com>...
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > I'd like to see a valid record of Miccolis' experience in
> > > > actually measuring antenna gains...or even an engineering
> > > > analysis of such gains (he IS a BSEE he say, gave "talks
> > > > to industry" too, but I dunno on what...).
> >
> > >
> > > "he say"? :-) :-) :-(
> >
> > I say. WRONG as usual *PUTZ*, big surprise that. Jimbo has an MSEE,
> > you gots nothing even close, NOTHING and you never will, at the height
> > of your self-pronounced glory you were just a lameass aerospace
> > dime-a-dozen bench tech jobbie floundering around yer keyboard today
> > in a time warp.
> >
> > Jimbo's record in his industry more than speaks for itself and the
> > fact that you "dunno on what" is just one more example of your
> > fundamental cluelessness.
> >
> >
> > > > >Your and Dave's example is absurd. The T2FD supports local/regional
> > > > >communications and frequency switching. Its not a DX antenna. Get
> > > > >over it.
> > > >

> > > "Amateur radio is all about working DX on HF with CW."
> >
> > You haven't read the orginal QST and CQ articles either, huh?
> >
> > I worked the Johnston Island station on 75m SSB too. :-) :-) :-(
>
> Yee Haw! Good show!
>
> Check this one: The word just came down thru the club reflector that
> "Delmarva Jon" AA1K nailed JT1CO for the first ever 160 WAZ. Stew
> Perry would be amazed if he was still amongst us. Jon done it all with
> high loss antennas around the compass.

Bad info got tossed out, Jon is one of only a very few who hold a 160 WAZ.

>
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> w3rv

w3rv

1648. Re: The coders embarrass themselves on 14.275 MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-05 15:59:16 UTC
From: Bill Turner <jamspam@nowhere.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93195141F6846w7tidslextremecom@216.168.3.50>
Source record: 60731
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in
news:b1rahe8q05@enews3.newsguy.com:

> Prime example, the use of "for ID" was a learning experience
> for me. I listened (and still do) to the ham bands on scanners for
> quite a while and heard that particular phrase quite often. Therefore
> I deduced it must be a standard practice since I have not seen a book
> that truly handles how a QSO should be handled on voice modes. The
> ARRL text barely covers it. Maybe someone will write a book about that
> eh??
>

I believe the phrase came into use as a means of indicating compliance with
FCC rules requiring identification every so often, as opposed to
communicating your call with the other station(s) you were in QSO with.
The other guys know who you are, the FCC presumably doesn't.

In that context, it makes sense.

73, Bill W7TI

1649. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-05 16:02:48 UTC
From: Bill Turner <jamspam@nowhere.com>
Message-ID: <Xns931951DB59FCCw7tidslextremecom@216.168.3.50>
Source record: 60732

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in
news:b1rahd7q05@enews3.newsguy.com:

> IMHO, I think places like Radio Shack should have to ask for your
> license before you are allowed to purchase transmitting equipment.
> There definitely needs to be done with the sale of amateur equipment
> to non-licensed persons.

Then Radio Shack personnel at their warehouse would have to show a license
to the delivery truck? And how about the truck driver?

Possesion of radio equipment is and must be legal. It's the operation of
it that is and must be regulated.

73, Bill W7TI

1650. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-05 17:53:47 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0302050953.4aa07f70@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60733

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0302050116.5942e715@posting.google.com>...
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E40773F.16D904AA@earthlink.net>...
> > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > >
> > > In article <f45722ac.0302030728.34025c95@posting.google.com>,
> > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> > >
> > > >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> > > >news:<20030203063617.23598.00000079@mb-fz.aol.com>...
> > > >> In article <3E3D6FD6.1E048EA5@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > > >> writes:
> > > >>
> > > >> >Brian wrote:
> > > >> >>
> > > >> >> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> > > >> news:<20030201103647.29016.00000066@mb-fy.aol.com>...
> > >
> > >
> > > I'd like to see a valid record of

(N2EY's)

> > > experience in
> > > actually measuring antenna gains...or even an engineering
> > > analysis of such gains (he IS a BSEE he say, gave "talks
> > > to industry" too, but I dunno on what...).
>
> >
> > "he say"? :-) :-) :-(
>
> I say.

As has been pointed out before, W4RNL has done an analysis of the
T2FD/WBFD antenna. Nobody here has posted a description of any errors
in that analysis.

> WRONG as usual *PUTZ*, big surprise that. Jimbo has an MSEE,
> you gots nothing even close, NOTHING and you never will, at the height
> of your self-pronounced glory you were just a lameass aerospace
> dime-a-dozen bench tech jobbie floundering around yer keyboard today
> in a time warp.

No need for the pejoratives aimed at Mr. Anderson, Brian. It is a
common behavior of his to make mistakes about the qualifications of
those who disagree with him. It's similar to his mistakes about what
he and others have written in this NG. For example, his confusion
about my homebrewing, kitbuilding and restoration activities, the
difference between "unprofitable" and "bankrupt", his inability to
understand K8MN's communications work for the State Department, to
name just a few.

> Jimbo's record in his industry more than speaks for itself and the
> fact that you "dunno on what" is just one more example of your
> fundamental cluelessness.

Those who need to know that information have it. Mr. Anderson does not
need to know. This simple fact angers him, for some reason. Besides,
since Mr. Anderson has demonstrated that he cannot keep straight the
qualifications I have already mentioned, there is no reason to burden
him with more. Indeed, Mr. Anderson finds it necessary to frequently
rehash his military and employment experiences here, as if they
somehow have any bearing on amateur radio policy. Yet he never
explains what connection could exist.

> > > >Your and Dave's example is absurd. The T2FD supports local/regional
> > > >communications and frequency switching. Its not a DX antenna. Get
> > > >over it.
> > >
> > > "Amateur radio is all about working DX on HF with CW."
> >
> > You haven't read the orginal QST and CQ articles either, huh?
> >
> > I worked the Johnston Island station on 75m SSB too. :-) :-) :-(
>
> Yee Haw! Good show!
>
> Check this one: The word just came down thru the club reflector that
> "Delmarva Jon" AA1K nailed JT1CO for the first ever 160 WAZ.

Even a non-DXer like me can say WOW! to that one!

> Stew
> Perry would be amazed if he was still amongst us. Jon done it all with
> high loss antennas around the compass.
>
For receiving, you mean. I don't think AA1K used WBFD/T2FDs for 160.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1651. Re: Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, FCC, Cronkite, ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-05 18:12:32 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b1rk5a$ln3$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 60734
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Thats enough to make a preacher take up the drink.

Dan/W4NTI

> Man, isn't that the truth Dan! The next thing lloyd da toid will be
> supporting is that bunch of Raelian wackos who claim to have cloned a
> human. Could you imagine a cloned lloyd da toid? Now, that's scary!!
>
> Ed Norton
> (not at Ft. McPherson)

1652. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-05 19:05:05 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030205140505.20325.00001145@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 60735

In article <Xns931951DB59FCCw7tidslextremecom@216.168.3.50>, Bill Turner
<jamspam@nowhere.com> writes:

>"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in
>news:b1rahd7q05@enews3.newsguy.com:
>
>> IMHO, I think places like Radio Shack should have to ask for your
>> license before you are allowed to purchase transmitting equipment.
>> There definitely needs to be done with the sale of amateur equipment
>> to non-licensed persons.
>
>_____
>
>Then Radio Shack personnel at their warehouse would have to show a license
>to the delivery truck? And how about the truck driver?
>
>Possesion of radio equipment is and must be legal. It's the operation of
>it that is and must be regulated.

A good, concise, clear statement.

In the real world of all electronics and radio, equipment and users
of same outnumber radio amateurs by a considerable margin.
That takes in all markets, from consumer to industrial to
scientific to non-amateur-radio radio users. Requiring a "papers
check" at retail stores, "authentication by certificate" or whatever
greatly inhibits retail trade of goods affecting the retailers while
only providing some minor mental feel-good to radio amateur
hobbyists. That would be further regressive to the amateur
market already burdened with losses of retail outlets for amateur
products.

One problem that I see (constantly) is that lack of amateur radio
publications showing their readers their relationship to the whole
of the radio world. They focus inwards to their hobby. That
mental myopia limits understanding any other radio except
broadcasting, evil CB, or cellular telephones. There are more
private and government land mobile, aircraft mobile, private boat
radios than the total of US amateur radio licenses. One out of
three US citizens is a cell phone subscriber so there must be at
least 50 million cell phones in the USA capable of emitting RF.
Cordless telephones emit RF when used, are in the millions in
the US. Keyless entry automobile locks emit RF each time a
driver locks or unlocks such a vehicle. Wireless Local Area

Networks is currently a thriving niche in consumer electronics emitting RF to relay video, music, high-speed computer data, outside weather sensor data, all for home use. There's probably no accurate record of the total number of (allegedly evil) CB RF emitters in the 11m area other than it being safe to say "millions" just on inspection of the nation's highways at any time.

All of those and more share the EM spectrum and radio amateurs must share the same spectrum. To share it properly requires understanding of their RF environment, not an ignorance based on old information on what radio was a quarter or half century ago. Radio amateur publications focus inwardly and as a result the readers get a tunnel vision picture of their relationship to the whole of the RF world. Too many think they are alone (perhaps invincible to a grandiose few) in the RF world. This greatly diminishes their ability to negotiate a better RF environment for their hobby.

More feel-good bureaocracy with more "permits to purchase" are not any answer for expansion of enjoyment of a hobby.

1653. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-05 19:05:07 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030205140507.20325.00001146@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 60736

In article <d22b54c3.0302050116.5942e715@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3E40773F.16D904AA@earthlink.net>...
>> Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >
>> > In article <f45722ac.0302030728.34025c95@posting.google.com>,
>> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>> >
>> > >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>> > >news:<20030203063617.23598.00000079@mb-fz.aol.com>...
>> > >> In article <3E3D6FD6.1E048EA5@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
>> <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> > >> writes:
>> > >>
>> > >> >Brian wrote:
>> > >> >>
>> > >> >> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>> > >> news:<20030201103647.29016.00000066@mb-fy.aol.com>...
>> > >
>> > >
>> > > I'd like to see a valid record of Miccolis' experience in
>> > > actually measuring antenna gains...or even an engineering
>> > > analysis of such gains (he IS a BSEE he say, gave "talks
>> > > to industry" too, but I dunno on what...).
>
>>
>> "he say"? :-) :-) :-(
>
>I say. WRONG as usual *PUTZ*, big surprise that. Jimbo has an MSEE,
>you gots nothing even close, NOTHING and you never will, at the height
>of your self-pronounced glory you were just a lameass aerospace
>dime-a-dozen bench tech jobbie floundering around yer keyboard today
>in a time warp.

Kellie run out of mood drugs...again?!? :-)

"Bench tech jobbie?" :-)

That can't be me since I was never employed as a job-shopper
or "temp" in the aerospace industry. Whom is Kellie
smutzing now? :-)

What "glory?" Doing work and getting paid for it reasonably
well, yes. Nearly all of that as an electronics design engineer.

Only one patent. No biggie. A few articles in McGraw-Hill's
biweekly Electronics magazine, BYTE, Microcomputing in
addition to contributing a dozen plus articles to Ham Radio
magazine that ceased publication in 1990 as well as being
an Associate Editor there for two years.

Kellie must be trying to rub smutz on Brian Burke. Brian
has already stated what he has done, where he was, and
in the service of his country in the military. What is more
important (and probably devastating to Kellie) is that Brian
can think for himself and is not afraid to speak out when some
OFs vent gas in here on the "correct, proper anything"
according to the OF's directives on what all hams must do.

Kellie must have been in the sauce again. Very confused
he is. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

>Jimbo's record in his industry more than speaks for itself and the
>fact that you "dunno on what" is just one more example of your
>fundamental cluelessness.

Who is this "jimbo" who has a "record in his industry?" One
of the centers of the US recording industry is out here in Los
Angeles. Lots of "jims" in the recording industry. One of
them may have or had an amateur radio license.

If Kellie means Jimmie Miccolis, there is a problem. That
"jimbo" hasn't stated WHAT "his business is" or even the
company name. It's an UNKNOWN. That "jimbo" seems
afraid to reveal "his business."

Without such identification it is impossible to ascertain any
"record." Is it a DVD? CD? LP? 45? An old 78? An
Edison cylinder? Stenotype belt?

>> > >Your and Dave's example is absurd. The T2FD supports local/regional
>> > >communications and frequency switching. Its not a DX antenna. Get
>> > >over it.
>> >
>> > "Amateur radio is all about working DX on HF with CW."
>>
>> You haven't read the orginal QST and CQ articles either, huh?
>>
>> I worked the Johnston Island station on 75m SSB too. :-) :-) :-(
>
>Yee Haw! Good show!

"Good show?" A couple drinks and Kellie gets confused on
the entertainment industry. Must have pasted a QST cover
on his well-thumbed old issue of "Silver Screen."

Maybe confusion is endemic to PCTAs or all that beeping
advances Alzheimer's symptoms. There seems to be a

constant example of number confusion in here such as another OF who thinks that 7 x 24 = 148 (it is 168) and Kellie multiplied his single co-invention patent number to 26 separate patents (where his sole co-invention isn't even electronic let alone about radio)!

Maybe Kellie imagines he or his "jimbo" (whoever that is) once did a tutorial lecture on Maxwell's Equations? :-)

Like any good mathematician, Kellie should not drink and derive.

1654. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL support it ??)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-05 19:33:02 UTC
From: Dean Arthur <dearthur@silverstar.com>
Message-ID: <3E4166F4.DB3A8256@silverstar.com>
Source record: 60737
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

> What were the charges, neighborhood antenna law?

Unauthorized use of 1.2GHz antenna for access to broadcast TV w/o
payment.

1655. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL support it ??)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-05 19:35:37 UTC
From: Dean Arthur <dearthur@silverstar.com>
Message-ID: <3E41678F.EEE5B946@silverstar.com>
Source record: 60738
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

> speaking of law things.....are you the same dean arthur that has
been known to rip people off ????????? hmmmm????

Not the "thing" labeled "that" since no sales [only giveaways] and paid
in full for all transactions. Neither ripping off nor ripped off. Can
you say the same?

1656. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-05 20:08:27 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030205150827.23598.00000116@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 60739

In article <c2356669.0302050953.4aa07f70@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
>news:<d22b54c3.0302050116.5942e715@posting.google.com>...
>> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3E40773F.16D904AA@earthlink.net>...
>> > Len Over 21 wrote:
>> > >
>> > > In article <f45722ac.0302030728.34025c95@posting.google.com>,
>> > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>> > >
>> > > >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>> > > >news:<20030203063617.23598.00000079@mb-fz.aol.com>...
>> > > >> In article <3E3D6FD6.1E048EA5@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
>> <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> > > >> writes:
>> > > >>
>> > > >> >Brian wrote:
>> > > >> >>
>> > > >> >> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>> > > >> news:<20030201103647.29016.00000066@mb-fy.aol.com>...
>> > > >
>> > > > I'd like to see a valid record of
>
>(N2EY's)
>
>> > > > experience in
>> > > > actually measuring antenna gains...or even an engineering
>> > > > analysis of such gains (he IS a BSEE he say, gave "talks
>> > > > to industry" too, but I dunno on what...).
>>
>> > "he say"? :-) :-) :-(
>>
>> I say.
>
>As has been pointed out before, W4RNL has done an analysis of the
>T2FD/WBFD antenna. Nobody here has posted a description of any errors
>in that analysis.

Oh, oh, ANOTHER Sermon on the Antenna Mount from the
pedantic parson! Another episode in the on-going soap
opera featuring injured egos valiantly fighting to show they
are "right" by derisively taunting others. :-)

Tsk, tsk, tsk.

"As has been pointed out before..." down-speak. There is no evidence that Rev. Jimmie even knew of Cebik and Antennex columns before "others" mentioned it...now he is a grand champion of antenna analysis by "others" using the Numeric Electromagnetic Code (NEC, not to be confused with National Electrical Code) program core using the method of moments and first available free (in FORTRAN source) in the early 1980s.

Roy Lewallen did a very nice adaptation and rewrite of the NEC core in his EZNEC program (as advertised in QST). Does Rev. Jimmie have a copy? [legal copy, that is?] How about the two others also on the market? Can he operate one? Does it take an MSEE to operate one? [no]

There's no sign that N2EY has done ANY antenna analysis at all...Rev. Jimmie would rather point fingers and say "W4RNL already did it" trying to align his "work" with that of Cebik's.

>
>> WRONG as usual *PUTZ*, big surprise that. Jimbo has an MSEE,
>> you gots nothing even close, NOTHING and you never will, at the height
>> of your self-pronounced glory you were just a lameass aerospace
>> dime-a-dozen bench tech jobbie floundering around yer keyboard today
>> in a time warp.
>
>No need for the pejoratives aimed at Mr. Anderson, Brian. It is a
>common behavior of his to make mistakes about the qualifications of
>those who disagree with him. It's similar to his mistakes about what
>he and others have written in this NG.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. More smutz-smearing. "Mistakes" are the re-definition of "truth" being what the PCTAs think, do, and command. "Disagreement" (with that of a PCTA) is re-defined as a near-capital offense, sullying the "honor" of some morsemen.

>For example, his confusion
>about my homebrewing, kitbuilding and restoration activities, the
>difference between "unprofitable" and "bankrupt", his inability to
>understand K8MN's communications work for the State Department, to
>name just a few.

Yes, tube-based homebrewing, once in a while using an actual semiconductor device, as featured in "Electric Radio" a non-newsstand "fanzine" for boatanchor and old radio fanciers. Making statements that he designs and builds is own equipment several times (note the "and") and then describing his Elecraft kit. "Restoration?" The only "restoration" seems to be the restoring of the good old days in amateur radio before Rev. Jimmie was born. :-)

Amazon.com announced in major newspaper business
sections nearly two weeks ago that it made its SECOND
SUCCESSIVE quarter of profit. Rev. Jimmie must have
been too busy to read of the outside world, busy with
studying "Electric Radio?" He took great offense because
one can buy a quantity of ARRL publications from amazon.
com ($25 or more) and not be charged shipping...yet the
same order for same publicaions at same price from ARRL
direct require EXTRA shipping charges. Tsk, tsk, tsk, one
little negativism towards the Church of St. Hiram and the
pedantic parson got all huffy! :-)

Did "K8MN" do "communications work for State?" No.
Dave Heil did communications work for State. The US
Department of State is not a sponsor of amateur radio
activity nor does it use amateur radio as part of
US government communications. Chalk up another
negativism, a large minus point for the pedantic parson.

>> Jimbo's record in his industry more than speaks for itself and the
>> fact that you "dunno on what" is just one more example of your
>> fundamental cluelessness.
>
>Those who need to know that information have it.

"There you have it." Unverifiable statement, supported by
NO evidence is suddenly re-defined as "truth." Wow,
Orwellian Truthspeak pasted all over the newsgroup! :-)

>Mr. Anderson does not need to know.

Nobody else "need know." Is it some kind of security
classification authorized by the US government? A
foreign government? Trade secret?

>This simple fact angers him, for some reason.

Not really. SNOW JOB blowers are a nuisance. Fish
stories smell as bad as rotten fish. Unverifiable
information is just FALSE statements of braggadoccio.

>Besides,
>since Mr. Anderson has demonstrated that he cannot keep straight the
>qualifications I have already mentioned, there is no reason to burden
>him with more.

What "qualifications?" Self-promotion? Bragging?
Refusal to reveal major life-experience data?

>Indeed, Mr. Anderson finds it necessary to frequently
>rehash his military and employment experiences here, as if they
>somehow have any bearing on amateur radio policy. Yet he never
>explains what connection could exist.

Oh, my...ERROR...the "connection" is that HF radio is HF radio regardless of the radio service using it. Radio physics in amateur radio is the same as any other radio service. Radio physics does not change by human legislative classification.

That has been repeated in here many times and is TRUTH in all-capitals, no re-definition at all.

Rev. Jimmie has a loss of circuit continuity. He cannot see that much of HF radio use by hams of today is AS IT WAS FIFTY YEARS AGO in part of the rest of the radio world. That's more serious than myopia or mental tunnel vision. He won't acknowledge any "connection" because that would dissolve his fantasy world of preserving the old ways forever and ever.

The fantasy is "US amateur radio is all about working DX on HF with CW."

They are the few, the proud, the Morsemen!

Long may they wave. [...bye-bye...one hopes]

1657. Re: arrl article on echolink - impress a non ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-05 20:30:42 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E4174D1.867F6F57@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60740

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E407667.75BD00B4@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >> Who "called?" The next Tom Clancy CIA operative out of exotic
> >> middle-somewhere Africa? :-)
> > >
> > >Did you have another comment on my "vanity" callsign?
>
> Only that Heil appears to be ALL vanity... :-)

C'mon, Len. Did you have any real input on what you incorrectly call my
"vanity callsign" or are we just seeing "callsign envy" on your part?

Dave K8MN

1658. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-05 20:32:50 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0302051232.1af8b35e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60741

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<b1rahd7q05@enews3.newsguy.com>...
> I do not support any measure of registration for ham gear in the manner
> similar to the way guns are registered but I do support any legislation
> supporting the sale of transmitting equipment to those that hold the
> appropriate licensure for that equipment. (I said transmitting, not
> recieving equipment)

The problem is that such a system would amount to de facto
registration.
>
> IMHO, I think places like Radio Shack should have to ask for your license
> before you are allowed to purchase transmitting equipment. There definitely
> needs to be done with the sale of amateur equipment to non-licensed persons.
> (reference the problem with 10 meters for starters.)

OK, fine. I go to RS or HRO or wherever and buy a new Ikensu DGX-5000.
SHow my license and the clerk takes down the info.

Couple years later I sell the rig. Do I have to check the license of
the buyer? How do I know the buyer is a for-real ham, anyway, if the
sale is via eBay or some such? Do I have to let RS or HRO know that I
sold the DGX-5000?

Suppose a ham's unlicensed spouse wants to buy "that dream rig" as a
present - how can that be done? What about prospective hams who are
going to take the test in the near future? Etc.

Most of all, what about the purchase of rigs that a ham is "partially"
licensed to use? Example: New ham has a Tech but wants to buy an
FT-897 or similar MF/HF/VHF all-in-one box. This ham is licensed for
VHF/UHF but not HF - can he/she buy the rig legally or not?
>
> If this is not the answer, what is? What allows us to normally purchase
> stuff we have a right to, by licensure, but keeps the transmitting equipment
> out of the hands of unlicensed persons?? A better way I would like to see
> this thread go.... Maybe there might actually be some positive suggestions.

Simple - more and better enforcement of existing laws. Go after those
who are actually misusing the gear, not those who simply own it.
>

> --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
> .. --. .... - . .-. ...
>

That part I agree with!

73 de Jim, N2EY>
>
>
>
>
> > >Anyone (...and I mean anyone) who would lend their
> > >support to this insane proposal is aiding totalitarian
> > >style controls to the private ownership of a radio
> > >transmitter.
> > >
> > And such a rule simply won't work. External RF power amplifiers for the 27
> MHz
> > range have been heavily regulated for 25 years now. Has that stopped their
> > illegal manufacture, sale or use? Not that I can see. All the proposed
> rule
> > will do is add an unnecessary level of paperwork and regulation to
> law-abiding
> > radio owners while doing little or nothing to stop violators.

1659. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-05 20:53:11 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E417A07.7CBF6D59@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60742

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E409005.BD650A22@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <20030204063616.05048.00000443@mb-cs.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
> >(N2EY)
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >That was not my intention. I have no idea hw much experience, knowledge or
> >> >skill he has with HF antennas.
> >>
> >> Since when has actual knowledge of anyone stopped Rev.
> >> Jimmie from making uneducated guesses about technical
> >> knowledge of others? He will presuppose anything to make
> >> his message case.
> >>
> >
> > >Whew! Thanks for the yuks, Len. When were you ever stopped from making
> > >uneducated guesses about the technical knowledge of others or about
> > >another's job?
>
> This is an unmoderated newsgroup permitting anyone to
> access it. Nobody has stopped me physically or electrically
> from using it. Some individual ethnic cleansers have been
> continually trying to scrub away those wanting amateur
> radio to get out of the last century and into the new millennium.
> All of those ethnic cleansers are PCTAs. They turn it into a
> weird soap opera trying to do all that cleansing. :-)

All of us already knew that the newsgroup is unmoderated. What I asked
was when you'd been stopped from doing the very things of which you
accuse N2EY?
Why are you worried about an endeavor in which you are not even a
participant?

Thanks for admitting that no one has stopped you from posting in any
way.
What ethnic minority do you belong to?

> >Did you ever,
> >for example, misquote someone and keep repeating the same falsehood for
> >years?

>
> What "falsehood," Ma Perkins? :-)

What is the smiley for, Len? You don't feel like answering?

> >Did you ever make any blanket statements about N2EY's technical
> >ability?
>
> Yes. He "designs and builds his own radio equipment" just
> like that Elecraft K2 he has described. He must have
> "designed" it. :-)
>
> Now Jimmie will just have to jump in here and say "he never
> said that and everyone go back to Google, now, now." :-)
>
> I don't recall ANY statement about blankets, though. Better
> get right over to Google and search and search until you
> find one.

Your comments don't seem to address technical ability. Don't care to
answer that one either?

> >W0EX's technical ability?
>
> No. I don't think he has much. I remember well his trying
> to make intelligent remarks with Cecil Moore. He might
> have tried real hard, but nothing much came out, would up
> just being trying.

You think but you have no way of really knowing. It looks like an
uneducated guess on your part.

> >my technical ability?
>
> I'm not too fond of yours, either. Hard to tell if you have some
> since so much time is spent in here attacking the persons
> of your "opponents." :-)

I didn't ask you if you were fond of my technical ability. I asked if
you'd made any statements without possessing any real knowledge of my
technical background. Your last sentence above could apply to you.

> Remember, 7 x 24 = 168, nor 148?

Remember "Go such an 807 plate cap"? How about "nor 148"?

> >I'd have to call those statements uneducated guesses.
>
> You MUST disparage them. You are obsessed with
> conservative-traditionalist "ethnic cleansing" in here
> in order to portray the guru and elder statesman among
> the PCTAs.

You MUST be a mind reader. You know all about what other people can and
can't do. You divine insight to their technical abilities from the
aether. From what ethnic minority group do you spring?

> >Your uneducated guess on the Key Officers listings didn't pan out very
> >well, did it?
>
> I would expect "key lists" to be a listing of encryption keys,
> the master listing of keys to be used. That's how it was
> in older times before CWO Walker did his treasonous
> work in the USN.
>
> "Key officers" are normally the corporate or government lists
> of "key people," the "key" referring to important/valuable
> persons and liberally used to inflate egos of the named "keys."
> No doubt State thinks ALL its embassy staff are "key players."

Ah, you're starting down the path of deliberate falsehood again. I've
already addressed your nonsense about what State "thinks" about its Key
Officer listings. Those listings don't carry the names of those who
worked under me.
They don't list the entire staff of the Political or Economics
sections. They don't list the entire staff of the Defense Attache
Office. They don't list the entire USAID staff.

I want to be sure that I understand one point you've attempted to make:
You believe that State sends out these lists twice yearly in printed and
electronic form to every U.S. embassy and consulate to massage the egos
of those listed therein. Is that about it?

> Call them what you will. I say staff listings are just staff
> listings regardless of the fancy list heading.

You surely say that now rather than eating crow. Just a week ago, you
called them Key Officer listings and claimed I wasn't on any of them.
You're certainly rewriting your history on the fly.

> >How're you coming along finding those archived posts which will no doubt
> >prove you right? *snicker* I'm a patient fellow. Go on with your
> >research.
>
> Why? I don't live in Google trying to find the least bit of
> FIVE YEAR OLD POSTINGS to avenge some perceived
> slight. Went there once recently, that was that.

I wouldn't live there either if I were you. Google can be a very scary
place and you could be bitten on the ass by your own words. What you
describe as a slight wasn't that at all. It was you stating a falsehood
over a period of five years despite having been corrected a number of
times. Would you like me to post every instance where you've repeated
that lie along with every instance of rebuttal by me? Google can be a
very scary place to a guy like you.

> I'm still waiting for a technically-valid reason for switching
> to CW to "coordinate" schedules and comm data, then
> going back to TTY for regular messages. If TTY works, a
> common-sense radio person would use TTY to
> "coordinate" skeds. If CW is needed for "coordination"
> then TTY won't work for regular traffic.

So you say. It certainly looks like you'll have to seek your answers in Google. Be careful about being bitten in the ass.

> No doubt Heil is going to bitch and moan and issue
> misdirection nastygrams for ANOTHER 5 years without
> giving a technical justification. :-)

...without providing yet another one? Yes.

> Scrub, scrub, scrub...

Washing the egg from your face?

Dave K8MN

1660. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-05 20:57:56 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E417B33.951CC769@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60743

Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > I worked the Johnston Island station on 75m SSB too. :-) :-) :-(
>
> Yee Haw! Good show!
>
> Check this one: The word just came down thru the club reflector that
> "Delmarva Jon" AA1K nailed JT1CO for the first ever 160 WAZ. Stew
> Perry would be amazed if he was still amongst us. Jon done it all with
> high loss antennas around the compass.

I understand that Bill W4ZV nailed it too with a JT1CO contact. I'm still trying to hear the guy. If I only had one of those spiffy T2FD's...

Dave K8MN

1661. Re: The coders embarrass themselves on 14.275 MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-05 23:38:51 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b1s7er$ec8$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 60745
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:b1rahe8q05@enews3.newsguy.com...
> Ya know.... most of the terminology like "for ID" or "destinated" or
"first
> personal" and many other terminology/phrases that I have heard being used
> have been used by the "old timers" in my area, people who have been
licensed
> at least 20 years or more....

And the problem with the use of those phrases is what?

> If anything they are setting a bad example
> for the newbies coming into the hobby as they may have a tendancy to think
> that is the way it is supposed to be done since the "old timers" are doing
> it that way.

Why are those terms/phrases a bad example?

> Prime example, the use of "for ID" was a learning experience
> for me. I listened (and still do) to the ham bands on scanners for quite
a
> while and heard that particular phrase quite often. Therefore I deduced it
> must be a standard practice since I have not seen a book that truly
handles
> how a QSO should be handled on voice modes. The ARRL text barely covers
it.
> Maybe someone will write a book about that eh??

Much ado about nothing. The language we use on the air
isn't cast in stone. The three phrases above I hear and have
used myself. Who cares?

> Another one is the usage of the word "clear." In other services the word
is
> used often, and there is no problem with it. I view it as a courtesy to
> others who were courteous enough to wait until you were done trying to
call
> the person you were trying to call and letting them know you were done....
> But I am sure there are others with a different opinion.

I use "Clear" myself. If I transmit "K2UNK listening" on a repeater
and no one responds, I'll usually then say "K2UNK Clear" if
I'm going to change to a different repeater. It tells anyone that heard
me that I'm not listening anymore.

> In the absence of
> text or rulebooks covering a particular issue, I guess a person needs to
> make their best common sense guess.

We have too many nonsense rules. If it isn't the law, then personal
operating practices that differ from what some unwritten rule or
practice that others believe is sacrosanct just doesn't both me.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1662. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL support it ??)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-05 23:39:22 UTC
From: cheesecutter@webhideout.com
Message-ID: <fef386d5.0302051539.46154c60@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60744
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

Dean Arthur <dearthur@silverstar.com> wrote in message
news:<3E41678F.EEE5B946@silverstar.com>...
> > speaking of law things.....are you the same dean arthur that has
> been known to rip people off ????????? hmmmm????
>
> Not the "thing" labeled "that" since no sales [only giveaways] and paid
> in full for all transactions. Neither ripping off nor ripped off. Can
> you say the same?

oh ok.....you are right.....i had you mixed up with somebody
else..actually you are that fat slob of a pseudo technician that got
his ass fired over at cb city.....now i remember....welcome back
numbnutts.....

1663. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL support it ??)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-06 01:25:05 UTC
From: Dean Arthur <dearthur@silverstar.com>
Message-ID: <3E41B974.B333DB37@silverstar.com>
Source record: 60746
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

>,,,welcome back numbnutts

You're right there. Between Diabetes, phlebitis and non-benign
Parkinson's, my nutts stopped functioning two years ago!

1664. Re:Why one more "worthy" of coverage than other?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-06 01:42:11 UTC
From: Dean Arthur <dearthur@silverstar.com>
Message-ID: <3E41BD77.A92609D6@silverstar.com>
Source record: 60747
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Money, money, money!

1665. Re: Thoughts on the Columbia tragedy.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-06 01:43:11 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030205204311.27873.00000452@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 60750

In article <20030204084925.23989.00000127@mb-fz.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

> Secondly, why doesn't "the media" spend any significant time showing
>Americans (and subsequently the whole world) just how much thier lives ARE
>impacted by the space program? People shouldn't have to go to the Discovery
>or
>TLC channels to see what's being done for them. Too many people still think
>the space program is there JUST to show that IT (flying in space) can be
>done.
>
> They don't.
>
>>It's a simple matter of coverage.
>
> Change "coverage" to "sensationalism" and I'll agree wholeheartedly.
>
>>For all other great accomplishments and tragic failures that we know of
>>personally, by aren't publicized, it's up to the individual or individuals
>>that witness them to celebrate or mourn them in our own thoughts and
>>circles.

Part of the problem is that the space program, particularly the shuttle, was originally sold to the American people as something quite different than the inherently risky, experimental, cutting edge program that it really is. Remember when we were told that STS would be a "space truck" that would do all sorts of jobs better and cheaper than "throw-away" rockets?

Much of the Shuttle's original stated mission has been taken over by "throwaway rockets" and unmanned satellites.
>
> I know it's morbid to say "only" when we are discussing people's deaths,
>but the truth is there have only been 17 deaths in America's space program
>since 1968. That averages out to less than two people a year.

Redo the math, Steve. One person every two years.

But consider the Shuttle's performance record. Two complete losses in less than 115 flights - that's a failure rate of once every ~57 flights.
>
> Now, consider that the benefits of the space program touch millions of
>people every day. In my case I am an ER nurse, and I know for a fact at
>least
>a dozen items I use on a near-daily basis are spin-offs of or were directly
>developed for the space program. Now multiply my experiences by 30,000 (just
>a

>rough number of ER nurses) and it's easy to see how it truly DOES benefit
>millions.

Agreed.

But the real question is not "should we have a space program?" - the obvious answer is yes. The real, hard-to-answer question is, "are we going about the space program in the best way?" - and that's not an easy question to answer.

How much does a typical STS mission cost, beginning to end, and how much benefit do we get from it?

> The medium we share these comments on...while not directly created for
>the space program, was certainly a significant factor in it's proliferation.

Sure - the basic development back in the '60s and '70s.

Please understand I'm NOT saying the money is wasted or that manned space flight should stop. Just that there may be better ways than the ones currently in use.
>
> Now we're up to billions.
>
> It's astounding.

Not really. Look at the progress in aviation in the 20th century - from Kitty Hawk to the first supersonic flight in 44 years. From supersonic flight to the moon in 22 more years.
>
> My prayers to their Families, Godspeed to NASA in finding out what
>happened, and time to go forward.
>
Agreed.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1666. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-06 01:43:12 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030205204312.27873.00000453@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 60748

In article <b1q1jhfuj1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

(snip of my earlier comments)

>Jim's comments are right on....

tnx Bill

>and let's be serious here...this
>idea is dead on arrival other than going through the mechanics
>of the process.
>
I really hope you are right about that.

>The FCC is just letting the process run its course.

Better get our comments in, then.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1667. Re: Montana and Florida

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-06 01:43:12 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030205204312.27873.00000454@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 60749

In article <aFY%9.166405$VU6.133133@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net>, "Jackie"
<buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030204083636.03273.00000344@mb-mb.aol.com...
>
>> Particulalry impressive considering the antenna went up during a Minnesota
>> winter.
>
>No doubt, Jim... and in the middle of a snowstorm... really (we got 8" of
>snow last Sunday!)

Back in Wayne County, NY, we called that a "dusting". Here in the Philly area
they call it a "blizzard".
>
>Going to check out 20 meters now... see ya!
>
Tally ho!

73 de Jim, N2EY

1668. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-06 02:40:00 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b1si2bkot1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 60751

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:b1rahd7q05@enews3.newsguy.com...
> I do not support any measure of registration for ham gear in the manner
> similar to the way guns are registered but I do support any legislation
> supporting the sale of transmitting equipment to those that hold the
> appropriate licensure for that equipment. (I said transmitting, not
> recieving equipment)

So you would not want me to sell my current rig unless I check the
license of the person buying it?

> IMHO, I think places like Radio Shack should have to ask for your license
> before you are allowed to purchase transmitting equipment. There
definitely
> needs to be done with the sale of amateur equipment to non-licensed
persons.
> (reference the problem with 10 meters for starters.)

So when I was a teenager, I shouldn't have been allowed to purchase the
transmitter that I saved up for while studying for my license?

> If this is not the answer, what is? What allows us to normally purchase
> stuff we have a right to, by licensure, but keeps the transmitting
equipment
> out of the hands of unlicensed persons??

You don't need a license to buy a car?

> A better way I would like to see
> this thread go.... Maybe there might actually be some positive
suggestions.

The whole concept of requiring a license to purchase, and/or
registration of transmitting equipment is just a beaurocratic
impossibility (IMHO)...for no other reason than the fact that
there must be hundreds of thousands of rigs out there
already that can be and are bought/sold through many
non-commercial venues (classifieds, ebay, flea markets, etc.)

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1669. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-06 02:42:45 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030205214245.14740.00000086@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 60752

>Subject: Re: NR-1 Book
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/4/03 2:50 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030204155050.26864.00001217@mb-mq.aol.com>

>Since when has actual knowledge of anyone stopped Rev.
> Jimmie from making uneducated guesses about technical
> knowledge of others? He will presuppose anything to make
> his message case.

Pot/kettle/black

As demonstrated in recent threads dedicated to you, Lennie, YOUR posts are ripe with LACK of facts.

>>Is the above untrue? I don't see how it's an insult. I don't have much
>>knowledge of ancient Chinese pottery.
>
>Pottery and ceramics is another newsgroup. Go there.

As there are newsgroups for people wanting to discuss war stories, commercial radio and radio control of aircraft...But it's never stopped you from doing it here, Your Supreme Putziness.

>>Is the above untrue? I don't see how it's an insult. I lack skill in flying
>>aircraft, so I might want to start out with one that required less skill
>>than, say, a P-51 Mustang.
>
> Har!

I don't find Leonard H. Anderson in the FAA database.

>>Some folks see insults where there are only plain, simple facts.
>
> Yes, Rev. Jimmie comes unglued when FACTS are presented
> in front of him in public.

Kinda like Lennie the Liar seeing his own words repeated back to him in threads highlighting his own newsgroup misdeeds...?!?!

No...Nothing at ALL like it...Jim Miccolis' posts are factual. Leonard H. Anderson's are not.

>A 234 foot long dipole is NOT a pretty sight in a residential
> neighborhood. Go take your 2 MHz dipole out in the
> country.

A matter of opinon. I think seeing my neighbor's wife walking to the mailbox in robe and curlers is far more offensive than any antenna I have EVER seen.

Ya PUTZ.

Steve

1670. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-06 02:46:49 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030205214649.14740.00000087@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 60753

>Subject: Re: NR-1 Book
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/5/03 1:27 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030205022756.17159.00000020@mb-fx.aol.com>

>>How're you coming along finding those archived posts which will no doubt
>>prove you right? *snicker* I'm a patient fellow. Go on with your
>>research.
>
> Why? I don't live in Google trying to find the least bit of
> FIVE YEAR OLD POSTINGS to avenge some perceived
> slight...(SNIP)

You should, Lennie.

Just for my own edification, I DID go back and try to find any posts that reflected your ideation of what Dave said.

They aren't there.

> Scrub, scrub, scrub...

Yes, Lennie...Do your best to clean up after yourself...You DO make SUCH a mess....

Ya PUTZ

Steve

1671. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-06 02:47:40 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b1sig6lr1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 60754

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0302051232.1af8b35e@posting.google.com...
> "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<b1rahd7q05@enews3.newsguy.com>...
> > I do not support any measure of registration for ham gear in the manner
> > similar to the way guns are registered but I do support any legislation
> > supporting the sale of transmitting equipment to those that hold the
> > appropriate licensure for that equipment. (I said transmitting, not
> > recieving equipment)
>
> The problem is that such a system would amount to de facto
> registration.

True, and even if it was done, who would it be enforced against.
Retail point-of-sale only, private sales, used equipment, etc.?

> > IMHO, I think places like Radio Shack should have to ask for your
license
> > before you are allowed to purchase transmitting equipment. There
definitely
> > needs to be done with the sale of amateur equipment to non-licensed
persons.
> > (reference the problem with 10 meters for starters.)
>
> OK, fine. I go to RS or HRO or wherever and buy a new Ikensu DGX-5000.
> SHow my license and the clerk takes down the info.
>
> Couple years later I sell the rig. Do I have to check the license of
> the buyer? How do I know the buyer is a for-real ham, anyway, if the
> sale is via eBay or some such? Do I have to let RS or HRO know that I
> sold the DGX-5000?
>
> Suppose a ham's unlicensed spouse wants to buy "that dream rig" as a
> present - how can that be done? What about prospective hams who are
> going to take the test in the near future? Etc.
>
> Most of all, what about the purchase of rigs that a ham is "partially"
> licensed to use? Example: New ham has a Tech but wants to buy an
> FT-897 or similar MF/HF/VHF all-in-one box. This ham is licensed for
> VHF/UHF but not HF - can he/she buy the rig legally or not?

All great examples of exactly why the petition will go nowhere.

> > If this is not the answer, what is? What allows us to normally
purchase
> > stuff we have a right to, by licensure, but keeps the transmitting
equipment
> > out of the hands of unlicensed persons?? A better way I would like to
see
> > this thread go.... Maybe there might actually be some positive
suggestions.
>
> Simple - more and better enforcement of existing laws. Go after those
> who are actually misusing the gear, not those who simply own it.

EXACTLY!

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1672. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-06 02:49:55 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030205214955.14740.00000088@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 60755

>Subject: Re: NR-1 Book
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/4/03 12:54 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030204135409.03943.00000169@mb-fj.aol.com>

>"Amateur radio is all about working DX on HF with CW."

You keep reciting this quote, Lennie, but you never cite the author. No one in HERE has said it EXCEPT you, and you are not in any position to validate it by experience.

So who said it?

Steve, K4YZ

1673. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-06 03:03:08 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030205220308.14740.00000089@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 60756

>Subject: Re: NR-1 Book
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/5/03 1:05 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030205140507.20325.00001146@mb-fo.aol.com>

>That can't be me since I was never employed as a job-shopper
> or "temp" in the aerospace industry.

Not according to your frequently recited "CV", Lennie.

>Whom is Kellie smutzing now?

We could ask the same of you, but WE know that the only person YOU are
"smutzing" is yourself. The funny part is you don't even realize it!

>What is more
> important (and probably devastating to Kellie) is that Brian
> can think for himself and is not afraid to speak out when some
> OFs vent gas in here on the "correct, proper anything"
> according to the OF's directives on what all hams must do.

Acutally, you can change "devastating" to "laughable" since Brian is
constantly stepping on his own tail. Some people should be a bit more
reluctant to "speak out" when they are so-clearly confused.

>If Kellie means Jimmie Miccolis, there is a problem.

Who's "Jimmie" Miccolis? I don't recall him calling you "Lennie" or
anything else other than "Len" or "Mr. Anderson".

I >>DO<< recall YOU whining about this being done to you ahnd how you
wouldn't do that to anyone who didn't do it to you.

But you ARE a pathological liar, and we do not expect you to live up to
your word, ergo we are not disappointed.

Ya PUTZ.

Steve

1674. Re: arrl article on echolink - impress a non ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-06 03:05:42 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030205220542.14740.00000090@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 60757

>Subject: Re: arrl article on echolink - impress a non ham
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 2/5/03 2:30 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3E4174D1.867F6F57@earthlink.net>

>C'mon, Len. Did you have any real input on what you incorrectly call my
>"vanity callsign" or are we just seeing "callsign envy" on your part?

Must be, Dave...Just like the OTHER kind of "envy", he's obsessing over
something he does not have, but which someone else does...

And not only do they have "it", they know how to USE it!

73

Steve, K4YZ

1675. Re: GROL vs Amateur Privileges

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-06 03:08:18 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030205220818.14740.00000091@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 60758

>Subject: Re: GROL vs Amateur Privileges
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/4/03 12:54 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030204135407.03943.00000166@mb-fj.aol.com>

>No matter that once there were classes...(SNIP)

"Once"...as in the past...As in no longer. As in NOT GERMANE.

>All that for a hobby activity.

A hobby for some.

Steve, K4YZ

1676. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-06 03:13:16 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030205221316.14740.00000092@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 60759

>Subject: Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 2/4/03 5:48 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0302041548.21274c4a@posting.google.com>

>So now you're calling Morgan Fairchild a liar?

Once again, Brain is caught short.

Nice job, Brain.

Steve

1677. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-06 03:15:16 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030205221516.14740.00000093@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 60760

>Subject: Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 2/4/03 1:44 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0302041144.36a955e0@posting.google.com>

>> >You still won't get a T5 card from me...(SNIP)
>>
>> Neither will anyone else.
>
>I've still got a few left.

I am sure you've got a whole shoebox full of them.

Steve, K4YZ

1678. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-06 03:34:51 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0302051934.5e52685c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60761

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0302050644.ecd4173@posting.google.com>...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0302050116.5942e715@posting.google.com>...
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E40773F.16D904AA@earthlink.net>...
>
> > > I worked the Johnston Island station on 75m SSB too. :-) :-) :-(
>
> Should be- :))
>
> > Yee Haw! Good show!
> >
> > Check this one: The word just came down thru the club reflector that
> > "Delmarva Jon" AA1K nailed JT1CO for the first ever 160 WAZ. Stew
> > Perry would be amazed if he was still amongst us. Jon done it all with
> > high loss antennas around the compass.
>
> That's sweet! Which high loss antenna(s) was he using? Hardline loop?

Dunno for certain yet but prolly phased Beverages. The boy has some acreage.

1679. Re: arrl article on echolink - impress a non ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-06 04:00:50 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030205230050.28727.00000079@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 60762

From K4YZ:
>>C'mon, Len. Did you have any real input on what you incorrectly call my
>>"vanity callsign" or are we just seeing "callsign envy" on your part?

Seems like Len had his fair share of radios. Why would he have "callsign envy"?

1680. Re: GROL vs Amateur Privileges

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-06 04:06:05 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.h9v0ub4.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 60764

On 05 Feb 2003 07:27:54 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:

>> In your dreams, brother. Most of the comm attorneys whom I know
>> that take amateur cases do so for very mimimal or no fee if the
>> case has merit.
>
> No revenue? For an attorney?!? Incroyable! :-)

We lose money on every case but make it up in volume. <ggg>

Nighty night, Len.....

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1681. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-06 04:06:06 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.h9v3m16.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 60763

On Wed, 5 Feb 2003 01:46:27 -0500, KC8PMX wrote:

>If this is not the answer, what is? What allows us to normally purchase
>stuff we have a right to, by licensure, but keeps the transmitting equipment
>out of the hands of unlicensed persons?? A better way I would like to see
>this thread go.... Maybe there might actually be some positive suggestions.

When I worked for the Israeli Ministry of Communications (granted, a long time ago), they had a transmitter registration system like that. Dealers or private parties were not allowed to import or transfer possession of radio transmitters to anyone else without written permission of the Ministry (the equivalent of the FCC) and all radio licenses in all services had model and serial numbers recorded on them. The dealers/sellers were required to keep an inventory log of equipment sales/transfers by model and serial number. My job, among many, included review of the applications and approval of the transfer permits. It took up about an hour a day of my time and several hours a day of the two clerks who worked for me. And that was a very small country with not a lot of radios in "civilian" hands.

Let's not get into "rights" - let's just talk about the bureaucracy that would be needed for that here...makes the collective DMV nationwide look like a picnic.

Fortunately I believe that the FCC will agree that it's not for us.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1682. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-06 04:06:07 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.h9v1ep5.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 60765

On 05 Feb 2003 07:28:00 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:

>> That
>> never happened at my agency. Then again, none of them were ham radio
>> operations anyhow.
>
> So, by that veiled inference, you WANT amateur radio to
> retain old, outmoded manual morse testing? Why?

You have a reading problem? Reread my comments in the restructuring docket about dropping the Morse test requirement and the NCI reply comment referring to it, and THEN ask again whether I want to retain Morse testing in the ARS....(short answer - I do not).

I may be a competent Morse examiner but a "morseman" I am not.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1683. Re: ARS License Numbers (quantity vs quality)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-06 04:29:25 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030205232925.28727.00000080@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 60766

I have built kits, Heathkit oscilloscope for example. Also, made many mini circuits: op-amp circuits, counter circuits, telephone circuits, and various others. Many visits to radio shack. Took apart power supplies, or other sections of items that would have been thrown away.

Didn't get into (radio) electronics until later. Made some transmitter circuits (my own). Now I have a Spectrum Analyzer to use.

I took a few rf and communications courses. In one microwave electronics course the approach was not too useful. In first class Prof listed reference books for the course. I was disappointed that not one of these was an ARRL publication. ARRL publication often has very good book with practical circuits. If there was a lab and ARRL book was one of the books, the course quality would be ALOT better.

I would like to do more, alot more. I would like to do some coil circuits: torroids, baluns, matching circuits, coupling circuits. These topics often do not get enough coverage in an academic course.

Unfortunately, pretty soon amateur radio will probably become just a diversion to me. A fond memory. Then, the only homebrewing I might do would be homebrewing beer.

1684. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL support it ??)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-06 04:47:26 UTC
From: John <Y4@datbehappn'.net>
Message-ID: <v43q6llfh3mlc5@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 60767
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

Sounds like John Aschcroft is gettin' bored again. How did this
jackmeat get so much power, he wasn't elcted to office. Come to think
of it, neither was his boss.....What the F**K is Ashcroft doing,
just 'cause he got beat in the last election he ran in by a dead guy
doesn't mean he has the right to totally trash OUR Constitution and OUR
rights. "OUR" includes you..... Thank God we only have 2 more
years of this crap. Hopefully we'll survive it but I have my doubts.

1685. Re: arrl article on echolink - impress a non ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-06 06:32:16 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E4201AC.F241D6B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60768

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From K4YZ:
> >>C'mon, Len. Did you have any real input on what you incorrectly call my
> >>"vanity callsign" or are we just seeing "callsign envy" on your part?
>
> Seems like Len had his fair share of radios. Why would he have "callsign envy"?

Hmmmmmm. Let me ponder this one. Hmmmmmm. It'll only be speculation on my part but I'd guess it is because he doesn't have a callsign. He doesn't have a callsign because he doesn't have an amateur radio license. He doesn't have an amateur radio license because, despite a decades long interest, he isn't really THAT interested.

My Aunt Faye had a lot of radios too. She didn't have an amateur radio license either but she enjoyed listening to WBZ, KDKA and WWVA in her room, in the kitchen, in the living room and out on the porch.

Do try and get it right, Vipul. K4YZ did not write the statement you attribute to him. I did.

Dave K8MN

1686. Re: Montana and Florida

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-06 06:38:34 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b1tt103285n@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 60777

Jeeesh.... wish we had that much snow.... we may be lucky if we had 8
separate 1" snowfalls here in Mid-Michigan!!!!!

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

"Jackie" <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> wrote in message
news:aFY%9.166405$VU6.133133@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net...
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030204083636.03273.00000344@mb-mb.aol.com...
>
> > Particulalry impressive considering the antenna went up during a
Minnesota
> > winter.
>
> No doubt, Jim... and in the middle of a snowstorm... really (we got 8" of
> snow last Sunday!)
>
> Going to check out 20 meters now... see ya!
>
> Jackie
>
>

1687. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-06 06:46:43 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b1tt134285n@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 60778

If they are purchasing I would say yes. If they are being paid to transport
I would think not. With only a few exceptions that is not required more
most transport people. Talk about being silly....

>
> Then Radio Shack personnel at their warehouse would have to show a license
> to the delivery truck? And how about the truck driver?

Right..... and I agree with the first sentence below. Any positive
suggestions for the second sentence??

>
> Possesion of radio equipment is and must be legal. It's the operation of
> it that is and must be regulated.
>

Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

1688. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-06 06:49:46 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b1tt1a5285n@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 60779

Alrighty then Jim.... like I said to the other guy.... what is the solution then, to keep the transmitting equipment out of the hands of the ones that should not have transmitting equipment? Any constructive ideas? We as a collective group can sit around and bitch about the problem with 10 meters (and other bands as well) but unless something is done, it will get worse.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0302051232.1af8b35e@posting.google.com...
> "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<b1rahd7q05@enews3.newsguy.com>...
> > I do not support any measure of registration for ham gear in the manner
> > similar to the way guns are registered but I do support any legislation
> > supporting the sale of transmitting equipment to those that hold the
> > appropriate licensure for that equipment. (I said transmitting, not
> > recieving equipment)
>
> The problem is that such a system would amount to de facto
> registration.
> >
> > IMHO, I think places like Radio Shack should have to ask for your
license
> > before you are allowed to purchase transmitting equipment. There
definitely
> > needs to be done with the sale of amateur equipment to non-licensed
persons.
> > (reference the problem with 10 meters for starters.)
>
> OK, fine. I go to RS or HRO or wherever and buy a new Ikensu DGX-5000.
> SHow my license and the clerk takes down the info.
>
> Couple years later I sell the rig. Do I have to check the license of
> the buyer? How do I know the buyer is a for-real ham, anyway, if the
> sale is via eBay or some such? Do I have to let RS or HRO know that I
> sold the DGX-5000?
>
> Suppose a ham's unlicensed spouse wants to buy "that dream rig" as a

> present - how can that be done? What about prospective hams who are
> going to take the test in the near future? Etc.
>
> Most of all, what about the purchase of rigs that a ham is "partially"
> licensed to use? Example: New ham has a Tech but wants to buy an
> FT-897 or similar MF/HF/VHF all-in-one box. This ham is licensed for
> VHF/UHF but not HF - can he/she buy the rig legally or not?
> >
> > If this is not the answer, what is? What allows us to normally
purchase
> > stuff we have a right to, by licensure, but keeps the transmitting
equipment
> > out of the hands of unlicensed persons?? A better way I would like to
see
> > this thread go.... Maybe there might actually be some positive
suggestions.
>
> Simple - more and better enforcement of existing laws. Go after those
> who are actually misusing the gear, not those who simply own it.
> >
>
> > --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
> > .. --. .... - . .-. ...
> >
> That part I agree with!
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY>
> >
> >
> >
> >
> > > >Anyone (...and I mean anyone) who would lend their
> > > >support to this insane proposal is aiding totalitarian
> > > >style controls to the private ownership of a radio
> > > >transmitter.
> > > >
> > > And such a rule simply won't work. External RF power amplifiers for
the 27
> > MHz
> > > range have been heavily regulated for 25 years now. Has that stopped
their
> > > illegal manufacture, sale or use? Not that I can see. All the proposed
> > rule
> > > will do is add an unnecessary level of paperwork and regulation to
> > law-abiding
> > > radio owners while doing little or nothing to stop violators.

1689. Re: The coders embarrass themselves on 14.275 MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-06 06:57:39 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b1tt1f6285n@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 60781
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:b1s7er$ec8$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
> news:b1rahe8q05@enews3.newsguy.com...
> > Ya know.... most of the terminology like "for ID" or "destinated" or
> "first
> > personal" and many other terminology/phrases that I have heard being
used
> > have been used by the "old timers" in my area, people who have been
> licensed
> > at least 20 years or more....
>
> And the problem with the use of those phrases is what?

I don't see to much of a problem with them myself, but some here in
newsgroups as well as others in my area have expressed dislike in practices
like that in others....

>
> > If anything they are setting a bad example
> > for the newbies coming into the hobby as they may have a tendancy to
think
> > that is the way it is supposed to be done since the "old timers" are
doing
> > it that way.
>
> Why are those terms/phrases a bad example?

See above response....

>
> > Prime example, the use of "for ID" was a learning experience
> > for me. I listened (and still do) to the ham bands on scanners for
quite
> a
> > while and heard that particular phrase quite often. Therefore I deduced
it
> > must be a standard practice since I have not seen a book that truly
> handles
> > how a QSO should be handled on voice modes. The ARRL text barely covers
> it.
> > Maybe someone will write a book about that eh??
>

> Much ado about nothing. The language we use on the air
> isn't cast in stone. The three phrases above I hear and have
> used myself. Who cares?
>

Again see above comment....

> > Another one is the usage of the word "clear." In other services the
word
> is
> > used often, and there is no problem with it. I view it as a courtesy to
> > others who were courteous enough to wait until you were done trying to
> call
> > the person you were trying to call and letting them know you were
done....
> > But I am sure there are others with a different opinion.
>
> I use "Clear" myself. If I transmit "K2UNK listening" on a repeater
> and no one responds, I'll usually then say "K2UNK Clear" if
> I'm going to change to a different repeater. It tells anyone that heard
> me that I'm not listening anymore.

Sounds good to me.... "listening" or "monitoring" after a call is nice,
short and sweet and gets the point across. I usually use "clear" after
making a direct call to another, and if I am going to a different frequency
I will say something like "KC8PMX clear, switching to _____ frequency," as
opposed to QSY which must be one of the deadly sins apparently on FM voice
as I have heard.

>
> > In the absence of
> > text or rulebooks covering a particular issue, I guess a person needs to
> > make their best common sense guess.
>
> We have too many nonsense rules. If it isn't the law, then personal
> operating practices that differ from what some unwritten rule or
> practice that others believe is sacrosanct just doesn't both me.
>

I would agree with a part of that statement. For me the rules that are
clear as a bell are fine, it is the ones that are completely open for
interpretation that need to be cleared up.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

1690. Re: arrl article on echolink - impress a non ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-06 10:38:25 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030206053825.11866.00000418@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 60769

>Subject: Re: arrl article on echolink - impress a non ham
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 2/5/03 10:00 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030205230050.28727.00000079@mb-fr.aol.com>
>
>From K4YZ:
>>>C'mon, Len. Did you have any real input on what you incorrectly call my
>>>"vanity callsign" or are we just seeing "callsign envy" on your part?
>
>Seems like Len had his fair share of radios. Why would he have "callsign
>envy"?

Vipul, how many times has someone asked you to QUOTE CORRECTLY...?!?!

You whine and snivvel about how "low tech" you percieve Amateur Radio to be, but YOU don't seem to posses the skills to be able to get a simple quotation correct.

What's your problem?

Steve, K4YZ

1691. Re: arrl article on echolink - impress a non ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-06 10:42:32 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030206054232.11866.00000419@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 60770

>Subject: Re: arrl article on echolink - impress a non ham
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 2/6/03 12:32 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3E4201AC.F241D6B@earthlink.net>

>Do try and get it right, Vipul. K4YZ did not write the statement you
>attribute to him. I did.

Viputz is so busy dissing Amateur radio that he doesn't ahve time to pay attention. Slowing down to get his quotations correct might derail his train of thought. Both cars of it.

Ooooops...I meant Vipul. Sorry.

73

Steve, K4YZ

1692. Re: arrl article on echolink - impress a non ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-06 10:49:27 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030206054927.11866.00000420@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 60771

>Subject: Re: arrl article on echolink - impress a non ham
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 2/5/03 10:00 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030205230050.28727.00000079@mb-fr.aol.com>
>
>From K4YZ:
>>>C'mon, Len. Did you have any real input on what you incorrectly call my
>>>"vanity callsign" or are we just seeing "callsign envy" on your part?
>
>Seems like Len had his fair share of radios. Why would he have "callsign
>envy"?

And to answer your question although you improperly quoted me, is that Leonard H. is emabarrased, perhaps even ashamed, that after decades of "professional radio experience", he is not able to do what even YOU can do, Vipul...And that's put a radio transmitter with more than 5 watts of RF on 27mHz on the air.

Lennie thinks that only night-school educated EE's should be allowed to operate a radio transmitter, and then only after having served in a rear area radio relay station in the 1950's.

Lennie wouldn't HAVE "callsign envy" if he'd just invest $10 and 30 minutes of his time at a local VE session...Might even give some of his rants here some credibility.

...Naaaaaaaaaaaah

Steve, K4YZ

1693. Re: ARS License Numbers (quantity vs quality)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-06 10:59:44 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030206055944.11866.00000421@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 60772

>Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers (quantity vs quality)
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 2/5/03 10:29 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030205232925.28727.00000080@mb-fr.aol.com>

>I have built kits, Heathkit oscilloscope for example. Also, made many mini
>circuits: op-amp circuits, counter circuits, telephone circuits, and various
>others. Many visits to radio shack. Took apart power supplies, or other
>sections of items that would have been thrown away.

I love it when Vipul the Technonerd starts off a post without quoting who
he is responding to...When he can get THAT right, that is...

And I have NO DOUBT that he's taken a lot of things apart...Now getting
them back together...THAT'S another story!

>Didn't get into (radio) electronics until later. Made some transmitter
>circuits
>(my own). Now I have a Spectrum Analyzer to use.

Have you tried taping the leads to your forehead and seeing what's there?

>I took a few rf and communications courses. In one microwave electronics
>course
>the approach was not too useful. In first class Prof listed reference books
>for
>the course. I was disappointed that not one of these was an ARRL publication.
>ARRL publication often has very good book with practical circuits. If there
>was
>a lab and ARRL book was one of the books, the course quality would be ALOT
>better.

Did you take the ARRL pubs to the "Prof" and suggest them to him? Or did
you just sit there and stew about it like you do in here?

>Unfortunately, pretty soon amateur radio will probably become just a
>diversion
>to me. A fond memory.

So what do we have to do to get you to make that more sooner than later?

>Then, the only homebrewing I might do would be
>homebrewing beer.

I have NO DOUBT that you have ALREADY been brewing beer at home. May I
suggest that you NOT continue to use that little round porcelain fixture in the
bathroom?

Steve, K4YZ

1694. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-06 12:43:36 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302060443.fbe5d3c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60773

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030205221316.14740.00000092@mb-cc.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 2/4/03 5:48 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0302041548.21274c4a@posting.google.com>
>
> >So now you're calling Morgan Fairchild a liar?
>
> Once again, Brain is caught short.
>
> Nice job, Brain.
>
> Steve

Nothing short here.

But you are beginning to see liars behind every tree.

And say hi to Morgan for me.

1695. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-06 13:11:21 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030206081121.25559.00000198@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 60774

>Subject: Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 2/6/03 6:43 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0302060443.fbe5d3c@posting.google.com>

>Nothing short here.

I doubt that.

>But you are beginning to see liars behind every tree.

No...But I do see guys who can't get their stories straight. I DO know the difference between "lying" and "confused". You're just "confused" to a degree below normal. I don't think you're a liar, Brian. Just confused and unwilling to admit it.

>And say hi to Morgan for me.

She said "Brian who..?!?!"...

Steve, K4YZ

1696. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-06 14:03:21 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0302060603.26d8f4b7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60775

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E417B33.951CC769@earthlink.net>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > I worked the Johnston Island station on 75m SSB too. :-) :-) :-(
> >
> > Yee Haw! Good show!
> >
> > Check this one: The word just came down thru the club reflector that
> > "Delmarva Jon" AA1K nailed JT1CO for the first ever 160 WAZ. Stew
> > Perry would be amazed if he was still amongst us. Jon done it all with
> > high loss antennas around the compass.
>
> I understand that Bill W4ZV nailed it too with a JT1CO contact.

Slick . . Zone 23 has always been the big crunch. I just saw a post
which states that W4LRL has 310 confirmed on 160. That's just amazing,
the 160 hotshot ops gotta be as good as they come when it gets down to
weak signal work and antenna smarts. Ears, it's all about the ears . .

> I'm
> still trying to hear the guy. If I only had one of those spiffy
> T2FD's...

. . . maybe a two over two stack . .

>
> Dave K8MN

w3rv

1697. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-06 14:16:39 UTC
From: Bill Turner <jamspam@nowhere.com>
Message-ID: <Xns931A3FDBAD532w7tidslextremecom@216.168.3.50>
Source record: 60776

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in news:d22b54c3.0302060603.26d8f4b7
@posting.google.com:

> the 160 hotshot ops gotta be as good as they come when it gets down to
> weak signal work and antenna smarts. Ears, it's all about the ears . .

Also patience and timing. W1GKK, the only ham to ever work ALL countries,
not just the active ones, said the key to DXing is to "be there when
they're there". Oddly, his accomplishment was done solely on 20 meters.

73, Bill W7TI

1698. FCC Fees

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-06 14:51:41 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b1tt1g7285n@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 60780

Just an idea for a new thread....

Should the F.C.C. be allowed to collect and "maintain" the fees and fines etc. by their offices in order to be self sustaining or should the fee's go into the "general fund?" One thought would be that they could budget for more enforcement activities, but I am sure there are many other thoughts on this topic.

Your comments please,

Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

1699. Re: FCC Fees

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-06 15:32:11 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v44vvb5j1ej5e8@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 60782

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:b1tt1g7285n@enews2.newsguy.com...
> Just an idea for a new thread....
>
>
> Should the F.C.C. be allowed to collect and "maintain" the fees and fines
> etc. by their offices in order to be self sustaining or should the fee's
go
> into the "general fund?" One thought would be that they could budget for
> more enforcement activities, but I am sure there are many other thoughts
on
> this topic.
>
> Your comments please,
>
>
>
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF/MFR
> REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
> --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
> .. --. .... - . .-. ...
>
>

I don't think so just because then the FCC would be
able to "find" enforcement problems that don't matter
much and make money off of them. Kind of like the
small town speed trap that generates money for the
town. OTOH that might just be what's needed to
clean up the "freeband" & 11 meter problems ;^)

BTW I like your "CW" message!
--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx

1700. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-06 15:48:46 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v450ueki3us655@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 60783

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:b1tt1a5285n@enews2.newsguy.com...
> Alrighty then Jim.... like I said to the other guy.... what is the
solution
> then, to keep the transmitting equipment out of the hands of the ones that
> should not have transmitting equipment? Any constructive ideas? We as a
> collective group can sit around and bitch about the problem with 10 meters
> (and other bands as well) but unless something is done, it will get worse.
>
>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF/MFR
> REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
> --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
> .. --. .... - . .-. ...
>

The real answer would be to fill the spectrum with 'use' to
the point the illegals COULDN'T use it. Look at 75/80
meters, even if you do have a license it's hard to find a
free spot to use. If the lower portion of 10 meters was
being used that way the "freebanders" would just about
disappear from there. Then make the FCC do some
more enforcement in the 26.0 - 26.9 MHz and 27.5 -
28.0 MHz area to slow down all the "freeband" crap!

The only way I would approve of the radio registration
at point of sale would be if ALL amateur radio equipment
was excluded and just business radio buyers be tracked.
That "might" slow down the number of business frequencies
being used by non-licensed users, but I wouldn't hold my
breath on that one!
--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx

>
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> news:c2356669.0302051232.1af8b35e@posting.google.com...
> > "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
> news:<b1rahd7q05@enews3.newsguy.com>...

> > > I do not support any measure of registration for ham gear in the
manner
> > > similar to the way guns are registered but I do support any
legislation
> > > supporting the sale of transmitting equipment to those that hold the
> > > appropriate licensure for that equipment. (I said transmitting, not
> > > recieving equipment)
> >
> > The problem is that such a system would amount to de facto
> > registration.
> > >
> > > IMHO, I think places like Radio Shack should have to ask for your
> license
> > > before you are allowed to purchase transmitting equipment. There
> definitely
> > > needs to be done with the sale of amateur equipment to non-licensed
> persons.
> > > (reference the problem with 10 meters for starters.)
> >
> > OK, fine. I go to RS or HRO or wherever and buy a new Ikensu DGX-5000.
> > SHow my license and the clerk takes down the info.
> >
> > Couple years later I sell the rig. Do I have to check the license of
> > the buyer? How do I know the buyer is a for-real ham, anyway, if the
> > sale is via eBay or some such? Do I have to let RS or HRO know that I
> > sold the DGX-5000?
> >
> > Suppose a ham's unlicensed spouse wants to buy "that dream rig" as a
> > present - how can that be done? What about prospective hams who are
> > going to take the test in the near future? Etc.
> >
> > Most of all, what about the purchase of rigs that a ham is "partially"
> > licensed to use? Example: New ham has a Tech but wants to buy an
> > FT-897 or similar MF/HF/VHF all-in-one box. This ham is licensed for
> > VHF/UHF but not HF - can he/she buy the rig legally or not?
> > >
> > > If this is not the answer, what is? What allows us to normally
> purchase
> > > stuff we have a right to, by licensure, but keeps the transmitting
> equipment
> > > out of the hands of unlicensed persons?? A better way I would like
to
> see
> > > this thread go.... Maybe there might actually be some positive
> suggestions.
> >
> > Simple - more and better enforcement of existing laws. Go after those
> > who are actually misusing the gear, not those who simply own it.
> > >
> >

> > > --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. .
..-.
> > > .. --. .... - . .-. ...
> > >
> > That part I agree with!
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY>
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > > > >Anyone (...and I mean anyone) who would lend their
> > > > >support to this insane proposal is aiding totalitarian
> > > > >style controls to the private ownership of a radio
> > > > >transmitter.
> > > > >
> > > > And such a rule simply won't work. External RF power amplifiers for
> the 27
> > > MHz
> > > > range have been heavily regulated for 25 years now. Has that stopped
> their
> > > > illegal manufacture, sale or use? Not that I can see. All the
proposed
> > > rule
> > > > will do is add an unnecessary level of paperwork and regulation to
> > > law-abiding
> > > > radio owners while doing little or nothing to stop violators.
>
>

1701. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL support it ??)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-06 15:54:23 UTC
From: cheesecutter@webhideout.com
Message-ID: <fef386d5.0302060754.61eec305@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60784
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

Dean Arthur <dearthur@silverstar.com> wrote in message
news:<3E41B974.B333DB37@silverstar.com>...
> >,,,welcome back numbnutts
>
> You're right there. Between Diabetes, phlebitis and non-benign
> Parkinson's, my nutts stopped functioning two years ago!

hey yo pimp......i got a new customer for ya.........

1702. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-06 16:06:35 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v452019lfrsre6@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 60785

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:b1si2bkot1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net...
>
<SNIP>

> The whole concept of requiring a license to purchase, and/or
> registration of transmitting equipment is just a beaurocratic
> impossibility (IMHO)...for no other reason than the fact that
> there must be hundreds of thousands of rigs out there
> already that can be and are bought/sold through many
> non-commercial venues (classifieds, ebay, flea markets, etc.)
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>

Bill
Not to mention the new industry that would be set up. Just like
the 10 meter linear amps and "export" CB radios that are "illegal"
to sell in the U.S. but you can buy NEW ones right now in just
about any truck stop, CB shop, and of course Ebay. We would
have the same thing with other radio gear being manufactured for
"export" only then being sold here without any action at all
from the FCC.

That "regulated" future would bring ads like this;
"Brand new Cobra 10 thru 160 meter CB for
EXPORT only (wink, wink, nudge, nudge) radio
tuned and peaked will TX .5 MHz thru 30 MHz
no gaps. Swings over 170 watts. Free "roadmap"
with every radio order!

--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx

1703. Re: The coders embarrass themselves on 14.275 MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-06 16:19:50 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v452omh1mblr7b@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 60786
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:b1tt1f6285n@enews2.newsguy.com...
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:b1s7er$ec8$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net...
> >
> > "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
> > news:b1rahe8q05@enews3.newsguy.com...
> > > Ya know.... most of the terminology like "for ID" or "destinated" or
> > "first
> > > personal" and many other terminology/phrases that I have heard being
> used
> > > have been used by the "old timers" in my area, people who have been
> > licensed
> > > at least 20 years or more....
> >
> > And the problem with the use of those phrases is what?
>
> I don't see to much of a problem with them myself, but some here in
> newsgroups as well as others in my area have expressed dislike in
practices
> like that in others....
>
> >
> > > If anything they are setting a bad example
> > > for the newbies coming into the hobby as they may have a tendancy to
> think
> > > that is the way it is supposed to be done since the "old timers" are
> doing
> > > it that way.
> >
> > Why are those terms/phrases a bad example?
>
> See above response....
>
> >
> > > Prime example, the use of "for ID" was a learning experience
> > > for me. I listened (and still do) to the ham bands on scanners for
> quite
> > a
> > > while and heard that particular phrase quite often. Therefore I
deduced
> it
```

> > > must be a standard practice since I have not seen a book that truly
> > handles
> > > how a QSO should be handled on voice modes. The ARRL text barely
covers
> > it.
> > > Maybe someone will write a book about that eh??
> >
> > Much ado about nothing. The language we use on the air
> > isn't cast in stone. The three phrases above I hear and have
> > used myself. Who cares?
> >
>
> Again see above comment....
>
>
> > > Another one is the usage of the word "clear." In other services the
> word
> > is
> > > used often, and there is no problem with it. I view it as a courtesy
to
> > > others who were courteous enough to wait until you were done trying to
> > call
> > > the person you were trying to call and letting them know you were
> done....
> > > But I am sure there are others with a different opinion.
> >
> > I use "Clear" myself. If I transmit "K2UNK listening" on a repeater
> > and no one responds, I'll usually then say "K2UNK Clear" if
> > I'm going to change to a different repeater. It tells anyone that heard
> > me that I'm not listening anymore.
>
> Sounds good to me.... "listening" or "monitoring" after a call is nice,
> short and sweet and gets the point across. I usually use "clear" after
> making a direct call to another, and if I am going to a different
frequency
> I will say something like "KC8PMX clear, switching to _____ frequency," as
> opposed to QSY which must be one of the deadly sins apparently on FM voice
> as I have heard.

I myself don't use "destinated" or "KB9TMP for ID" but I do use
the QSY and some other "Q" signals. It just seems shorter to say
"KB9TMP QSY to 146.58" than it does to say "KB9TMP switching
frequencies to 146.58". I also do a lot of "public safety" type radio
comms and the use of "10" codes are a large part of that, just like
"Q" codes are a part of the ARS.

>
>
> >
> > > In the absence of
> > > text or rulebooks covering a particular issue, I guess a person needs

to
> > > make their best common sense guess.
> >
> > We have too many nonsense rules. If it isn't the law, then personal
> > operating practices that differ from what some unwritten rule or
> > practice that others believe is sacrosanct just doesn't both me.
> >
>
> I would agree with a part of that statement. For me the rules that are
> clear as a bell are fine, it is the ones that are completely open for
> interpretation that need to be cleared up.
>
>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF/MFR
> REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
> --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
> .. --. .... - . .-. ...
>
>
>

1704. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-06 17:28:22 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0302060928.50218901@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60787

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<b1si2bkot1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>...
> "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
> news:b1rahd7q05@enews3.newsguy.com...
>
> > IMHO, I think places like Radio Shack should have to ask for your license
> > before you are allowed to purchase transmitting equipment. There
> > definitely
> > needs to be done with the sale of amateur equipment to non-licensed
> > persons.
> > (reference the problem with 10 meters for starters.)

I think Ryan meant "transmitting equipment that requires a license to
use".
>
> So when I was a teenager, I shouldn't have been allowed to purchase the
> transmitter that I saved up for while studying for my license?

Good example, but most hams today use transceivers - which makes the
problem even worse, because a ham-to-be who wants to get a station set
up while in the process of getting the license would be forced to wait
until the license is in hand before buying a transceiver.
>
> > If this is not the answer, what is? What allows us to normally purchase
> > stuff we have a right to, by licensure, but keeps the transmitting
> equipment
> > out of the hands of unlicensed persons??
>
> You don't need a license to buy a car?

Here's another probelm - what about the sale of kits, and parts that
are commonly used to build transmitters? Would they be restricted? Who
decides what is a "transmitting" part?

> > A better way I would like to see
> > this thread go.... Maybe there might actually be some positive
> suggestions.

Here's another angle:

The real problem is misuse of equipment, not ownership. The proposed
rules could cause some people to get ham licenses just so they could
buy equipment, either for their own use or resale. 10 meter problem,
you say? Check out the FCC enforcement letters for January 24 on the
ARRL website. FCC has cited 10 NYC area hams and 2 unlicensed persons

for unlicensed operation on 26.555 MHz (and in some cases 25.540 MHz) - two frequencies that are not near any ham band. Some interesting points about those who received letters:

- 6 Generals, 1 Advanced, 1 Technician
- None are newbies. License dates range from 1994 to 2001, with the median between 1997 and 1998. (Those dates are not necessarily the dates of initial license, just the date of last renewal or new license issue).
- None of the 7 who have birthdates listed with license info are kids. Ages range from 36 to 60. All but one is in the 44-60 year old range.

If those who received letters actually operated on those frequencies, one has to wonder why, since all but 1 is licensed to use all of the HF/MF amateur bands.

> The whole concept of requiring a license to purchase, and/or
> registration of transmitting equipment is just a beaurocratic
> impossibility (IMHO)...for no other reason than the fact that
> there must be hundreds of thousands of rigs out there
> already that can be and are bought/sold through many
> non-commercial venues (classifieds, ebay, flea markets, etc.)

True story: About 10 years ago, a local ham showed me something he'd picked up off the trash. It was a BC-459A - WW2 vintage transmitter used in aircraft, covers 7-9.1 MHz. It was unmodified, in excellent shape. He got $25 for it at a local hamfest. (Yeah, I KNOW I coulda told him it was worth 50 cents and bought it, but I don't work like that.)

Point is, anybody could have picked it off the trash and with a little effort got it working. How you gonna stop stuff like that?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1705. Re: arrl article on echolink - impress a non ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-06 17:47:08 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0302060947.2b55453c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60788

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E4201AC.F241D6B@earthlink.net>...
> Vshah101 wrote:
> >
> > >>C'mon, Len. Did you have any real input on what you incorrectly call my
> > >>"vanity callsign" or are we just seeing "callsign envy" on your part?
> >
> > Seems like Len had his fair share of radios. Why would he have "callsign envy"?
>
> Hmmmmmm. Let me ponder this one. Hmmmmmm. It'll only be speculation
> on my part but I'd guess it is because he doesn't have a callsign. He
> doesn't have a callsign because he doesn't have an amateur radio
> license. He doesn't have an amateur radio license because, despite a
> decades long interest, he isn't really THAT interested.

Perhaps, Dave.

Or maybe Mr. Anderson's interest in amateur radio is not about being a ham, but rather about damaging, eroding and destroying amateur radio.

Think about all the things Mr. Anderson has expressed his opposition to. Yes, there's the code test, but that's just the smokescreen. Note how he denies/minimizes the public service contributions of amateur radio, denies/minimizes the use of Morse code in both the ARS and other services, and challenges the technical qualifications of complete strangers based on their code-test views. Note also his continuous harping about the ARRL and his opposition to the licensing of young people.

Guess who wrote the following, in reference to young people in amateur radio - specifically young people using Morse code on the air:

"I've always had trouble with integrating "youngsters" in what is a primarily _adult_ skill/technique recreational activity."

Just the kinda person you want setting entrance requirements, huh?

Note particularly that his focus is always to MINIMIZE amateur radio, and attack its accomplishments, traditions and institutions, rather than to become part of it, or even to express a positive vision of its future.

IOW, he'll tell you what he's against, but never what he's for, or why he's so interested.

> My Aunt Faye had a lot of radios too. She didn't have an amateur radio
> license either but she enjoyed listening to WBZ, KDKA and WWVA in her
> room, in the kitchen, in the living room and out on the porch.

HAW!!

73 de Jim, N2EY

1706. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-06 17:59:47 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v458k4bijqf2a6@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 60789

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0302060928.50218901@posting.google.com...

<SNIP>

> True story: About 10 years ago, a local ham showed me something he'd
> picked up off the trash. It was a BC-459A - WW2 vintage transmitter
> used in aircraft, covers 7-9.1 MHz. It was unmodified, in excellent
> shape. He got $25 for it at a local hamfest. (Yeah, I KNOW I coulda
> told him it was worth 50 cents and bought it, but I don't work like
> that.)

Nice to know that there are some honest people left in the world!

>
> Point is, anybody could have picked it off the trash and with a little
> effort got it working. How you gonna stop stuff like that?

Sounds like a great opportunity to start a new cottage industry,
"Dumpster Diving"! ;^)
--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

1707. Re: FCC Fees

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-06 19:50:58 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.h9wb799.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 60790

On Thu, 6 Feb 2003 10:32:11 -0500, KB9TMP wrote:

>> Should the F.C.C. be allowed to collect and "maintain" the fees and
>> fines tc. by their offices in order to be self sustaining or should
>> the fee's go into the "general fund?" One thought would be that they
>> could budget for more enforcement activities, but I am sure there are
>> many other thoughts on this topic.

> I don't think so just because then the FCC would be able to "find"
> enforcement problems that don't matter much and make money off of
> them. Kind of like the small town speed trap that generates money for
> the town.

As a professional in the asset seizure and forfeiture field when I
was with the FCC I agree with you 1000%. Our experience with local
law enforcement which is able to keep a certain percentage of seized
assets in the "War Against Drugs" is frightening, and it lowers the
professional quality of law enforcement.

And in any case, The Congress intended that this "income" go to the
general fund, not to the agency. They are very definite about that.
It forestalls one obvious avenue of crookedness.

> OTOH that might just be what's needed to clean up the "freeband" &
> 11 meter problems

What is needed is a clear commitment from the top down that (a) the
11 meter and "freeband" problem is a real problem that won't go away
if it is ignored, and (2) that the field enforcement troops - who
know how to do the job - be allowed to do that job instead of being
restrained as they are now. Once those commitments are made, the
rest will follow.

Instead, the powers-that-be first gutted and then abolished the
separate Field Operations Bureau and hid the remnant inside an
overall Enforcement Bureau, most of whose decisioon-makers were used
to having enforcement cases worked out on paper between Washington
attorneys, not by enforcement agents going out in the field and
nabbing the bad guys.

Changes do need to be made if the job is to get done.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1708. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL support it ??)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-06 20:15:54 UTC
From: RedOctober90@space.com
Message-ID: <9553ed5f.0302061215.461a8c86@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60791
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

John <Y4@datbehappn'.net> wrote in message news:<v43q6llfh3mlc5@corp.supernews.com>...
> Sounds like John Aschcroft is gettin' bored again. How did this
> jackmeat get so much power, he wasn't elcted to office. Come to think
> of it, neither was his boss.............What the F**K is Ashcroft doing,
> just 'cause he got beat in the last election he ran in by a dead guy
> doesn't mean he has the right to totally trash OUR Constitution and OUR
> rights. "OUR" includes you......... Thank God we only have 2 more
> years of this crap. Hopefully we'll survive it but I have my doubts.

yup.

1709. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL support it ??)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-06 20:17:28 UTC
From: RedOctober90@space.com
Message-ID: <9553ed5f.0302061217.51dc3a6a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60792
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

"I've been spammed!" <spammed@covad.net> wrote in message
news:<b1ok2lkoc1@sun-news.laserlink.net>...
> Freaking morons. They just cannot stand to see people being free. Register
> your guns. Register your radio. Register Register Register. Left wing
> totalitarian maggots is what they are.

Get used to it, more of your rights will be packing up and leaving out
your front door soon. We need Col Steve Anderson back on the air.

1710. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL support it ??)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-06 20:19:26 UTC
From: RedOctober90@space.com
Message-ID: <9553ed5f.0302061219.fec7005@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60793
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

When they mean by "two way" radio coms does that also include things like FRS and CB Radios? That's just ridicious. Maybe soon they will require people registering television sets.

1711. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL support it ??)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-06 20:28:05 UTC
From: Fred Hambrecht Sr <w4jle@charter.net>
Message-ID: <v45hamnm3uo47a@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 60794
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

Before you get your panties in a wad, it is not the government trying to
force registration.

It is a proposal for rule making submitted to FCC by a ham radio operator.

The chances of it being adopted are little and none.

"RedOctober90" <RedOctober90@space.com> wrote in message
news:9553ed5f.0302061219.fec7005@posting.google.com...
> When they mean by "two way" radio coms does that also include things
> like FRS and CB Radios? That's just ridicious. Maybe soon they will
> require people registering television sets.

1712. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL support it ??)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-06 20:41:30 UTC
From: Zombie Wolf <zmbwf@acadia.net>
Message-ID: <v45i3qbqemekc3@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 60795
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

Nixon already wanted to put a bug into every new TV set sold in this country
. Nothing new there......

"RedOctober90" <RedOctober90@space.com> wrote in message
news:9553ed5f.0302061219.fec7005@posting.google.com...
> When they mean by "two way" radio coms does that also include things
> like FRS and CB Radios? That's just ridicious. Maybe soon they will
> require people registering television sets.

1713. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL support it ??)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-06 21:01:57 UTC
From: Gray Shockley <gray@compcomm.com>
Message-ID: <0001HW.BA6829650035F4560D335DB0@news-central.giganews.com>
Source record: 60796
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

On Thu, 6 Feb 2003 14:19:26 -0600, RedOctober90 wrote
(in message <9553ed5f.0302061219.fec7005@posting.google.com>):

> When they mean by "two way" radio coms does that also include things
> like FRS and CB Radios? That's just ridicious.

Ah, to be young again . . .

I came across my FFC license for my CB radio last week.

> Maybe soon they will
> require people registering television sets.

Gray Shockley

"Swinehood hath no remedy." - Sidney Lanier

1714. Re: arrl article on echolink - impress a non ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-06 21:43:02 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E42D72F.33F58D2A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60797

N2EY wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E4201AC.F241D6B@earthlink.net>...
> > Vshah101 wrote:
> > >
> > > >>C'mon, Len. Did you have any real input on what you incorrectly call my
> > > >>"vanity callsign" or are we just seeing "callsign envy" on your part?
> > >
> > > Seems like Len had his fair share of radios. Why would he have "callsign envy"?
> >
> > Hmmmmmm. Let me ponder this one. Hmmmmmm. It'll only be speculation
> > on my part but I'd guess it is because he doesn't have a callsign. He
> > doesn't have a callsign because he doesn't have an amateur radio
> > license. He doesn't have an amateur radio license because, despite a
> > decades long interest, he isn't really THAT interested.
>
> Perhaps, Dave.
>
> Or maybe Mr. Anderson's interest in amateur radio is not about being a
> ham, but rather about damaging, eroding and destroying amateur radio.

That's something I've long suspected. His real hobby is posting usenet
messages.

> Think about all the things Mr. Anderson has expressed his opposition
> to. Yes, there's the code test, but that's just the smokescreen. Note
> how he denies/minimizes the public service contributions of amateur
> radio, denies/minimizes the use of Morse code in both the ARS and
> other services, and challenges the technical qualifications of
> complete strangers based on their code-test views. Note also his
> continuous harping about the ARRL and his opposition to the licensing
> of young people.

> Guess who wrote the following, in reference to young people in amateur
> radio - specifically young people using Morse code on the air:
>
> "I've always had trouble with integrating "youngsters" in what is a
> primarily _adult_ skill/technique recreational activity."
>
> Just the kinda person you want setting entrance requirements, huh?

He claims to want to open up amateur radio for all--all except the
young.

> Note particularly that his focus is always to MINIMIZE amateur radio,
> and attack its accomplishments, traditions and institutions, rather

> than to become part of it, or even to express a positive vision of its
> future.

He attacks the ARRL but he isn't a member. He attacks radio amateurs
and their accomplishments but he isn't a radio amateur.

> IOW, he'll tell you what he's against, but never what he's for, or why
> he's so interested.

That's an easy one. He is interested because "amateur radio is a fun
hobby" though how he knows that is beyond me. I don't understand how
one can claim interest in something for decades without bothering to
pursue participation or how claimed interest results in the bad-mouthing
of a large group of existing participants.

> > My Aunt Faye had a lot of radios too. She didn't have an amateur radio
> > license either but she enjoyed listening to WBZ, KDKA and WWVA in her
> > room, in the kitchen, in the living room and out on the porch.
>
> HAW!!

Well, Len has come no closer to Aunt Faye in obtaining an amateur radio
license and she had no interest at all in amateur radio. She just liked
Larry Glick's program and hillbilly music. She did buy me my first
guitar and I believed it pained her that I ended up in a blues band.
That aside, she was proud that her nephew was a ham radio op and loved
to tell the neighbors about receiving radiograms relayed by K8AN who ran
the local Kroger store.

Dave K8MN

1715. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL support it ??)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-06 22:03:50 UTC
From: Fred Hambrecht Sr <w4jle@charter.net>
Message-ID: <v45mu7i00utt72@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 60798
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

And would you please provide a reference for this factoid.

We all ready have been treated to your chicken little cries of the sky falling over registration.

"Zombie Wolf" <zmbwf@acadia.net> wrote in message news:v45i3qbqemekc3@corp.supernews.com...
> Nixon already wanted to put a bug into every new TV set sold in this country
> . Nothing new there......
>
> "RedOctober90" <RedOctober90@space.com> wrote in message
> news:9553ed5f.0302061219.fec7005@posting.google.com...
> > When they mean by "two way" radio coms does that also include things
> > like FRS and CB Radios? That's just ridicious. Maybe soon they will
> > require people registering television sets.
>
>

1716. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-06 22:31:07 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302061431.2ecad813@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60799

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030206081121.25559.00000198@mb-fm.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 2/6/03 6:43 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0302060443.fbe5d3c@posting.google.com>
>
> >Nothing short here.
>
> I doubt that.
>
> >But you are beginning to see liars behind every tree.
>
> No...But I do see guys who can't get their stories straight. I DO know
> the difference between "lying" and "confused". You're just "confused" to a
> degree below normal. I don't think you're a liar, Brian. Just confused and
> unwilling to admit it.
>
> >And say hi to Morgan for me.
>
> She said "Brian who..?!?!"...

I'm highly insulted. Typical gold-digging blond.

Is she one of your Ohio wive's, or was that Phyllis Diller?

1717. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-06 22:38:52 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0302061438.2514250@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60800

"KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com> wrote in message news:<v458k4bijqf2a6@corp.supernews.com>...
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> news:c2356669.0302060928.50218901@posting.google.com...
> > True story: About 10 years ago, a local ham showed me something he'd
> > picked up off the trash. It was a BC-459A - WW2 vintage transmitter
> > used in aircraft, covers 7-9.1 MHz. It was unmodified, in excellent
> > shape. He got $25 for it at a local hamfest. (Yeah, I KNOW I coulda
> > told him it was worth 50 cents and bought it, but I don't work like
> > that.)
>
> Nice to know that there are some honest people left in the world!
>
Thanks!!
> >
> > Point is, anybody could have picked it off the trash and with a little
> > effort got it working. How you gonna stop stuff like that?
>
> Sounds like a great opportunity to start a new cottage industry,
> "Dumpster Diving"! ;^)

I refer to it as "Radio Recycling". Quite amazing what people throw
out, and what they hang on to.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1718. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-06 22:51:17 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0302061451.f2079bf@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60801

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<b1tt1a5285n@enews2.newsguy.com>...
> Alrighty then Jim.... like I said to the other guy.... what is the solution
> then, to keep the transmitting equipment out of the hands of the ones that
> should not have transmitting equipment? Any constructive ideas? We as a
> collective group can sit around and bitch about the problem with 10 meters
> (and other bands as well) but unless something is done, it will get worse.

Several things:

First, as KB9TMP so correctly points out, make the ham bands unattractive to freebanders and other intruders. Imagine the bands full of hams running CW, SSB, data modes, etc, 24/7, with nary a space for an intruder. Those who do intrude should be "actively ignored" - IOW, their existence should not be acknowledged. The use of non-voice modes is a good idea because most intruders probably won't be able to understand them. (Yet another good reason to USE CW!!)

Second, we hams should give FCC the evidence they need to track down the intruders. This means AUDIO TAPES with notes of frequency, time, date and receive location, at least. FCC enforcement is complaint-driven, and the complaints have to be credible, and usable by FCC.

Third, hams need to avoid knowingly helping freebanders by selling them things or helping them with technical stuff like "mods".

Fourth, publicity about what ham radio is and does can only help the situation. The general public needs to know the difference between legal and illegal stations.

Trying to interdict radio equipment will hurt hams more than the bad guys.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1719. New Field Day Entry Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-06 23:10:06 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0302061510.634b0c0d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60802

Looks like some of the suggestions have been heard.

FD 2003 will have a new "Class F" entry class, for stations set up at
EOCs (Emergency Operations Centers).

See:

http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2003/02/06/3/?nc=1

73 de Jim, N2EY

1720. Re: The coders embarrass themselves on 14.275 MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-07 01:32:16 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b1v2fc$v99$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 60803
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:b1tt1f6285n@enews2.newsguy.com...
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:b1s7er$ec8$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net...
> >
> > "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
> > news:b1rahe8q05@enews3.newsguy.com...
> > > Ya know.... most of the terminology like "for ID" or "destinated" or
> > "first
> > > personal" and many other terminology/phrases that I have heard being
> used
> > > have been used by the "old timers" in my area, people who have been
> > licensed
> > > at least 20 years or more....
> >
> > And the problem with the use of those phrases is what?
>
> I don't see to much of a problem with them myself, but some here in
> newsgroups as well as others in my area have expressed dislike in
practices
> like that in others....

I'd just ignore them. There's too many self styled
airwaves police who think only they know what is or should be
correct on-the-air operation/usage/phrases.

> > > If anything they are setting a bad example
> > > for the newbies coming into the hobby as they may have a tendancy to
> think
> > > that is the way it is supposed to be done since the "old timers" are
> doing
> > > it that way.
> >
> > Why are those terms/phrases a bad example?
>
> See above response....

We agree again then.

> > > Prime example, the use of "for ID" was a learning experience
> > > for me. I listened (and still do) to the ham bands on scanners for
> quite
> > a

> > > while and heard that particular phrase quite often. Therefore I
deduced
> it
> > > must be a standard practice since I have not seen a book that truly
> > handles
> > > how a QSO should be handled on voice modes. The ARRL text barely
covers
> > it.
> > > Maybe someone will write a book about that eh??
> >
> > Much ado about nothing. The language we use on the air
> > isn't cast in stone. The three phrases above I hear and have
> > used myself. Who cares?

> Again see above comment....

Still in sync then.

> > > Another one is the usage of the word "clear." In other services the
> word
> > is
> > > used often, and there is no problem with it. I view it as a courtesy
to
> > > others who were courteous enough to wait until you were done trying to
> > call
> > > the person you were trying to call and letting them know you were
> done....
> > > But I am sure there are others with a different opinion.
> >
> > I use "Clear" myself. If I transmit "K2UNK listening" on a repeater
> > and no one responds, I'll usually then say "K2UNK Clear" if
> > I'm going to change to a different repeater. It tells anyone that heard
> > me that I'm not listening anymore.
>
> Sounds good to me.... "listening" or "monitoring" after a call is nice,
> short and sweet and gets the point across. I usually use "clear" after
> making a direct call to another, and if I am going to a different
frequency
> I will say something like "KC8PMX clear, switching to _____ frequency," as
> opposed to QSY which must be one of the deadly sins apparently on FM voice
> as I have heard.

Actually there's nothing wrong with QSY either...in my book :-)

> > > In the absence of
> > > text or rulebooks covering a particular issue, I guess a person needs
to
> > > make their best common sense guess.
> >
> > We have too many nonsense rules. If it isn't the law, then personal
> > operating practices that differ from what some unwritten rule or
> > practice that others believe is sacrosanct just doesn't both me.

> >
>
> I would agree with a part of that statement. For me the rules that are
> clear as a bell are fine, it is the ones that are completely open for
> interpretation that need to be cleared up.

That's the beauty of language...there are many ways to
say the same thing. I wouldn't worry about interpretation.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1721. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL support it ??)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-07 02:05:01 UTC
From: Dean Arthur <dearthur@silverstar.com>
Message-ID: <3E43144F.4DD1F851@silverstar.com>
Source record: 60804
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

> OUR Constitution and OUR rights

Sorry, big guy but the Constitution no longer is in full force and
effect. Or do you think you can repudiate your lawful debts and stll be
protected? Bankrupts have no constitutional anything!

1722. Re: arrl article on echolink - impress a non ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-07 02:05:46 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030206210546.12173.00000448@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 60805

In article <3E42D72F.33F58D2A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> > It'll only be speculation
>> > on my part but I'd guess it is because he doesn't have a callsign. He
>> > doesn't have a callsign because he doesn't have an amateur radio
>> > license. He doesn't have an amateur radio license because, despite a
>> > decades long interest, he isn't really THAT interested.
>>
>> Perhaps, Dave.
>>
>> Or maybe Mr. Anderson's interest in amateur radio is not about being a
>> ham, but rather about damaging, eroding and destroying amateur radio.
>
>That's something I've long suspected. His real hobby is posting usenet
>messages.

And commenting to the FCC at length about how awful hams are.
>
>> Think about all the things Mr. Anderson has expressed his opposition
>> to. Yes, there's the code test, but that's just the smokescreen. Note
>> how he denies/minimizes the public service contributions of amateur
>> radio, denies/minimizes the use of Morse code in both the ARS and
>> other services, and challenges the technical qualifications of
>> complete strangers based on their code-test views. Note also his
>> continuous harping about the ARRL and his opposition to the licensing
>> of young people.
>
>> Guess who wrote the following, in reference to young people in amateur
>> radio - specifically young people using Morse code on the air:
>>
>> "I've always had trouble with integrating "youngsters" in what is a
>> primarily _adult_ skill/technique recreational activity."
>>
>> Just the kinda person you want setting entrance requirements, huh?
>
>He claims to want to open up amateur radio for all--all except the
>young.

I recall the exchange where Hans told us about his 14-year-old age-requirement
idea in his comments to the FCC. Comments that were filed long after the
comment period had ended, when FCC was supposed to only be getting reply
comments. That was during the period when he was referring to you as a
"convivial stormtrooper from central africa" and asking about your boots and
armband being too tight. He also stated that the parents of some young hams had

"conned the VEs into passing" the kids, or some such.
>
>> Note particularly that his focus is always to MINIMIZE amateur radio,
>> and attack its accomplishments, traditions and institutions, rather
>> than to become part of it, or even to express a positive vision of its
>> future.
>
>He attacks the ARRL but he isn't a member.

He knows that without ARRL, ham radio would have been slowly legislated out of
existence.

> He attacks radio amateurs
>and their accomplishments but he isn't a radio amateur.
>
Doesn't want to be, either.

>> IOW, he'll tell you what he's against, but never what he's for, or why
>> he's so interested.
>
>That's an easy one. He is interested because "amateur radio is a fun
>hobby" though how he knows that is beyond me. I don't understand how
>one can claim interest in something for decades without bothering to
>pursue participation or how claimed interest results in the bad-mouthing
>of a large group of existing participants.
>
It's simple, Dave. His "interest" is the desire to damage, erode and ultimately
destroy amateur radio. Cutting out the young folks is one way to do that.
Stirring up arguments and hostility over what has become a non-issue (code
testing) is another.

Championing the use of a big-yet-inefficient antenna like the WBFD is another.
Imagine if lotsa hams used 'em....

Now we'll be treated to another bunch of his posts full of name-calling,
factual errors, misquotes, faulty logic, and just plain insults. So typical.
The "Reverend" nonsense is a bit surreal, considering my religious beliefs.

>> > My Aunt Faye had a lot of radios too. She didn't have an amateur radio
>> > license either but she enjoyed listening to WBZ, KDKA and WWVA in her
>> > room, in the kitchen, in the living room and out on the porch.
>>
>> HAW!!
>
>Well, Len has come no closer to Aunt Faye in obtaining an amateur radio
>license and she had no interest at all in amateur radio. She just liked
>Larry Glick's program and hillbilly music. She did buy me my first
>guitar and I believed it pained her that I ended up in a blues band.

For that alone I would thank her.

>That aside, she was proud that her nephew was a ham radio op and loved
>to tell the neighbors about receiving radiograms relayed by K8AN who ran

>the local Kroger store.
>
Everyone should have such an aunt.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1723. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL support it ??)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-07 02:11:52 UTC
From: Ross Archer <archer@topnow.com>
Message-ID: <3E4315E8.13D2B7C2@topnow.com>
Source record: 60806
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

Gray Shockley wrote:
>
> On Thu, 6 Feb 2003 14:19:26 -0600, RedOctober90 wrote
> (in message <9553ed5f.0302061219.fec7005@posting.google.com>):
>
> > When they mean by "two way" radio coms does that also include things
> > like FRS and CB Radios? That's just ridicious.
>
> Ah, to be young again . . .
>
> I came across my FFC license for my CB radio last week.

KBTN 4826

>
> > Maybe soon they will
> > require people registering television sets.
>
> Gray Shockley
> -------------------------
> "Swinehood hath no remedy." - Sidney Lanier

1724. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL support it ??)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-07 02:23:36 UTC
From: Ross Archer <archer@topnow.com>
Message-ID: <3E4318A7.6C39845C@topnow.com>
Source record: 60807
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

RedOctober90 wrote:
>
> When they mean by "two way" radio coms does that also include things
> like FRS and CB Radios? That's just ridicious. Maybe soon they will
> require people registering television sets.

No, if anything they would like as many people to park
themselves in front of the Great Pacifier Tube for as long
and as often as possible. Or more accurately, go to work,
come home and be pacified, and simultaneously stimulated as
a consumer to buy things to be a useful economic widget.

While actively talking with someone, some naughty subversive
thought might be unleashed. We must not have that! Approved
drivel, entertainment, and commercial messages only, please!
;)

So licenses for anything that might make a person more
involved and active, and incentives for anything that makes
you passive, lazy, content, and manipulatable. That's why
TV is still free. :)

-- Ross

1725. Re: ARS License Numbers (quantity vs quality)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-07 02:27:56 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E4319AB.5050408@adelphia.net>
Source record: 60808

Vshah101 wrote:

> I have built kits, Heathkit oscilloscope for example. Also, made many mini
> circuits: op-amp circuits, counter circuits, telephone circuits, and various
> others. Many visits to radio shack. Took apart power supplies, or other
> sections of items that would have been thrown away.
>
> Didn't get into (radio) electronics until later. Made some transmitter circuits
> (my own). Now I have a Spectrum Analyzer to use.

Sounds good. There must be some like-minded people in your area. I think
you live in the Boston area? Don't know for sure, but I thought you
mentioned that.

> I took a few rf and communications courses. In one microwave electronics course
> the approach was not too useful. In first class Prof listed reference books for
> the course. I was disappointed that not one of these was an ARRL publication.
> ARRL publication often has very good book with practical circuits. If there was
> a lab and ARRL book was one of the books, the course quality would be ALOT
> better.

Hmm, did the Prof. recommend his own books? The ARRL books might be
considered too "general" or "practical" for college courses.

> I would like to do more, alot more. I would like to do some coil circuits:
> torroids, baluns, matching circuits, coupling circuits. These topics often do
> not get enough coverage in an academic course.

Definitely not. It seems you are looking for something with a more
practical bent than the academic courses. That is one of my criticisms
of those courses.

ARRL has an antenna design course that might be of interest to you.

> Unfortunately, pretty soon amateur radio will probably become just a diversion
> to me. A fond memory. Then, the only homebrewing I might do would be
> homebrewing beer.

Homebrewing beer is great fun. I've done a bit in my time. I haven't been
able to do much lately, with the ham club, hockey and amateur astronomy
hobbies.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1726. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL support it ??)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-07 02:40:44 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <8VE0a.7858$mo6.1529@FE03>
Source record: 60809
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

If you haven't done anything wrong, then you have nothing to worry about. So what's the big problem??

KR4AJ

"Bill B" <leakylinkie@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:3e3f3c8a@snipnews.snip.net...
> If the ARRL even REMOTLY offers ANY SUPPORT
> WHATSOEVER to this Orwellian proposal by K8AD
> than it will signal the **DEATH KNELL** for ARRL.
>
> Anyone (...and I mean anyone) who would lend their
> support to this insane proposal is aiding totalitarian
> style controls to the private ownership of a radio
> transmitter.
>
> I wonder if K8AD went to the "Soviet Gulag School" of
> Ham Radio? The Govt. or anyone else has no damm
> business AT ALL knowing what makes and models of radios
> I may purchase or own G-DDAMMIT!
>
> What the frig? Are we to now have HANDGUN STYLE
> Registration Requirements for Ham Radio and CB Equipment???
>
> IF THE ARRL GOES ALONG WITH THIS PROPOSAL -
> IN ANY CAPACITY WHATSOEVER, YOU WILL SEE THE
> BIGGEST ABANDONMENT OF ARRL MEMBERSHIP
> SINCE THE INCENTIVE LICENSING DISASTER OF
> THE 60's and 70's.
>
> -----> Do not support or touch this proposal W1AW - unless you
> want to go the way of the Spark Transmitter and Rotary Dial Telephone.
>
>
> "RadioGuy" <nospam@nospam.com> wrote in message
> news:b1mrgo$s1a$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> > SB QST @ ARL $ARLB011
> > ARLB011 FCC Invites Comments on Amateur-Related Petition
> >
> > ZCZC AG11
> > QST de W1AW
> > ARRL Bulletin 11 ARLB011

> > From ARRL Headquarters
> > Newington CT January 31, 2003
> > To all radio amateurs
> >
> > SB QST ARL ARLB011
> > ARLB011 FCC Invites Comments on Amateur-Related Petition
> >
> > Dale Reich, K8AD has petitioned the FCC to require sellers of
> > two-way voice or data equipment to keep on file a buyer's name,
> > address, telephone number and "any future information when selling a
> > radio that required licensing under the current FCC rules." Comments
> > on the petition, RM-10641, are due February 28.
> >
> > Information collected would remain private, available only to the
> > FCC or law enforcement. Reich said in his petition that any retail
> > vendor would be able to ask local police for an investigation if the
> > retailer suspected the radios were not going to be used in
> > compliance with the law.
> >
> > Included in the petition is a requirement for "ownership and license
> > tagging" for gear operating under Parts 5, 15, 18, 74, 80, 90, 95
> > and 97. In his petition, Reich said such tagging used to be an FCC
> > requirement and that his proposed change was a needed tool for local
> > law enforcement.
> >
> > The full text of Reich's petitions is available on the FCC Web site.
> > Search for the petition number.
> > NNNN
> > /EX
> >
> >
>
>
>
>

1727. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-07 03:50:28 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030206225028.23804.00000218@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 60810

>Subject: Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 2/6/03 4:31 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0302061431.2ecad813@posting.google.com>

>Is she one of your Ohio wive's, or was that Phyllis Diller?

Phyllis said "Brian who?" too. What's up with that?

Steve, K4YZ

1728. Re: FCC Fees

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-07 04:19:14 UTC
From: Ken Farnswell <RInter@farn832w.org>
Message-ID: <b1vc2v$i1g$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 60811

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:b1tt1g7285n@enews2.newsguy.com...
> Just an idea for a new thread....
>
> Should the F.C.C. be allowed to collect and "maintain" the fees and fines
> etc. by their offices in order to be self sustaining or should the fee's
go
> into the "general fund?" One thought would be that they could budget for
> more enforcement activities, but I am sure there are many other thoughts
on
> this topic.
>
> Your comments please,
>
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF/MFR
> REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.

No such thing will ever happen, considering the relationship
the FCC has with those who might implement such a thing.

73,
Ken Farnswell, P.E., Ph. D.
Slaycor International

1729. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-07 05:45:11 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E43481B.F43E73EA@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60812

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E408CDA.35C3536B@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030204063616.05048.00000443@mb-cs.aol.com>...
> > > > In article <3E3F1CCC.180E41A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > > > writes:
> > >
> > > > >I generally have low noise here but I really having no way of knowing if
> > > > >I could have heard AH3D on a T2FD without a preamp.
> > > >
> > > > How far above the noise was he? WVA to Johnston Island is a fur piece on 160.
> > >
> > > Jim, Johnston Island is the same distance regardless of band.
> >
> > Wow! If I'd only had your substantive knowledge, I could have skipped
> > that 160m QSO and just been satisified with working 'em on 10m SSB.
>
> Dave, please tell me how much further Johnston Island is on 160M then on 10M.
>
> A bigshot DXer like you should know.

And you must believe me that I do know the distance, the bearing and the
reciprocal bearing to Johnston Island. Jim's comment indicated that
Johnston Island is a tough one from this part of the country. Then
again you knew that.
All that's left to decide is the reason for your smart-assed comment.

Dave K8MN

1730. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-07 06:23:48 UTC
From: W7TI <jamspam@nowhere.com>
Message-ID: <Xns931AE3D4FF92Cpookster@216.168.3.50>
Source record: 60813

> Jim, Johnston Island is the same distance regardless of band.

Not true. Using groundwave on a very low frequency band, the distance the wave travels will be shorter than with ionospheric propagation. The island will be "closer".

So there. :-)

73, Bill W7TI

1731. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-07 06:54:36 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030207015436.09900.00000432@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 60814

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.h9v1ep5.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 05 Feb 2003 07:28:00 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>>> That
>>> never happened at my agency. Then again, none of them were ham radio
>>> operations anyhow.
>>
>> So, by that veiled inference, you WANT amateur radio to
>> retain old, outmoded manual morse testing? Why?
>
> You have a reading problem? Reread my comments in the restructuring
> docket about dropping the Morse test requirement and the NCI reply
> comment referring to it, and THEN ask again whether I want to retain
> Morse testing in the ARS....(short answer - I do not).

I READ your comments in regard to NPRM98-143. You called
the US amateur radio license a "federal merit badge."

That was in 1998. This year is 2003. 4 1/2 years since.

Many things can happen in 4 1/2 years. Minds can change.
Some minds (of PCTAs) in here go berserk at odd moments.

I am cheered that Phil Kane retains his original conviction
that morse tests should be abolished.

> I may be a competent Morse examiner but a "morseman" I am not.

Not even a little, tiny bit? :-)

1732. Re: arrl article on echolink - impress a non ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-07 06:54:40 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030207015440.09900.00000433@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 60815

In article <20030206210546.12173.00000448@mb-mr.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <3E42D72F.33F58D2A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>writes:
>
>>> > It'll only be speculation
>>> > on my part but I'd guess it is because he doesn't have a callsign. He
>>> > doesn't have a callsign because he doesn't have an amateur radio
>>> > license. He doesn't have an amateur radio license because, despite a
>>> > decades long interest, he isn't really THAT interested.
>>>
>>> Perhaps, Dave.
>>>
>>> Or maybe Mr. Anderson's interest in amateur radio is not about being a
>>> ham, but rather about damaging, eroding and destroying amateur radio.
>>
>>That's something I've long suspected. His real hobby is posting usenet
>>messages.
>
>And commenting to the FCC at length about how awful hams are.

Heh heh heh...the pedantic parson is at it again. Once more
a Sermon on the Antenna Mount, denouncing the "evil doers"
(who arrived via black helicopters?).

Can Rev. Jimmie provide ANY further "comment to the FCC"
since the document accepted 13 January 1999? No? I didn't
think so. That's OVER 4 years since, hardly "at length." :-)

>>> Think about all the things Mr. Anderson has expressed his opposition
>>> to. Yes, there's the code test, but that's just the smokescreen.

Of course. "Smokescreens" hide the black helicopters. :-)

>>> Note
>>> how he denies/minimizes the public service contributions of amateur
>>> radio, denies/minimizes the use of Morse code in both the ARS and
>>> other services, and challenges the technical qualifications of
>>> complete strangers based on their code-test views.

Of course, especially those of the certificated pedantry who
work in some industry but spend their off-hours fantasizing
wonderful stuff for their lifestyle. :-)

>>> Note also his
>>> continuous harping about the ARRL and his opposition to the licensing

>>> of young people.

ARRL is to be loved? "Representing" a very distinct MINORITY
of all licensed US radio amateurs. "Representation" by a
smaller minority within ARRL who decide "what is good for US
amateur radio?"

What "opposition to licensing of young people?" Define "young."

In modern American speech "young people" refer to older teens
and those recently past their 18th birthday.

I've never been "against young people." I've been against
CHILDREN, especially CHILDREN only six years old "passing
an amateur examination."

Let's look at the "young people" in here. Are there ANY posting
in here? Not quite. Ryan comes the closest, then Jackie, Brian
(Burke), and some others. Legally, ALL are ADULTS, rather
well past the legal age birthday.

There are a very regular group of OLD FARTS who like control
and dictating who should say what when and where, expressing
an inordinate fondness for the OLD WAYS to the point of
demands to Keep The Status as Quo as Possible because that
is Their Way. Those are all Fortysomething and later.

Those are the regulars. We all know what is synonymous with
"regularity," yes? :-)

Their "childhood" is two things. First, it is a vague nostalgia for
long ago that has morphed into some vague fantasy where They
overcame all obstacles to win triumphant by passing that
enormous hurdle of the TEST, an academic achievement of
momentous proportions. Second, it is still a fantasy, but a
current one, that they believe they are "still young" all the while
keeping up a decided OLD FART appearance in text. Their
physical prowess is unsurpassed, their intelligence keen as any
Nobel recipient, they know more and have done more than any
of "lesser" certification than They according to their texts.

>>> Guess who wrote the following, in reference to young people in amateur
>>> radio - specifically young people using Morse code on the air:
>>>
>>> "I've always had trouble with integrating "youngsters" in what is a
>>> primarily _adult_ skill/technique recreational activity."
>>>
>>> Just the kinda person you want setting entrance requirements, huh?
>>
>>He claims to want to open up amateur radio for all--all except the
>>young.
>
>I recall the exchange where Hans told us about his 14-year-old

>age-requirement
>idea in his comments to the FCC. Comments that were filed long after the
>comment period had ended, when FCC was supposed to only be getting reply
>comments.

Error. Error. Error. My comment on NPRM 98-143 was/is on
the FCC public database as having been received on 13 Jan 99.
[it was received earlier than that, sent by registered USPS mail
the first week in January 1999, paperwork still here]

The Comment period end was 15 January 1999 according to
the FCC by their extension. That was for ALL comments
AND replies.

Please do not put wrong words into the FCC. Their statements
are in public view.

> That was during the period when he was referring to you as a
>"convivial stormtrooper from central africa" and asking about your boots and
>armband being too tight. He also stated that the parents of some young hams
>had "conned the VEs into passing" the kids, or some such.

In my opinion, the big RFI from State hasn't changed a bit.

In my opinion and that of several others, SIX YEAR OLDS
passing a WRITTEN test is a JOKE.

>>> Note particularly that his focus is always to MINIMIZE amateur radio,
>>> and attack its accomplishments, traditions and institutions, rather
>>> than to become part of it, or even to express a positive vision of its
>>> future.

Oh, my, the pedantic parson is getting white knuckles gripping
the pulpit rim! :-)

My "focus" is on MINIMIZING the would-be controllers and
dictators of a hobby activity who demand Their Version of a
hobby to be the Model for all others to emulate (because they
are so damn good, noble, fine and true according to their own
words). They can't take it. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

The parson cannot see "positive" attributes that He did/does
not want. He wants things His way. What is curious is that
that way is how amateur radio was before his birth.

Not so curious is that such a syndrome is common to the
PCTAs. Hold the Old seems to be their only "future."

>>He attacks the ARRL but he isn't a member.

Ah, one must "love" ARRL, Church of St. Hiram or be
considered a blasphemer, a heretic.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, ARRL is a political entity, not a religious
institution. Political entities are fair game in America, a

"tradition" far older than radio.

ARRL is only the remaining survivor of many original
organizations that attempted to "represent all of US
radio amateurs." It was a distant second to the Radio
Club of America...which still survives but does not favor
only amateur radio.

>He knows that without ARRL, ham radio would have been slowly legislated out
>of existence.

Error. Error. Error. NO ONE can predict OR prove an
alternate universe. A number of different things happened
in USA radio by 1920 and ARRL is a minor thing in all
that. St. Hiram did go to Washington, DC, at his own
expense, but He did not miraculously "straighten out" the
lawmakers nor "chart any future."

>> He attacks radio amateurs
>>and their accomplishments but he isn't a radio amateur.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, another error. The pedantic parson is NOT
representative of all US amateur radio. The dill sergeant is
NOT representative of all US amateur radio. The robust
oberst is NOT representative of all US amateur radio. The
bus driver is NOT representative of all US amateur radio.

Those wonderful "examples" of the hobby love to shoot
down others not agreeing with them and their wonderous
"accomplishments." THEY get "attacked"...because They
DESERVE it for trying to deride and denigrate their
opponents in discussions of the future. They can't take
discussions on subjects, so they act the way they do.

>Doesn't want to be, either.

That's not on a list of immediate priorities...:-)

>>> IOW, he'll tell you what he's against, but never what he's for, or why
>>> he's so interested.
>>
>>That's an easy one. He is interested because "amateur radio is a fun
>>hobby" though how he knows that is beyond me.

Many things are "beyond" the pedantic parson. :-)

>>I don't understand how
>>one can claim interest in something for decades without bothering to
>>pursue participation or how claimed interest results in the bad-mouthing
>>of a large group of existing participants.

"Large group?!?" Of THESE regulars?!?!? :-)

Many things in life are INTERESTING. NO ONE needs any
license or certificate or title to BE INTERESTED. Considering
that RADIO, the whole world of radio, not the small slice that
is a recreational, hobby activity, is great, diverse, full of
innovation and invention, and very, very interesting.

When we get to the OF group of regulars (parson, oberst, dill
putzman, driver), ALL must do "fun" as They do fun...or it
isn't "fun" according to them. All must be licensed, titled,
certificated, wallpapered according to strict regimental
protocol that They require to be enforced...enforced by any
means possible.

>It's simple, Dave. His "interest" is the desire to damage, erode and
>ultimately destroy amateur radio.

The amateur Osama bin Laden describing his "opponents."

Tsk, tsk, tsk, the pedantic parson is reaching for the Fire
and Brimstone!

>Cutting out the young folks is one way to do that.

Good grief! The pedantic parson thinks I hang around grade
schools threatening six-year-olds?!?

The parson slipped on too many pulpit boxes. He's flipped
too much fire and brimstone, lost his mental perspective in
His Image of Amateur Holy Orders!

>Stirring up arguments and hostility over what has become a non-issue (code
>testing) is another.

A "non-issue?!?" The daft parson doesn't realize that the
"code issue" is NOT YET RESOLVED. WRC-03 is a few
months away.

>Championing the use of a big-yet-inefficient antenna like the WBFD is
>another Imagine if lotsa hams used 'em....

??? WHO "championed big-yet-inefficient antennas?"

The pedantic pulpit-pushing parson has been quaffing too
much sacred wine?!?

>Now we'll be treated to another bunch of his posts full of name-calling,
>factual errors, misquotes, faulty logic, and just plain insults. So typical.
>The "Reverend" nonsense is a bit surreal, considering my religious beliefs.

Parson, you are a Holy One of the Church of St. Hiram.
A Believer, almost a fedayin when it comes to amateur
radio. You will take any opinion against the Sacred Words
of that Church of St. Hiram as heresy of the highest horror.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, if ARRL wrote "2 + 2 = 5," the pedantic
parson would say that the corrected expression of

"2 + 2 = 4" is an error! :-)

What next? Will the parson form a posse and burn an
ARRL diamond on my front lawn?!? :-)

<unsigned post, the sender is identified in message header>

1733. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-07 10:30:43 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302070230.7d465f39@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60816

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030206225028.23804.00000218@mb-fz.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 2/6/03 4:31 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0302061431.2ecad813@posting.google.com>
>
> >Is she one of your Ohio wive's, or was that Phyllis Diller?
>
> Phyllis said "Brian who?" too. What's up with that?
>
> Steve, K4YZ

You do have wildly varying taste; Morgan Fairchild and Phyllis Diller. Enjoi.

1734. Re: The coders embarrass themselves on 14.275 MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-07 10:44:18 UTC
From: OH2OT <oh2ot@sral.fi>
Message-ID: <b202mdfiv1@phys-news1.kolumbus.fi>
Source record: 60817
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

> The douchebag sending vulgarities on CW on 14.279 is likely
> located in 9-Land.

Which 9-land?
9A, 9U, 9Y ???
Different parts of the world?

Max OH0BT

1735. Re: Montana and Florida

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-07 14:13:11 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0302070613.5df3d591@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60818

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<b1tt103285n@enews2.newsguy.com>...
> Jeeesh.... wish we had that much snow.... we may be lucky if we had 8
> separate 1" snowfalls here in Mid-Michigan!!!!!

We got about 5 inches of new snow overnight. Went for a pre-dawn run
(about 2-1/2 miles) in the stuff about 5 AM. Wonderful time.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1736. Re: arrl article on echolink - impress a non ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-07 15:14:28 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030207101428.29188.00000218@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 60819

>Subject: Re: arrl article on echolink - impress a non ham
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/7/03 12:54 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030207015440.09900.00000433@mb-fc.aol.com>

>What "opposition to licensing of young people?" Define "young."

What a hoot. Suggests tot he FCC tha an age limit is required for Amateur
Radio licensure and then tries a STUPID dodge like this.

Putz.

>In modern American speech "young people" refer to older teens
> and those recently past their 18th birthday

And in how many presentations have YOU discussed "young people", Lennie?
I am only 47, and to me "young people" refers to children and teens. Of course
I DO work with kids EVERY DAY.

>I've never been "against young people." I've been against
> CHILDREN, especially CHILDREN only six years old "passing
> an amateur examination."

Why? YOU don't have one against which we could use as a milestone, so what
does it matter?

And PLEASE show us where these six year olds have been an ENFORCEMENT
problem...!

> There are a very regular group of OLD FARTS who like control
> and dictating who should say what when and where, expressing
> an inordinate fondness for the OLD WAYS to the point of
> demands to Keep The Status as Quo as Possible because that
> is Their Way. Those are all Fortysomething and later

"Keep The Status Quo"...?!?!

That's funny. NO ONE in this forum that responded to 98-143 suggested
"don't change a thing".

NOT A ONE, Your Lyingness.

>>I recall the exchange where Hans told us about his 14-year-old
>>age-requirement
>>idea in his comments to the FCC. Comments that were filed long after the
>>comment period had ended, when FCC was supposed to only be getting reply
>>comments.
>

> Error. Error. Error. My comment on NPRM 98-143 was/is on
> the FCC public database as having been received on 13 Jan 99.
> [it was received earlier than that, sent by registered USPS mail
> the first week in January 1999, paperwork still here]

The FACT is that YOU told the FCC that YOU thought an AGE LIMIT was necessary for the Amateur Radio service.

It's never been a problem before...it's not a problem today, and it's UNLIKELY to be a problem in the future.

>In my opinion and that of several others, SIX YEAR OLDS
> passing a WRITTEN test is a JOKE.

Kinda like your assertion that YOU would get an "Extra lite out of the box" was a joke, Lennie?

THEY did it...YOU haven't. So who'd the clown now?

>My "focus" is on MINIMIZING the would-be controllers and
> dictators of a hobby activity who demand Their Version of a
> hobby to be the Model for all others to emulate (because they
> are so damn good, noble, fine and true according to their own
> words). They can't take it.

Ahhhhh! Lenie wants to be IN CONTROL!

ANOTHER LIE EXPOSED BY HIS OWN HAND!

Until now, Lennie's "claim" was "only to elimitnate the Morse Code test".

Now in clear English he finally admits to his agenda!

This is NOT about the "Morse Code test"....It's jsut as I said all along...Lennie got his feelings ruffled at some point by Amateur Radio in general or some Ham in particular, and now he's ON A MISSION!

>Many things in life are INTERESTING. NO ONE needs any
> license or certificate or title to BE INTERESTED. Considering
> that RADIO, the whole world of radio, not the small slice that
> is a recreational, hobby activity, is great, diverse, full of
> innovation and invention, and very, very interesting.

But in order to PARTICIPATE in Amateur Radio, one NEEDS a license. Otherwise one sits on the sidelines...JUST LIKE YOU!

>>It's simple, Dave. His "interest" is the desire to damage, erode and
>>ultimately destroy amateur radio.
>
> The amateur Osama bin Laden describing his "opponents."

You got that wrong, Lennie...He was describing the Osama Bin Laden >of <Amateur Radio...Which would be YOU.

>>Cutting out the young folks is one way to do that.
>
> Good grief! The pedantic parson thinks I hang around grade
> schools threatening six-year-olds?!?

I think you hang around six year olds offering them candy and offering them a ride in your car, myself.

>The pedantic pulpit-pushing parson has been quaffing too
> much sacred wine?!?

You really ARE scrambling to dig yourself out of this, aren't you, Your Scumminess?

>What next? Will the parson form a posse and burn an
> ARRL diamond on my front lawn?!?

Burned a cross or two in your day, have you Lennie? You seem fixated with the idea......

Steve

1737. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL support it ??)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-07 16:57:41 UTC
From: RedOctober90@space.com
Message-ID: <9553ed5f.0302070857.1b46e436@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60820
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

Ross Archer <archer@topnow.com> wrote in message news:<3E4318A7.6C39845C@topnow.com>...
> RedOctober90 wrote:
> >
> > When they mean by "two way" radio coms does that also include things
> > like FRS and CB Radios? That's just ridicious. Maybe soon they will
> > require people registering television sets.
>
> No, if anything they would like as many people to park
> themselves in front of the Great Pacifier Tube for as long
> and as often as possible. Or more accurately, go to work,
> come home and be pacified, and simultaneously stimulated as
> a consumer to buy things to be a useful economic widget.
>
> While actively talking with someone, some naughty subversive
> thought might be unleashed. We must not have that! Approved
> drivel, entertainment, and commercial messages only, please!
> ;)
>
> So licenses for anything that might make a person more
> involved and active, and incentives for anything that makes
> you passive, lazy, content, and manipulatable. That's why
> TV is still free. :)
>
> -- Ross

I should of read the article a little better, I just skimmed through it in a hurry. I agree here Ross, but make a mention of what you say anywhere else and you be labled a "conspiracy wacko): We need Col Steve Anderson on the air.

1738. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL support it ??)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-07 16:58:40 UTC
From: RedOctober90@space.com
Message-ID: <9553ed5f.0302070858.124282e3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60821
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message news:<8VE0a.7858$mo6.1529@FE03>...
> If you haven't done anything wrong, then you have nothing to worry about. So
> what's the big problem??
>

Today it doesen't matter if you did anything wrong. Your the enemy no matter what.

1739. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL support it ??)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-07 16:59:23 UTC
From: RedOctober90@space.com
Message-ID: <9553ed5f.0302070859.64f819e8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60822
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

```
Gray Shockley <gray@compcomm.com> wrote in message
news:<0001HW.BA6829650035F4560D335DB0@news-central.giganews.com>...
> On Thu, 6 Feb 2003 14:19:26 -0600, RedOctober90 wrote
> (in message <9553ed5f.0302061219.fec7005@posting.google.com>):
>
> > When they mean by "two way" radio coms does that also include things
> > like FRS and CB Radios? That's just ridicious.
>
> Ah, to be young again . . .
>
> I came across my FFC license for my CB radio last week.
>
>
> > Maybe soon they will
> > require people registering television sets.
>
>
>
> Gray Shockley
> -------------------------
> "Swinehood hath no remedy." - Sidney Lanier
'
That was a bit uncalled for, no reason to insult. I admitted that I
should of read it a little slower.
```

1740. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-07 17:31:15 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0302070931.29e855ad@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60823

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030205214245.14740.00000086@mb-cc.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: NR-1 Book
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >Date: 2/4/03 2:50 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20030204155050.26864.00001217@mb-mq.aol.com>
>
> >Since when has actual knowledge of anyone stopped Rev.
> > Jimmie from making uneducated guesses about technical
> > knowledge of others? He will presuppose anything to make
> > his message case.
>
> Pot/kettle/black

Of course. SOP for Mr. Anderson.
>
> As demonstrated in recent threads dedicated to you,

(Mr. Anderson)

>, YOUR posts are ripe with LACK of facts.

Again, SOP.
>
> >>Is the above untrue? I don't see how it's an insult. I don't have much
> >>knowledge of ancient Chinese pottery.
> >
> >Pottery and ceramics is another newsgroup. Go there.
>
> As there are newsgroups for people wanting to discuss war stories,
> commercial radio and radio control of aircraft...But it's never stopped you
> from doing it here,

[pejorative deleted]

You missed the point, Steve. Mr. Anderson claims that others have
tried to silence him, yet it is he who tries to silence those who
disagree with him.

> >>Is the above untrue? I don't see how it's an insult. I lack skill in flying
> >>aircraft, so I might want to start out with one that required less skill
> >>than, say, a P-51 Mustang.
> >
> > Har!
>
> I don't find Leonard H. Anderson in the FAA database.

Typical.
>
> >>Some folks see insults where there are only plain, simple facts.
> >
> > Yes, Rev. Jimmie comes unglued when FACTS are presented
> > in front of him in public.

I suppose that if calm presentation of actual quotes, facts, and
opinions without using pejoratives, name-calling, is "coming
unglued"...
>
> Kinda like

(Mr. Anderson)

> seeing his own words repeated back to him in
> threads highlighting his own newsgroup misdeeds...?!?!

Maybe.
>
> No...Nothing at ALL like it...Jim Miccolis' posts are factual. Leonard H.
> Anderson's are not.

Well, there you have it.
>
> >A 234 foot long dipole is NOT a pretty sight in a residential
> > neighborhood.

Now we see a glimpse of Mr. Anderson's actual mission, Steve. He
doesn't want to see amateur radio antennas. Perhaps that's why he
wants amateur radio to go away.

The interesting part is that my comparisons are between a WBFD and a
dipole of equal size. If anything, a WBFD is even more visually
apparent than a plain dipole.

A 165 foot WBFD was modeled by W4RNL and is shown to have at least 7
dB of loss in the resistor. Which means it radiates less than 20% of
the RF fed to it as RF.

> > Go take your 2 MHz dipole out in the
> > country.
>
See what I mean? He wants to force us hams into only a few areas.

Some weeks back, I saw a really nice house for sale in my
neighborhood. 4 BR/2-1/2 bath colonial on a flat 1 acre with big
trees. No antenna restrictions that I know of. A 160 meter dipole
would have fit nicely on the diagonal, and been oriented N-S to boot.
Wire would be hard to see for the trees, too. And I sure don't live
out in the country.

Of course a dipole would not be the preferred antenna for 160 DX
anyway unless you could get it up really high.

One wonders what Mr. Anderson would like to see happen to the N2EY "antenna farm". Just a homebrew multiband trap inverted V, with the feedpoint supported by some RS TV mast on a gable end, and the ends in some convenient trees. Coax fed, covers 80/40 CW without a tuner and all bands with a little help. Feed efficency is acceptable because the coax is kept short. Neighbors don't even notice it. To me it's beautiful, 'specially at time like this morning. Snow drifting down and the sun rising over my town as I come down the street from an early-morning run.

But I suppose such things are unacceptable to Mr. Anderson.

Didja notice that Mr. Burke hasn't made a peep about his end-fed yet?

> A matter of opinon. I think seeing my neighbor's wife walking to the
> mailbox in robe and curlers is far more offensive than any antenna I have EVER
> seen.

All depends on the neighbor. Now if your neighbor looked like Heidi Klum, with a VS robe.....

73 de Jim, N2EY

1741. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-07 18:32:03 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3E43FBA3.9020809@psu.edu>
Source record: 60826

KC8PMX wrote:
> Alrighty then Jim.... like I said to the other guy.... what is the solution
> then, to keep the transmitting equipment out of the hands of the ones that
> should not have transmitting equipment? Any constructive ideas? We as a
> collective group can sit around and bitch about the problem with 10 meters
> (and other bands as well) but unless something is done, it will get worse.
>

Enforcement is the answer. Get out the recorders, bust a few booleggers, and the problem will start to go away. Registration of radio equipment is bogus and unconstitutional.

What about homebrew tx equipment? I can see it now. A knock on the door late at night... Uncle Ned being led away in chains for the crime of building a Rock-Mite.......

fugittaboudit

- mike KB3EIA -

1742. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-07 18:32:41 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.h9y3112.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 60824

On 07 Feb 2003 06:54:36 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:

>> You have a reading problem? Reread my comments in the restructuring
>> docket about dropping the Morse test requirement and the NCI reply
>> comment referring to it, and THEN ask again whether I want to retain
>> Morse testing in the ARS....(short answer - I do not).
>
> I READ your comments in regard to NPRM98-143. You called
> the US amateur radio license a "federal merit badge."

Gee, thast's funny. I did a word search on my copy of the comments
AS SUBMITTED and the phrase "merit badge" never was used. That may
have been your inference but it was not my implication.

What have you been reading?
>
>> I may be a competent Morse examiner but a "morseman" I am not.
>
> Not even a little, tiny bit? :-)

Do I know Morse code? Yes. Is it the be-all and end-all of
amateur radio? No. Should examinations in Morse code
proficiency be a required part of the amateur radio license
examination? I believe not.

It's that simple.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1743. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-07 18:35:25 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3E43FC6D.90708@psu.edu>
Source record: 60825

KB9TMP wrote:
> "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
> news:b1tt1a5285n@enews2.newsguy.com...
>
>>Alrighty then Jim.... like I said to the other guy.... what is the
>
> solution
>
>>then, to keep the transmitting equipment out of the hands of the ones that
>>should not have transmitting equipment? Any constructive ideas? We as a
>>collective group can sit around and bitch about the problem with 10 meters
>>(and other bands as well) but unless something is done, it will get worse.
>>
>>
>>--
>>Ryan, KC8PMX
>>FF/MFR
>>REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
>>--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
>>.. --. .... - . .-. ...
>>
>
>
>
> The real answer would be to fill the spectrum with 'use' to
> the point the illegals COULDN'T use it.

Yeah, but the 10-10'ers scare people away. Except of course for the
bootleggers.

- Mike -

1744. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-07 18:53:04 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E440088.E93B9C61@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60827

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E43481B.F43E73EA@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E408CDA.35C3536B@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030204063616.05048.00000443@mb-cs.aol.com>...
> > > > > > In article <3E3F1CCC.180E41A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > > > > > writes:
> > >
> > > > > > >I generally have low noise here but I really having no way of knowing if
> > > > > > >I could have heard AH3D on a T2FD without a preamp.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > How far above the noise was he? WVA to Johnston Island is a fur piece on 160.
> > > > >
> > > > > Jim, Johnston Island is the same distance regardless of band.
> > > >
> > > > Wow! If I'd only had your substantive knowledge, I could have skipped
> > > > that 160m QSO and just been satisified with working 'em on 10m SSB.
> > >
> > > Dave, please tell me how much further Johnston Island is on 160M then on 10M.
> > >
> > > A bigshot DXer like you should know.
> >
> > And you must believe me that I do know the distance, the bearing and the
> > reciprocal bearing to Johnston Island. Jim's comment indicated that
> > Johnston Island is a tough one from this part of the country. Then
> > again you knew that.
> > All that's left to decide is the reason for your smart-assed comment.
Well there you have it.
>
> I state something factual, and its now a smart-assed comment.

That is correct to a point. You stated something factual as a
smart-assed comment.

Dave K8MN

1745. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-07 19:16:57 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030207141657.19751.00001340@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 60828

In article <c2356669.0302070931.29e855ad@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
>news:<20030205214245.14740.00000086@mb-cc.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: NR-1 Book
>> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>> >Date: 2/4/03 2:50 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <20030204155050.26864.00001217@mb-mq.aol.com>
>>
>> >Since when has actual knowledge of anyone stopped Rev.
>> > Jimmie from making uneducated guesses about technical
>> > knowledge of others? He will presuppose anything to make
>> > his message case.
>>
>> Pot/kettle/black
>
>Of course. SOP for Mr. Anderson.

:-) The pedantic parson pens some parables to the peripheral percussionist of the putzim.... :-)

>> As demonstrated in recent threads dedicated to you,
>
>(Mr. Anderson)

"Dedication" by the brain-dead. :-)

>>, YOUR posts are ripe with LACK of facts.
>
>Again, SOP.

:-)

>> >>Is the above untrue? I don't see how it's an insult. I don't have much
>> >>knowledge of ancient Chinese pottery.
>> >
>> >Pottery and ceramics is another newsgroup. Go there.
>>
>> As there are newsgroups for people wanting to discuss war stories,
>> commercial radio and radio control of aircraft...But it's never stopped you
>> from doing it here,
>
>[pejorative deleted]

Shame, shame, parson! "Putz" is not a middle-European pejorative of ethnic Jewish origin, it is a standard title

bestowed upon the non-amateurs by Hostile Action Heroes.

It's best counterpart might be "goyim." :-)

>You missed the point, Steve. Mr. Anderson claims that others have
>tried to silence him, yet it is he who tries to silence those who
>disagree with him.

Of course. My production lines are going three shifts to
manufacture Black Helicopters...whop, whop, whop, to overfly
all amateur radio antenna farms. Of course. :-)

>> >>Is the above untrue? I don't see how it's an insult. I lack skill in
flying
>> >>aircraft, so I might want to start out with one that required less skill
>> >>than, say, a P-51 Mustang.
>> >
>> > Har!
>>
>> I don't find Leonard H. Anderson in the FAA database.
>
>Typical.

Ahem...the pedantic parson penned a perfidy! This is not a
flying newsgroup, not for sport flying, not for commercial
flying, not about aeronautics. Tsk, tsk, tsk. :-)

>> >>Some folks see insults where there are only plain, simple facts.
>> >
>> > Yes, Rev. Jimmie comes unglued when FACTS are presented
>> > in front of him in public.
>
>I suppose that if calm presentation of actual quotes, facts, and
>opinions without using pejoratives, name-calling, is "coming
>unglued"...

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Parson pens pernicious persiflage in petulance.
:-)

>> Kinda like
>
>(Mr. Anderson)
>
>> seeing his own words repeated back to him in
>> threads highlighting his own newsgroup misdeeds...?!?!
>
>Maybe.

Parson has "doubts?!?" How can that be? Parson = Perfect.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...pedantic parson's postings are always TRVTH
for they are from the good book of the Curch of St. Hiram.
That church as no doubts for they commandeth and define

what is TRVTH. :-)

>> No...Nothing at ALL like it...Jim Miccolis' posts are factual.
>> Leonard H. Anderson's are not.
>
>Well, there you have it.

"Calm presentation of actual quotes, facts, and opinions
without using pejoratives, name-calling, is 'coming unglued.'"

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Bad glue, hold, hold, dry in the corner until
there is courage to confront opponents directly instead of
through intermediaries who use "putz" as part of their
everyday speech. :-)

>Now we see a glimpse of Mr. Anderson's actual mission, Steve. He
>doesn't want to see amateur radio antennas. Perhaps that's why he
>wants amateur radio to go away.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Delusional again. Sacramental wine tippling?

Poor reading skills due to too much late-night DXing the rare
ones? Slip on the ice during the "5 AM run" and confuse the
cerebrum?

>The interesting part is that my comparisons are between a WBFD and a
>dipole of equal size. If anything, a WBFD is even more visually
>apparent than a plain dipole.

There you have it, the Final Word from a J. C. Maxwell, Jr.

>A 165 foot WBFD was modeled by W4RNL and is shown to have at least 7
>dB of loss in the resistor. Which means it radiates less than 20% of
>the RF fed to it as RF.

There you have it, no personal analysis, no application of
the much-vaunted MSEE skills, just a quote of what Cebik
wrote elsewhere.

This could be taken to rec.radio.amateur.antennas, but that
would result in a Loss of Pulpit Venue! :-)

>> > Go take your 2 MHz dipole out in the
>> > country.
>>
>See what I mean? He wants to force us hams into only a few areas.

The peripathetic pedantic parson personifies perfidy with
his "calm presentation of actual quotes, facts, and opinions
without using pejoratives" but using false, misleading, and
perjurous attempts at character assassination based on
imagination, supposition, and inability to handle opinions
contrary to His. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

>Some weeks back, I saw a really nice house for sale in my
>neighborhood. 4 BR/2-1/2 bath colonial on a flat 1 acre with big
>trees. No antenna restrictions that I know of. A 160 meter dipole
>would have fit nicely on the diagonal, and been oriented N-S to boot.
>Wire would be hard to see for the trees, too. And I sure don't live
>out in the country.

Oh, my, how lovely. My wife and I might consider a bid on our
northern house on the Kitsap Penninsula in Washington state.
10 acres, evergreens 60 to 80 feet high (approximately). Nice
for small rhombics. :-)

>Of course a dipole would not be the preferred antenna for 160 DX
>anyway unless you could get it up really high.

Wait a while...all those evergreens are still growing up in WA
state... :-)

>One wonders what Mr. Anderson would like to see happen to the N2EY
>"antenna farm". Just a homebrew multiband trap inverted V, with the
>feedpoint supported by some RS TV mast on a gable end, and the ends in
>some convenient trees. Coax fed, covers 80/40 CW without a tuner and
>all bands with a little help. Feed efficency is acceptable because the
>coax is kept short. Neighbors don't even notice it. To me it's
>beautiful, 'specially at time like this morning. Snow drifting down
>and the sun rising over my town as I come down the street from an
>early-morning run.

Oh, my, pedantic parson perpetuates poetry! :-) How nice...

ADA's Camp Tomlinson ("Kashiwa") transmitter site was on a
former airfield about a mile long and half-mile wide, full of
wire antennas...including barracks, mess hall, etc. B Company
of FEC Sig Svc Bn lived there, working around the clock to keep
the messages flowing out. I would imagine the parson popping
his pomegranete living IN an antenna field and being able to do
"his morning run" WITHIN the antenna field. :-) We of B Co.
did. No snow, though.

>But I suppose such things are unacceptable to Mr. Anderson.

Been there, done that. Long time ago. :-)

>Didja notice that Mr. Burke hasn't made a peep about his end-fed yet?

Poor baby. Disappointed?

Tsk, tsk, tsk...how gauche, how plebian to use "simple, totally
unacceptible antennas" not blessed by the amateur nobility!

>> A matter of opinon. I think seeing my neighbor's wife walking to the
>> mailbox in robe and curlers is far more offensive than any antenna I have
>EVER seen.
>
>All depends on the neighbor. Now if your neighbor looked like Heidi

>Klum, with a VS robe.....

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Take this to the alt.rec.covet-thy-neighbor's-wife
newsgroup. Besides, all know that Dill Sergeant Putz has
orgasmic dreams of Morgan Fairchild and Phyllis Diller! :-)

76 (trombones)
<no signature>

1746. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-07 20:11:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030207151110.01259.00000151@mb-ci.aol.com>
Source record: 60829

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.h9y3112.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 07 Feb 2003 06:54:36 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>>> You have a reading problem? Reread my comments in the restructuring
>>> docket about dropping the Morse test requirement and the NCI reply
>>> comment referring to it, and THEN ask again whether I want to retain
>>> Morse testing in the ARS....(short answer - I do not).
>>
>> I READ your comments in regard to NPRM98-143. You called
>> the US amateur radio license a "federal merit badge."
>
> Gee, thast's funny. I did a word search on my copy of the comments
> AS SUBMITTED and the phrase "merit badge" never was used. That may
> have been your inference but it was not my implication.
>
> What have you been reading?

Four loose-leaf notebooks full of print-outs from the FCC ECFS,
FCC NPRMs, R&Os, and other documentation concerning
NPRM 98-143 et al.

I stand corrected and the phrase "federal merit badge" was my
intepretation of your 30 November 1998 Comment on 98-143
which was "essentially a prize-awarding system, where
personal status is conferred by the grade of license."

I used that quote on page10 (of 14) in footnote 22 of my
Comment on 98-143 stamp-dated as "received Jan 13 1998"
and "received Jan 13 1999" (actual year was 1999 and a
mistake by the FCC mail room as noted on the copy
available for public view from the ECFS).

"Essentially a prize-awarding system" is rather descriptive
by itself. That is essentially what Boy Scout merit badges
are once the emotional loading of scouting's "good works"
and "teaching" phraseology is removed.

"Personal status" is another phrase part that can stand by
itself to denote class and the (again) emotional result of
class distinction.

>>> I may be a competent Morse examiner but a "morseman" I am not.
>>
>> Not even a little, tiny bit? :-)

>
> Do I know Morse code? Yes. Is it the be-all and end-all of
> amateur radio? No. Should examinations in Morse code
> proficiency be a required part of the amateur radio license
> examination? I believe not.
>
> It's that simple.

No problem with that here. I'll log Phil Kane as being consistent
in that view up to, and including 8 February 2003.

Others' comments, particularly the PCTA's, are FAR from
simple! :-)

1747. Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-07 21:02:15 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030207160215.10456.00000263@mb-ma.aol.com>
Source record: 60830

There's been a lot of biased remarks categorized as myself "trying to destroy amateur radio for young people" which need to be cleared up for the record. Over four years ago I wrote the following in a Comment on NPRM 98-143 (page 12 of 14) which is in the public record:

"A COMMENT CONCERNING THE MINIMUM AGE OF A LICENSEE"

"The ARRL Letter, afeature of the ARRL Web site, carried a news story about the 'two youngest hams' who were licensed at age four. [footnote 24] There isnothing in the existing Part 97 regarding age of a licensee or a prospective amateur. It is this writer'sopinionthat thereshould be a minimum age."

"Anyone taking an amateur radio test should be literate. Further, examinees and licensed amateurs should possess sufficient reasoning of regulations that they will operate responsibly. Itleaves this writer in a state of incredulity to suppose that FOUR YEAR OLDS have sufficient reading capability, sufficient understanding and responsibility to be granted a radio license in any radio service. Regardless of familial claims of abilities, it should be clear to any adult that four year olds do not possess enough maturity to operate radio transmitters sending signals internationally or with possibility of interference to communications in other radio services. It cannot be excused that these CHILDREN will be operating under "parental supervision." Nothing in the existing Part 97 regulations covers "parental supervision" of very young amateurs. CHILDREN are simply too young, too immagure to be entrusted with the responsibility of lawful operation of radio transmitters."

"It is suggested that a minimum age of amateur radio license examinees be limited to at least age 14 or older, any license class. [footnote 25] Proof of meeting minimum age limit would be shown to the examining VE team. Exact age would not be required to be submitted to the FCC, responsibility would be put on the VE test team to state to the FCC that an examinee met the minimum age requirement."

Footnote 24: "ARRL Letter of March 20, 1998, Volume 17, Number 12. The two 'youngest hams' were licensed as KB9RYP (Samuel Lewis, Technician Plus) and KB9SEG (Sarah Bruno, Novice) in late February 1998. The ARRL Letter text indicated that their siblings and parents were all

licensed in various amateur radio classes."

Footnote 25: "Most states have a minimum vehicle driving license age of 16, usually as a "Learner's Permit" or similar. Vehicle driving has a direct possibility of causing injury to others. Radio transmitters do not have such a direct effect on public safety but, irresponsibly operated, a transmitter could cause interference to radio navigation aids or emergency radio signalling devices. Federal Air Regulations allow children to pilot certain aircraft types but only under the direct supervision of an adult at the controls."

That comment was responsible for some to take to pulpits of righteousness and state condemnation of "keeping youth out of ham radio!" Yes, FOUR-YEAR-OLDS. CHILDREN. CHILDREN at age 0 through ENTRANCE to teen years.

Most of those in this newsgroup who got interested in ham radio as teen-agers did so at around age 14. That age is TEN YEARS PAST the ages of Samuel Lewis and Sarah Bruno. Ten years to become literate through public school, to be able to read written regulations with at least some understanding. Age 14 is two years past "entrance to teen years."

I wrote the quoted material on a Comment to NPRM 98-143 (indicated received 13 Jan 1999) and that is a publicly-available document in the FCC files. One of the righteous in here levelled the accusation of "continually harping on the subject." I do not, only to do counterpoint to others' off-tuned harps where they, looking for some "attack point" want to dwell on four-year-old public material.

If the barring of CHILDREN is somehow the "death and destruction of amateur radio," then a number of the righteous in here have lost touch with reality. 30.

1748. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL support it ??)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-07 21:26:01 UTC
From: Dean Arthur <dearthur@silverstar.com>
Message-ID: <3E44246D.42FF710E@silverstar.com>
Source record: 60831
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

You tell 'em Red. Rewrite of "Trading With Enemies Act of 1917" makes all persons claiming to be United States citizens enemies of the United States government. Read it and [weep?] for those who know how to read at/above 12th grade level requirement of 1952.

1749. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-07 23:40:12 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.52.0302072325470.168@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 60832

On Fri, 7 Feb 2003, Len Over 21 wrote:
> ... "A COMMENT CONCERNING THE MINIMUM AGE OF A LICENSEE"
> ...
> "It is suggested that a minimum age of amateur radio license
> examinees be limited to at least age 14 or older, any license
> class. [footnote 25] Proof of meeting minimum age limit ...

Although there may be some merit in the "4-year-old" case, I don't believe that 14 is a proper age floor. The question of understanding and maturity is an issue that should be based on facts and circumstances of each individual and cannot be answered simply by age.

Some three years ago, the VE team that I work with had a 9-year-old girl pass her EXTRA class examination (and that was when 20wpm was in effect too). Am I to believe that in her case and despite passing the examination, she doesn't know what she's doing? Granted that this only proved technical knowledge and not maturity, but in the converse situation, there are plenty of 21+ year-olds who JAM and otherwise violate the rules, thus showing their lack of maturity.

In Los Angeles County, on the 147.435(os) repeater, a "jamfest" is in progress. You have the control operator codes. What should you do?

a) Do nothing.
b) Use the control codes to turn the repeat function off.
c) Identify the jammers and report them to the local FCC field office.
d) Key up on top of them and repeat the 7 "naughty words" until they stop.

Select the BEST answer.

1750. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-08 00:07:09 UTC
From: Jackie <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com>
Message-ID: <NSX0a.29222$vm2.13214@rwcrnsc54>
Source record: 60833

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030207160215.10456.00000263@mb-ma.aol.com...
> There's been a lot of biased remarks categorized as myself "trying
> to destroy amateur radio for young people" which need to be
> cleared up for the record. Over four years ago I wrote the
> following in a Comment on NPRM 98-143 (page 12 of 14) which
> is in the public record:

It's kinda interesting, the way you bandy around such lofty opinions
regarding the entrance requirements for a service that you don't partake in.

KC0ODY

1751. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-08 01:23:07 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030207202307.20477.00000368@mb-fb.aol.com>
Source record: 60835

In article <Pine.LNX.4.52.0302072325470.168@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>, "D. Stussy"
<kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> writes:

>Although there may be some merit in the "4-year-old" case, I don't believe
that
>14 is a proper age floor.

Then make it 12. Age 12 has thrice the life experience of a
four-year-old, is of the common age of leaving grade school
and entering middle school.

I put in a numeric value four years ago as fitting the observed
entrance age of long-timers in here. It's not an absolute, never
was...yet some in here will spend hours and hours of pointless
writing denouncing it as absolute! Not you, Dieter. :-)

>The question of understanding and maturity is an
>issue that should be based on facts and circumstances of each individual and
>cannot be answered simply by age.

There's NO requirement in Part 97 for all VEs to possess any
psychologist training to assess maturity or responsibility of
examinees. There hasn't been any movement to revise Part 97
to include that. Yet. :-)

Privatization of ALL radio operator licenses doesn't have any
"psychological assessment regulation" and that applies just
as much to COLEMs and VEs. Should there be one? I just
put that as a question.

There is NO age limit now. There might be some cutesy future
ARRL Letter squib about "world's youngest ham" of age three.
First of all, no one can possibly doubt ARRL's inherent, implicit
honesty in all things amateur. To do otherwise would be heresy
and call for some kind of capital punishment.

>Some three years ago, the VE team that I work with had a 9-year-old girl pass
>her EXTRA class examination (and that was when 20wpm was in effect too). Am
>I to believe that in her case and despite passing the examination, she doesn't
>know what she's doing?

I don't know this girl's level of anything other than your statement
about being able to pass the test. That is what matters for legal
licensing grants.

What if the girl was only four? Or three? Or five? Or six?

That amateur license gives the licensee the right to operate a transmitter according to regulations. That's all it does. There's NO requirement for any parental supervision while using the license for transmitting.

There's no metaphysical, spiritual, or divine force to make ANY licensee operate maturely or responsibly...just as there is nothing but a statement of proper operation in regulations. What exist in here are a lot of self-styled, self-propelled radio cops who assume a mantel of "authority" when such authorization is no more than the fire in the fireplace below the mantel (their mantle is invisible). :-)

>Granted that this only proved technical knowledge and
>not maturity, but in the converse situation, there are plenty of 21+
>year-olds
>who JAM and otherwise violate the rules, thus showing their lack of maturity.

That applies to fortysomethings and fiftysomethings, too. Some of those are licensed to the max. Considering they are adults, what do you think would happen if children got to play in radioland just as freely?

Note: Children can and do "play in radioland freely" now with the availability of cheap FRS handy-talkies license free. Those have limited output power and are UHF. A Tech Plus or higher-class license allows much more power output and lower frequencies which can reach out across national borders.

1752. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-08 01:23:07 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030207202307.20477.00000369@mb-fb.aol.com>
Source record: 60836

In article <NSX0a.29222$vm2.13214@rwcrnsc54>, "Jackie"
<buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> writes:

>It's kinda interesting, the way you bandy around such lofty opinions
>regarding the entrance requirements for a service that you don't partake in.

The FCC "bandies about" a number of US amateur radio
regulations yet no staffer or commissioner is required to
be granted an amateur radio license. :-)

A great number of Americans "bandy about lofty opinions"
about US national politics yet hardly any of them are IN
politics or even consider seriously entering politics.

Consider that "lofty" (or basement) opinions about
getting into US amateur radio don't require that anyone
be IN amateur radio as in already being licensed. They
don't need to "care."

Would you seriously consider a four-year-old child as a
"member of a ham fraternity/sorority" on an equal basis
with your own activities in ham radio? There is NO legal
bar to age. Reducing this to the absurd, it is quite
possible for a newborn to be "granted a ham license." :-)

There, more food for the other players in this Theater of
The Absurd to comment amidst shouts of explitives
about "not having the right attitude." :-)

1753. Re: New Field Day Entry Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-08 01:23:20 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E445BFD.2030309@adelphia.net>
Source record: 60834

N2EY wrote:

> Looks like some of the suggestions have been heard.
>
> FD 2003 will have a new "Class F" entry class, for stations set up at
> EOCs (Emergency Operations Centers).
>
> See:
>
> http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2003/02/06/3/?nc=1

I also like the lowering of GOTA station contacts for bonus points. My guess is that not too many groups got that bonus last year. The new folks tend to work a lot slower.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1754. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-08 01:36:33 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030207203633.23139.00000232@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 60837

In article <Pine.LNX.4.52.0302072325470.168@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>, "D. Stussy"
<kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> writes:

>Subject: Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs
>From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
>Date: Fri, 07 Feb 2003 23:40:12 GMT
>
>On Fri, 7 Feb 2003, Len Over 21 wrote:
>> ... "A COMMENT CONCERNING THE MINIMUM AGE OF A LICENSEE"
>> ...
>> "It is suggested that a minimum age of amateur radio license
>> examinees be limited to at least age 14 or older, any license
>> class. [footnote 25] Proof of meeting minimum age limit ...
>
>Although there may be some merit in the "4-year-old" case, I don't believe
>that 14 is a proper age floor.

The important question is: What problems has the lack of an age requirement for
an amateur license caused? The FCC and its predecessors have been licensing
hams for over 90 years now, and there has never been an age limit. Mr. Anderson
does not give a single example of the youth of a ham being the source of any
problems for the ARS or other radio services.

>The question of understanding and maturity is an
>issue that should be based on facts and circumstances of each individual and
>cannot be answered simply by age.

Agreed. It should also be noted that FCC does not require an understanding of
the material on the tests - just enough correct answers, in a test session
conducted according to the rules. The written tests have been multiple-choice
for at least 42 years, btw.
>
>Some three years ago, the VE team that I work with had a 9-year-old girl pass
>her EXTRA class examination (and that was when 20wpm was in effect too). >Am
I
>to believe that in her case and despite passing the examination, she doesn't
>know what she's doing?

Of course she knows what she's doing - at least as much as the test methods
allow that to be determined. The real test is how she behaves on the air. Any
problems you know of?

Mr. Anderson, however, thinks that no one under the age of 14 can possibly use
an amateur radio transmitter of any kind in a responsible manner, and so no one
under that age should be licensed, regardless of qualifications demonstrated.

But it gets worse: He claims that the parents of the 4 year olds "conned the VEs", and in another example, accused the ARRL and the VE team of "very mild fraud". (Exact google quotes provided on request).

btw, the youngest Extra that I know of got that license at age 8, back before restructuring. Good operator, too - I know that from first-hand experience.

>Granted that this only proved technical knowledge and
>not maturity, but in the converse situation, there are plenty of 21+
>year-olds
>who JAM and otherwise violate the rules, thus showing their lack of maturity.
>
EXACTLY!!

Now if there were a problem with sub-14-year-old hams breaking the rules, perhaps age limits would be a good idea. However, the opposite seems to be the case.

Mr. Anderson has every right to suggest things to the FCC, just like any other citizen. No one denies that.

However, accusing VEs of dishonesty without any evidence is pretty serious stuff.

He also seems to have a problem tolerating opposing viewpoints.

>---------
>In Los Angeles County, on the 147.435(os) repeater, a "jamfest" is in
>progress.
>You have the control operator codes. What should you do?
>
>a) Do nothing.
>b) Use the control codes to turn the repeat function off.
>c) Identify the jammers and report them to the local FCC field office.
>d) Key up on top of them and repeat the 7 "naughty words" until they stop.
>
>Select the BEST answer.
>
GOOD QUESTION!!!!

I'm debating between b) and c). I'll say b), because it stops the violation now. c) is good, but you also need a method of positively identifying the jammers and recording their jamming. OTOH, shutting down the repeater may simply cause them to go elsewhere.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1755. Getting old call sign back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-08 01:41:54 UTC
From: DaveH <ddhartwick@NO_SPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <48978355E07BF35D.E6F8C3FFB31CA57F.C75B5648F44B6379@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 60838

I've done some searching, but can't find an answer to this question.

I was issued WA3URR in 1974, but stupidly let my license expire.

After re-testing back up to Extra class, I received KA3STE--OK but it isn't me!

Will the FCC re-issue original call signs? I did a search and WA3URR is not currently issued.

DaveH

1756. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL support it ??)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-08 01:50:20 UTC
From: panda radio <leakycaps200@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3e44626a@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 60839
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:8VE0a.7858$mo6.1529@FE03...
> If you haven't done anything wrong, then you have nothing to worry about.
So
> what's the big problem??
>
> KR4AJ

Is that anything like those hams who
QRM on 75 Meters Un-ID ?

1757. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-08 01:54:10 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <6rZ0a.169945$HG.28632745@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 60840

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030207160215.10456.00000263@mb-ma.aol.com...
> "It is suggested that a minimum age of amateur radio license
> examinees be limited to at least age 14 or older, any license
> class.

Jeez, I hope not. The way my 5 yr. old is going, I see her as a General by approx. age 8. She's made a game of the code and is doing really well with her reading skills in kndergarten and at home. Imagine that...a young person actually having Morse code!

Common sense dictates that she wouldn't operate unsupervised, but it'd sure make a pretty cool father/daughter activity. She's already fascinated by QSL cards.

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

1758. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL support it ??)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-08 03:05:20 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302071905.7646a5eb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60842
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

RedOctober90@space.com (RedOctober90) wrote in message
news:<9553ed5f.0302070858.124282e3@posting.google.com>...
> "Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message news:<8VE0a.7858$mo6.1529@FE03>...
> > If you haven't done anything wrong, then you have nothing to worry about. So
> > what's the big problem??
> >
>
> Today it doesen't matter if you did anything wrong. Your the enemy no matter what.

We have met the enemy...

1759. Re: Getting old call sign back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-08 03:05:33 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <1u_0a.3241$4y4.1409610@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 60841

"DaveH" <ddhartwick@NO_SPAMearthlink.net> wrote in message
news:48978355E07BF35D.E6F8C3FFB31CA57F.C75B5648F44B6379@lp.airnews.net...
> I've done some searching, but can't find an answer to this question.
>
> I was issued WA3URR in 1974, but stupidly let my license expire.
>
> After re-testing back up to Extra class, I received KA3STE--OK but it
> isn't me!
>
> Will the FCC re-issue original call signs? I did a search and WA3URR
> is not currently issued.
>
> DaveH

You would have to apply for it as a vanity call. It is highly likely that
they would then grant this application unless someone else has requested it.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

1760. Re: New Field Day Entry Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-08 03:14:16 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030207221416.09289.00001231@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 60843

In article <c2356669.0302061510.634b0c0d@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>Looks like some of the suggestions have been heard.
>
>FD 2003 will have a new "Class F" entry class, for stations set up at
>EOCs (Emergency Operations Centers).
>
>See:
>
>http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2003/02/06/3/?nc=1

What's the point of this? EOC stations are usually full-blown stations with high power capability, good antennas, and all the coffee and donuts you can consume. What does operating from one of these stations prove from a standpoint of true emergency communications capability? The operators at EOC's are usually the most obese, chain-smoking, technically incompetent and personality-challenged hams you'll find on-the-air. AFAIC, giving them their ever-so-appropriate "F" (for Failure) category is a good idea -- so us guys out there in the field will know who to avoid! However, if they add a rule stating that any EOC-station must change operators at least every four hours, and are not permitted to use HF SSB, then I'd begin to see some value to this category.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1761. Re: Getting old call sign back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-08 03:14:16 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030207221416.09289.00001232@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 60844

In article <48978355E07BF35D.E6F8C3FFB31CA57F.C75B5648F44B6379@lp.airnews.net>,
DaveH <ddhartwick@NO_SPAMearthlink.net> writes:

>'ve done some searching, but can't find an answer to this question.
>
>I was issued WA3URR in 1974, but stupidly let my license expire.
>
>After re-testing back up to Extra class, I received KA3STE--OK but it
>isn't me!
>
>Will the FCC re-issue original call signs? I did a search and WA3URR
>is not currently issued.

Dave:

You are correct. Your old call sign, WA3URR, is available and you can request
it as a Vanity Call Sign as long as somebody doesn't beat you to it first
(which is unlikely).

BTW -- I wonder why you were issued KA3STE if you upgraded to Extra? Did you
receive that call sign as a Technician, and just elect to keep it?

73 de Larry, K3LT

1762. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL support it ??)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-08 04:57:10 UTC
From: "Stephen C. Robbins" <srobbinsNoSPaMDUDES@netacc.net>
Message-ID: <3e448df8@news.netacc.net>
Source record: 60845
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

> > "Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:<8VE0a.7858$mo6.1529@FE03>...
> > > If you haven't done anything wrong, then you have nothing to worry
about. So
> > > what's the big problem??
> > >

Hmm, the name Richard Jewel comes to mind. Remember the security guard in Atlanta who discovered a bomb and warned people away, probably saving a dozen lives. The FBI destroyed the man in an attempt to convict him of placing the bomb. They got him fired from his job, destroyed his reputation in the community by releasing false stories about him, and even tried to get his family to turn on him. The real bomber is still on the loose and went on to bomb two more establishments while the FBI ignored him and went after the innocent.

And now we also have all the death row prisoners who have been released since the advent of DNA evidence. Yea, right, if you havent done anything wrong, then you have nothing to worry about. Now that is one ignorant statement!

1763. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-08 06:02:02 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns931CA7AB4926elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 60846

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in
news:6rZ0a.169945$HG.28632745@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net:

> "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030207160215.10456.00000263@mb-ma.aol.com...
>> "It is suggested that a minimum age of amateur radio license
>> examinees be limited to at least age 14 or older, any license
>> class.
>
> Jeez, I hope not. The way my 5 yr. old is going, I see her as a General
> by approx. age 8. She's made a game of the code and is doing really
> well with her reading skills in kndergarten and at home. Imagine
> that...a young person actually having Morse code!
>
> Common sense dictates that she wouldn't operate unsupervised, but it'd
> sure make a pretty cool father/daughter activity. She's already
> fascinated by QSL cards.
>
> --
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI
>
>
>

There used to be a minimum of 14 in the UK, but it was abolished. In theory anyone who can pass the test should be allowed to operate. I have some trouble beleiving that 4-year olds could genuinely pass, but I suppose it might be possible. I knew one girl who was licenced at 7, a 20 wpm extra at 9, and then designed and built a 2m quad for the school science fair when she was 11, but she was probably smarter than Len! 7 would be a better minimum than 14, but why bother atall. Most kids have a hard time saving up for kW linears from their allowance anyway.

1764. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-08 06:26:34 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E44A300.93E473C0@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60847

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E440088.E93B9C61@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E43481B.F43E73EA@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E408CDA.35C3536B@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030204063616.05048.00000443@mb-cs.aol.com>...
> > > > > > > > In article <3E3F1CCC.180E41A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > > > > > > > writes:
> > >
> > > > > > > > >I generally have low noise here but I really having no way of knowing if
> > > > > > > > >I could have heard AH3D on a T2FD without a preamp.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > How far above the noise was he? WVA to Johnston Island is a fur piece on
160.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Jim, Johnston Island is the same distance regardless of band.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Wow! If I'd only had your substantive knowledge, I could have skipped
> > > > > > that 160m QSO and just been satisified with working 'em on 10m SSB.
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave, please tell me how much further Johnston Island is on 160M then on 10M.
> > > >
> > > > A bigshot DXer like you should know.
> > >
> > > And you must believe me that I do know the distance, the bearing and the
> > > reciprocal bearing to Johnston Island. Jim's comment indicated that
> > > Johnston Island is a tough one from this part of the country. Then
> > > again you knew that.
> > > All that's left to decide is the reason for your smart-assed comment.
> > Well there you have it.
> >
> > I state something factual, and its now a smart-assed comment.
> >
> That is correct to a point. You stated something factual as a

> > smart-assed comment.
>
> and Jim see's no insult in his "factual" statement.

Assuming you refer to his comment about who might select a T2FD as a choice for a suitable antenna, I don't see any insult in Jim's factual statement either. It certainly didn't single you out. Are you now volunteering as an example of his comment?

> You guys are a riot.

Actually, you provide many of the punch lines.

Dave K8MN

1765. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-08 07:01:20 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E44AB80.9A609B2F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60848

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> There's been a lot of biased remarks categorized as myself "trying
> to destroy amateur radio for young people" which need to be
> cleared up for the record. Over four years ago I wrote the
> following in a Comment on NPRM 98-143 (page 12 of 14) which
> is in the public record:
>
> "A COMMENT CONCERNING THE MINIMUM AGE OF A
> LICENSEE"
>
> "The ARRL Letter, afeature of the ARRL Web site, carried a
> news story about the 'two youngest hams' who were licensed
> at age four. [footnote 24] There isnothing in the existing Part
> 97 regarding age of a licensee or a prospective amateur. It is
> this writer'sopinionthat thereshould be a minimum age."
>
> "Anyone taking an amateur radio test should be literate.

{See para. 1 line 5, "writer'sopinionthat thereshould"}

> Further, examinees and licensed amateurs should possess
> sufficient reasoning of regulations that they will operate
> responsibly. Itleaves this writer in a state of incredulity to
> suppose that FOUR YEAR OLDS have sufficient reading
> capability, sufficient understanding and responsibility to be
> granted a radio license in any radio service. Regardless of
> familial claims of abilities, it should be clear to any adult
> that four year olds do not possess enough maturity to
> operate radio transmitters sending signals internationally or
> with possibility of interference to communications in other
> radio services.

> It cannot be excused that these CHILDREN
> will be operating under "parental supervision." Nothing in
> the existing Part 97 regulations covers "parental supervision"
> of very young amateurs. CHILDREN are simply too young,
> too immagure to be entrusted with the responsibility of
> lawful operation of radio transmitters."

The individual addressing whether children are too "immagure" to obtain
an amateur radio license write the following elsewhere:

quote Tsk, tsk, tsk, another error. The pedantic parson is NOT
representative of all US amateur radio. The dill sergeant is
NOT representative of all US amateur radio. The robust

oberst is NOT representative of all US amateur radio. The
bus driver is NOT representative of all US amateur radio. unquote

There is one fact here which is absolutely beyond dispute: Leonard H.
Anderson is NOT representative of any or all U.S. amateur radio. Aside
from that, he is simply too "immagure".

> "It is suggested that a minimum age of amateur radio license
> examinees be limited to at least age 14 or older, any license
> class. [footnote 25] Proof of meeting minimum age limit
> would be shown to the examining VE team. Exact age would
> not be required to be submitted to the FCC, responsibility
> would be put on the VE test team to state to the FCC that an
> examinee met the minimum age requirement."
>
> Footnote 24: "ARRL Letter of March 20, 1998, Volume 17,
> Number 12. The two 'youngest hams' were licensed as
> KB9RYP (Samuel Lewis, Technician Plus) and KB9SEG
> (Sarah Bruno, Novice) in late February 1998. The ARRL
> Letter text indicated that their siblings and parents were all
> licensed in various amateur radio classes."
>
> Footnote 25: "Most states have a minimum vehicle driving
> license age of 16, usually as a "Learner's Permit" or similar.
> Vehicle driving has a direct possibility of causing injury to
> others. Radio transmitters do not have such a direct effect
> on public safety but, irresponsibly operated, a transmitter
> could cause interference to radio navigation aids or
> emergency radio signalling devices. Federal Air Regulations
> allow children to pilot certain aircraft types but only under the
> direct supervision of an adult at the controls."
>
> ---
> -----------------
>
> That comment was responsible for some to take to pulpits of
> righteousness and state condemnation of "keeping youth out
> of ham radio!" Yes, FOUR-YEAR-OLDS. CHILDREN.
> CHILDREN at age 0 through ENTRANCE to teen years.

Yep. Nine-year-olds, eleven-year-olds, twelve and thirteen-year-olds
would be excluded if your comments were favorably acted upon by the
FCC. Since there is no history of problems with young licensees and
since there has never been a lower age limit in U.S. amateur licensing,
what's it to you?
>
> Most of those in this newsgroup who got interested in ham
> radio as teen-agers did so at around age 14. That age is
> TEN YEARS PAST the ages of Samuel Lewis and Sarah
> Bruno. Ten years to become literate through public school,
> to be able to read written regulations with at least some

> understanding. Age 14 is two years past "entrance to teen
> years."

When I was a fourteen-year-old Novice licensee in 1963, QST carried the story of a twelve-year-old who had passed the amateur Extra. That was back in the day when one had to hold a General Class ticket for two years before being able to take the Extra Class exam. Age 10 is two years prior to the "entrance" to teen years.

> I wrote the quoted material on a Comment to NPRM 98-143
> (indicated received 13 Jan 1999) and that is a publicly-
> available document in the FCC files. One of the righteous
> in here levelled the accusation of "continually harping on
> the subject." I do not, only to do counterpoint to others'
> off-tuned harps where they, looking for some "attack point"
> want to dwell on four-year-old public material.

You don't really need to continually harp on the subject. You sent your views directly to the FCC. Thankfully, FCC reaction to your idea was....silence.

> If the barring of CHILDREN is somehow the "death and
> destruction of amateur radio," then a number of the
> righteous in here have lost touch with reality. 30.

If you see the barring of CHILDREN who are not now prevented from obtaining an amateur radio license, as a good thing, you've lost touch with reality. Numerous countries like the U.K. and Finland which formerly had such lower age limits in amateur radio licensing, have dropped such requirements. If you ever act on your decades long "interest" in amateur radio, you'll likely have to share the airwaves with CHILDREN.

Thanks for clearing up the record. It looks just like it did before and my reaction to it is much the same.

Dave K8MN

1766. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-08 08:44:52 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030208034452.27695.00000601@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 60849

>Subject: Re: NR-1 Book
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/7/03 1:16 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030207141657.19751.00001340@mb-cu.aol.com>

>>> I don't find Leonard H. Anderson in the FAA database.
>>
>>Typical.
>
> Ahem...the pedantic parson penned a perfidy! This is not a
> flying newsgroup, not for sport flying, not for commercial
> flying, not about aeronautics. Tsk, tsk, tsk

Nor is it about regular-vs-conscripted Army service in the 1950's, SINCGARS, IEEE-vs-ARRL, or a host of other topics that YOU rail on about at length. Nor is it about your rear-area war hero exploits, nor is it about the characteristics of the AMA -vs-ARRL. Again, other "topics" that you find "appropriate" for the forum.

>The peripathetic pedantic parson...(SNIP)

...has pretty well nailed you down. He's much more civil about it...I just think you're a demented little troll, caught up in your own incredible web of deceit, lies and failures.

"Putz", for short.

1767. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-08 09:04:55 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030208040455.27695.00000602@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 60850

>Subject: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/7/03 3:02 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030207160215.10456.00000263@mb-ma.aol.com>

>There's been a lot of biased remarks categorized as myself "trying
> to destroy amateur radio for young people" which need to be
> cleared up for the record. Over four years ago I wrote the
> following in a Comment on NPRM 98-143 (page 12 of 14) which
> is in the public record:

There's nothing biased about it, and your re-posting of your 98-143
comments does NOTHING but lend even MORE creedence to those who find your idea
repulsive.

It still comes down to two things: (1) is there any evidence that these
persons obtained thier licenses fraudulently or with inappropraite assistence
from the Examiners, and (2) is there any evidence that these persons have posed
an enforcement issue?

>"It is suggested that a minimum age of amateur radio license
> examinees be limited to at least age 14 or older, any license
> class. [footnote 25] Proof of meeting minimum age limit
> would be shown to the examining VE team. Exact age would
> not be required to be submitted to the FCC, responsibility
> would be put on the VE test team to state to the FCC that an
> examinee met the minimum age requirement."

This sounded really stupid the first time I read it, and it's down right
hilliarious the second time around.

>Most of those in this newsgroup who got interested in ham
> radio as teen-agers did so at around age 14. That age is
> TEN YEARS PAST the ages of Samuel Lewis and Sarah
> Bruno. Ten years to become literate through public school,
> to be able to read written regulations with at least some
> understanding. Age 14 is two years past "entrance to teen
> years."

So....just because many Amateurs enter Amateur Radio at age 14, we should
codify that as the defacto minimum age, entering yet another law on the books
for a "problem" that's never manifested?

Lennie, rather than force your aspurgences on Amateur Radio, why don't you
just spend the rest of your waning years authoring more laws for problems that
DON'T exist...?!?!

Putz.

Steve, K4YZ

1768. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-08 09:12:01 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030208041201.27695.00000603@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 60901

>Subject: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/7/03 3:02 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030207160215.10456.00000263@mb-ma.aol.com>

>CHILDREN are simply too young,
> too immagure to be entrusted with the responsibility of
> lawful operation of radio transmitters."

"...too immagure"...?!?!

By the way, Lennie, you've STILL not told us how many kids YOU have sired,
or how many kids you've raised by adoption, etc etc.

P L E A S E, Lennie, ragale us with yet another LennieRant on how Dr. Spock
came to YOU for information on childhood development, and how you have had
alllll that experience raising kids?

Or is this, as I suspect, yet another field of endeavour in which you have
no practical experience?

Steve, K4YZ

1769. Re: FCC Fees

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-08 10:32:45 UTC
From: Jim at Q-57 FM <Jim@Q57maybe.org>
Message-ID: <b22mbsicc0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 60902

"Ken Farnswell" <RInter@farn832w.org> wrote in message
news:b1vc2v$i1g$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> No such thing will ever happen, considering the relationship
> the FCC has with those who might implement such a thing.
>
> 73,
> Ken Farnswell, P.E., Ph. D.
> Slaycor International
>
>
Hey Ken,

Good to see you again! Heard you check in on 7255 last night.
Looks like Mr. J at the FCC and the rest of his friends at the
Commission are up to their old lies and devious tricks again. And
they need another lesson in honesty and good government ethics
again. Apparently they learned little from their last trip to the wood
shed. Email me at my yahoo.com address and will bring you up
to date.

73,

Jim Q-57 FM

1770. Re: Getting old call sign back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-08 13:12:47 UTC
From: AC6V <none@nowhere.com>
Message-ID: <jn71a.7896$LW1.499333@news1.west.cox.net>
Source record: 60903

As far as I know -- ur old call (if available) can only be re-issued as a vanity call. Provided your present license class is within the proper alloted blocks. So you are eligible for WA6URR vanity.
See http://www.arrl.org/arrlvec/vanity.html

Many here in San Diego that I know have done this.

And an issued call can be shortened with a vanity (KE6JXY a tech can not get K6XY (extra) but could get K6JXY) with out an additional exam.

--
Caveat Lector - Ya All
I Doubt, Therefore I Might Be
73 From AC6V, (original issue)
Rod In Oceanside, CA
Home Page http://ac6v.com
DX Book http://ac6v.com/DXSAMPLE.htm

"DaveH" <ddhartwick@NO_SPAMearthlink.net> wrote in message news:48978355E07BF35D.E6F8C3FFB31CA57F.C75B5648F44B6379@lp.airnews.net...
> I've done some searching, but can't find an answer to this question.
>
> I was issued WA3URR in 1974, but stupidly let my license expire.
>
> After re-testing back up to Extra class, I received KA3STE--OK but it
> isn't me!
>
> Will the FCC re-issue original call signs? I did a search and WA3URR
> is not currently issued.
>
> DaveH

1771. Re: Getting old call sign back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-08 13:29:56 UTC
From: tad danley <tdanley@nospamatearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E45069E.AFB1DEF3@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60904

DaveH wrote:

> I've done some searching, but can't find an answer to this question.
>
> I was issued WA3URR in 1974, but stupidly let my license expire.
>
> After re-testing back up to Extra class, I received KA3STE--OK but it
> isn't me!
>
> Will the FCC re-issue original call signs? I did a search and WA3URR
> is not currently issued.

Check out the Mother of all Vanity call sign sites at
http://www.vanityhq.com/
Everything you want/need to know is there, including help on how to apply
for your old call and track the status of your application - a great
site!

Good luck and 73,

--
Tad Danley, K3TD

* Anti-spam return address in use *

1772. Re: Getting old call sign back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-08 16:05:59 UTC
From: DaveH <ddhartwick@NO_SPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <57C7FA5930616060.09C035F7088B4388.B256AC75093257C8@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 60905

Larry,
I've had a good search through VanityHQ and can't find where the availability of WA3URR is addressed. I examined the data base under the "call availability" link, but only see WA4URR. Perhaps if a call is not explicitly shown as being invalid or unavailable, it is available.

Regarding KA3STE: I received that call as a novice in 91 and think I elected to keep it when I was issued an extra-class license in 93. IIRC, I didn't want a call with an "A--" prefix.

It is was only recently that I decided to seriously pursue my old call.
Dave

On 08 Feb 2003 03:14:16 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote:

>In article <48978355E07BF35D.E6F8C3FFB31CA57F.C75B5648F44B6379@lp.airnews.net>,
>DaveH <ddhartwick@NO_SPAMearthlink.net> writes:
>
>>'ve done some searching, but can't find an answer to this question.
>>
>>I was issued WA3URR in 1974, but stupidly let my license expire.
>>
>>After re-testing back up to Extra class, I received KA3STE--OK but it
>>isn't me!
>>
>>Will the FCC re-issue original call signs? I did a search and WA3URR
>>is not currently issued.
>
>Dave:
>
>You are correct. Your old call sign, WA3URR, is available and you can request
>it as a Vanity Call Sign as long as somebody doesn't beat you to it first
>(which is unlikely).
>
>BTW -- I wonder why you were issued KA3STE if you upgraded to Extra? Did you
>receive that call sign as a Technician, and just elect to keep it?
>
>73 de Larry, K3LT

1773. Re: Getting old call sign back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-08 16:06:56 UTC
From: DaveH <ddhartwick@NO_SPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <D52ACACBBF655BB2.DEB593CB4867A97A.C64CA4F05C6C7361@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 60906

On Sat, 08 Feb 2003 13:12:47 GMT, "AC6V" <none@nowhere.com> wrote:

>As far as I know -- ur old call (if available) can only be re-issued as a
>vanity call. Provided your present license class is within the proper
>alloted blocks. So you are eligible for WA6URR vanity.
I assume you mean WA3URR??

>See http://www.arrl.org/arrlvec/vanity.html
>
>Many here in San Diego that I know have done this.
>
>And an issued call can be shortened with a vanity (KE6JXY a tech can not get
>K6XY (extra) but could get K6JXY) with out an additional exam.

1774. Re: Getting old call sign back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-08 16:17:08 UTC
From: AC6V <none@nowhere.com>
Message-ID: <84a1a.8529$LW1.525260@news1.west.cox.net>
Source record: 60907

You can check for callsign availibility at any of the following as I believe
they are updated daily from the FCC data base. WM7D' site is.
http://www.wm7d.net/
http://www.qrz.com/
http://www.buck.com/cgi-bin/do_hamcall

Or go to the FCC site -- good luck on weeding thru it
http://www.fcc.gov/
http://wireless.fcc.gov/services/amateur/index.html

--
Caveat Lector - Ya All
I Doubt, Therefore I Might Be
73 From AC6V, who is QBF most of the time !!
Rod In Oceanside, CA
Home Page http://ac6v.com
DX Book http://ac6v.com/DXSAMPLE.htm

"DaveH" <ddhartwick@NO_SPAMearthlink.net> wrote in message
news:57C7FA5930616060.09C035F7088B4388.B256AC75093257C8@lp.airnews.net...
> Larry,
> I've had a good search through VanityHQ and can't find where the
> availability of WA3URR is addressed. I examined the data base under
> the "call availability" link, but only see WA4URR. Perhaps if a call
> is not explicitly shown as being invalid or unavailable, it is
> available.
>
> Regarding KA3STE: I received that call as a novice in 91 and think I
> elected to keep it when I was issued an extra-class license in 93.
> IIRC, I didn't want a call with an "A--" prefix.
>
> It is was only recently that I decided to seriously pursue my old
> call.
> Dave
>
>
>
>
> On 08 Feb 2003 03:14:16 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
> wrote:
>
> >In article
<48978355E07BF35D.E6F8C3FFB31CA57F.C75B5648F44B6379@lp.airnews.net>,
> >DaveH <ddhartwick@NO_SPAMearthlink.net> writes:
> >

> >>'ve done some searching, but can't find an answer to this question.
> >>
> >>I was issued WA3URR in 1974, but stupidly let my license expire.
> >>
> >>After re-testing back up to Extra class, I received KA3STE--OK but it
> >>isn't me!
> >>
> >>Will the FCC re-issue original call signs? I did a search and WA3URR
> >>is not currently issued.
> >
> >Dave:
> >
> >You are correct. Your old call sign, WA3URR, is available and you can
request
> >it as a Vanity Call Sign as long as somebody doesn't beat you to it first
> >(which is unlikely).
> >
> >BTW -- I wonder why you were issued KA3STE if you upgraded to Extra? Did
you
> >receive that call sign as a Technician, and just elect to keep it?
> >
> >73 de Larry, K3LT
>

1775. Re: DO YOU REMEMBER WHEN???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-08 17:39:03 UTC
From: Landshark
Message-ID: <Xgb1a.1653$uT.574741617@newssvr13.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 60908
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

<Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
news:20030208120642.347$r3@newsreader.com...
> N8WWM Doug Adair(Anti Keyclown Control Center) wrote:
> > remember when CB'ers weren't federal criminals? remember when they
> > werent little pink muffin weeners like you guys?
> >
> .
> Remember when your name made the rain report,asshole?
> .
Remember when Doug was accused of being a
federal criminal, I do ..... LOL!!!

Landshark

--
Any day riding, is better than
being a newsgroupie

73 Baja Stroppe Bronco
98 Buell S3 Thunderbolt
99 Ford F-150 Supercab 4X4 (antenna platform)

1776. Re: n8wwm king of clowns busted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-08 19:00:06 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <zDqdnd8hQOoqztijXTWcqw@comcast.com>
Source record: 60909
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

<Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
news:20030208131111.061$Pn@newsreader.com...
> Life is good when you're not a fat blowhard like doug adair,n8wwm.

The whole episode is a non-issue when you dig in to the facts Mopar.
I've contacted several people directly involved and sorted out the
facts for myself. Twisted hasn't been completely truthful in his posts
it seems. Yes there where recordings of N8, however the recordings
where of him chewing out several other Hams on the repeater for
routinely causing interference, and his "strongly worded opinions"
about the lack of action by the control operator(s) to correct the
problem. Apparently one of the Hams involved in the interference made
those tape recording in an attempt to cover his behind, and tried to
get N8 to back off on his complaints, by sending them in to the FCC.
If N8 is really guilty of anything its trying to clean up an existing
problem on the Ham band in his local. This is something any really
concerned Ham would do, a bit of self policing action where we try to
clean up our own mess first before the FCC has to step in and do it
for us. As far as I can tell there isn't going to be any action taken
against N8 by the FCC.

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

ARRL Member
NCI Member
--
"I care about truth not for truth's sake
but for my own."

Samuel Butler

1777. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-08 19:13:08 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030208141308.16242.00000080@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 60910

In article <f45722ac.0302071905.7646a5eb@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>RedOctober90@space.com (RedOctober90) wrote in message
>news:<9553ed5f.0302070858.124282e3@posting.google.com>...
>> "Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
>news:<8VE0a.7858$mo6.1529@FE03>...
>> > If you haven't done anything wrong, then you have nothing to worry about.
>So
>> > what's the big problem??
>> >
>>
>> Today it doesen't matter if you did anything wrong. Your the enemy no
>matter what.
>
>We have met the enemy...

"Today is the tomorrow you worried about yesterday..." :-)

1778. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-08 19:13:09 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030208141309.16242.00000081@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 60911

In article <6rZ0a.169945$HG.28632745@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>, "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> writes:

>Jeez, I hope not. The way my 5 yr. old is going, I see her as a General by >approx. age 8. She's made a game of the code and is doing really well with >her reading skills in kndergarten and at home. Imagine that...a young person >actually having Morse code!

I have no problem with your five-year-old. You must have realized that many, many things fascinate children and few of those fascinations take root and hold all the way to adulthood. What fascinates your daughter right now may not be the case in six months or a year.

>Common sense dictates that she wouldn't operate unsupervised, but it'd sure >make a pretty cool father/daughter activity. She's already fascinated by QSL >cards.

"Common sense" may be apparent to an adult. It is not yet fully learned by children. "Common sense" doesn't "dictate" anything...it is just a common assumption. It may or may not have to be "worked into" a child (by backside) depending on the particular case.

As children grow into teen years they begin to resent parental supervision over "their" activity. Every such case is different and must be handled appropriately...there is no one way to do that which will work every time.

1779. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-08 19:13:12 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030208141312.16242.00000082@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 60912

In article <20030207203633.23139.00000232@mb-da.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <Pine.LNX.4.52.0302072325470.168@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>, "D.Stussy"
><kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> writes:
>
>>Subject: Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs
>>From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
>>Date: Fri, 07 Feb 2003 23:40:12 GMT
>>
>>On Fri, 7 Feb 2003, Len Over 21 wrote:
>>> ... "A COMMENT CONCERNING THE MINIMUM AGE OF A LICENSEE"
>>> ...
>>> "It is suggested that a minimum age of amateur radio license
>>> examinees be limited to at least age 14 or older, any license
>>> class. [footnote 25] Proof of meeting minimum age limit ...
>>
>>Although there may be some merit in the "4-year-old" case, I don't believe
>>that 14 is a proper age floor.
>
>The important question is: What problems has the lack of an age requirement
for
>an amateur license caused? The FCC and its predecessors have been licensing
>hams for over 90 years now, and there has never been an age limit. Mr.
Anderson
>does not give a single example of the youth of a ham being the source of any
>problems for the ARS or other radio services.

Heh heh heh...I'm not 90, either. Ahem...it is 91 years...1912. See
Thomas H. White USA radio histories on the Internet. Interesting
stuff, not limited or biased as comes out of a small city near Boston.

Parson, better stand away from the pulpit a bit further. Church
committee is complaining about the teeth marks you put there...

Why does there "have to be a problem" to streamline and reduce
federal regulations in anything?

There are more radio amateurs in the USA now than 90 years ago.
They have HF and higher power capability, relatively easy-to-use
controls compared to 85 years ago. Did anyone talk about "skip"
80 years ago? No? :-)

Trying to make the entire US amateur radio environment "the same"
now as it was in the beginning is nonsense. Too many things have
changed, improved, gotten easier to use. Spark has been outlawed

long since and vacuum tubes are on their way out of most radios and electronics. The types that remain in new products are magnetrons in microwave ovens (a few dozen million or so), TV and computer monitor display CRTs still operating before being replaced by TFT and Plasma and LCD screens, photomultiplier tubes in optical physics, and some RF power amplifiers (but not all).

Should radio amateurs have been thrown off MF in the US in the 1920s? Amateurs would have said, "of course not, we never 'caused any trouble!'" [they did, but ARRL won't tell that side of the story] "Spark never caused any trouble!" could have been a complaint when Class B emissions were outlawed. Every single change in amateur regulations seems to have its share of complaints of "it wasn't any trouble before, so why change it?!?" At the same time these complainants want (desperately?) to hold onto their old, familiar things and puff themselves up into something noble and good and trustworthy and honest and etc.

Back around 1980 every good catholic would have said "it's silly to have guards around the Pope...'nobody' would try to assasinate a Pope!" [despite one attempt in 1978] Then in 1981 John Paul II took a bullet and, afterwards, the "popemobile" was built. There "was no trouble" prior to 1978 so it was "unthinkable" that anyone would try to harm a Pope.

There's been "no trouble" about age for amateur licenses before according to the few, the proud, the hams. All children of hams lead exemplary lives, always obeying everything, always responsible, mature, trustworthy. Of course. And the world is flat, the moon made of green cheese, and all the evil in radio exists solely on CB. :-)

>>The question of understanding and maturity is an
>>issue that should be based on facts and circumstances of each individual and
>>cannot be answered simply by age.
>
>Agreed. It should also be noted that FCC does not require an understanding of
>the material on the tests - just enough correct answers, in a test session
>conducted according to the rules. The written tests have been multiple-choice
>for at least 42 years, btw.

Ah...and "insider" explains "what should be noted about FCC thinking! Tsk, tsk, tsk, no systems thinking by the "engineer" of some unnamed company who has "given talks to industry."

The purpose of ANY test, academic or otherwise, is to determine the depth of understanding of the subjects in the test. Miccolis seems to think an FCC test is just a form of lottery or bingo game. "Just supply the correct answers" because, according to the parson, "the FCC does not require any understanding of the material!" Marvelous non-deduction by the parson. If that were the case, why is there a test at all?

>>Some three years ago, the VE team that I work with had a 9-year-old girl pass
>>her EXTRA class examination (and that was when 20wpm was in effect too).
>>Am I to believe that in her case and despite passing the examination, she
doesn't
>>know what she's doing?
>
>Of course she knows what she's doing - at least as much as the test methods
>allow that to be determined. The real test is how she behaves on the air. Any
>problems you know of?

According to the pedantic parson "the FCC does not require any
understanding of the material." The "real test" is her behavior on
the air...which is a "test" in front of the "ARS community?"

>Mr. Anderson, however, thinks that no one under the age of 14 can possibly use
>an amateur radio transmitter of any kind in a responsible manner, and so no
one
>under that age should be licensed, regardless of qualifications demonstrated.

The pedantic parson is petulant. Tsk, tsk, tsk. He doesn't "know"
what I "think" despite his self-proclaimed expertise in telepathy in
"knowing what others think." Miccolis has NO qualifications in
telepathy. No one does. That does not deter the pedantic parson
who will not respond directly but must use intermediaries in here.

>But it gets worse: He claims that the parents of the 4 year olds "conned the
>VEs", and in another example, accused the ARRL and the VE team of "very mild
>fraud". (Exact google quotes provided on request).

Absolutely. Does Miccolis need a billboard size sign showing what
I wrote four years ago? "Google" doesn't need to be quoted. The
communication to the FCC became a public document on 13 Jan 99.

Does Miccolis think Google is a better archive than the FCC's own
public database?

>btw, the youngest Extra that I know of got that license at age 8, back before
>restructuring. Good operator, too - I know that from first-hand experience.

Absolutely. Absolutely ALL children who are hams are
exemplary...NO ONE does wrong if they have the LICENSE.

There is NO PROBLEM if Rev. Jimmie Callsign said there is
no problem. [all readers have seen similar statements...]

>Now if there were a problem with sub-14-year-old hams breaking the rules,
>perhaps age limits would be a good idea. However, the opposite seems to be
>the case.

What? No "thinking" elaborated there? No explanation of what
really happened according to the parson? No telepathic insights
to the deep, inner meanings of it all?

THERE IS NO PROBLEM WITH AGE LIMITS according to the
pedantic parson. There, that's the ruling. Da judge done spoke.

>Mr. Anderson has every right to suggest things to the FCC, just like any
>other citizen. No one denies that.

Better not, sweetums.

>However, accusing VEs of dishonesty without any evidence is pretty serious
>stuff.

So, take me to court, reverend. Let's make a federal case out
of it and find out how much clay makes up the feet of your
Church.

>He also seems to have a problem tolerating opposing viewpoints.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, reverend. I "have a problem?!?" Who is "replying"
to whom here? :-)

Ok, folks, here's Da Word from the pedantic parson: I HAVE
TROUBLE WITH OPPOSING VIEWPOINTS! Everyone laminate
that and keep it in your wallets. Engrave it on marble or on a
marble, put it in the Smithsonian on display, feature it on "60
Minutes." Rev. Jimmie said it in here!

Four years and three weeks ago I wrote something to the FCC
and Jimmie can't let go of it. He is a fedayin with a death grip
on the past, avenging the honor, nobility, and sacredness of
the old. Vengence is his?

1780. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-08 19:36:21 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030208143621.27873.00000507@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 60913

In article <3E44AB80.9A609B2F@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> There's been a lot of biased remarks categorized as myself "trying
>> to destroy amateur radio for young people" which need to be
>> cleared up for the record.

"Biased"?

>> Over four years ago I wrote the
>> following in a Comment on NPRM 98-143 (page 12 of 14) which
>> is in the public record:
>>
>> "A COMMENT CONCERNING THE MINIMUM AGE OF A
>> LICENSEE"

FCC classified it as a "Reply Comment".
>>
>> "The ARRL Letter, afeature of the ARRL Web site, carried a
>> news story about the 'two youngest hams' who were licensed
>> at age four. [footnote 24] There isnothing in the existing Part
>> 97 regarding age of a licensee or a prospective amateur. It is
>> this writer'sopinionthat thereshould be a minimum age."
>>
>> "Anyone taking an amateur radio test should be literate.
>
>{See para. 1 line 5, "writer'sopinionthat thereshould"}
>
>> Further, examinees and licensed amateurs should possess
>> sufficient reasoning of regulations that they will operate
>> responsibly. Itleaves this writer in a state of incredulity to
>> suppose that FOUR YEAR OLDS have sufficient reading
>> capability, sufficient understanding and responsibility to be
>> granted a radio license in any radio service. Regardless of
>> familial claims of abilities, it should be clear to any adult
>> that four year olds do not possess enough maturity to
>> operate radio transmitters sending signals internationally or
>> with possibility of interference to communications in other
>> radio services.

No proof of there ever having been a problem due to the youth of a radio
amateur. Perhaps Mr. Anderson should read the book "Radio Rescue", about the
public service of a young ham back in the '20s, when the nature of radio
equipment made the "possibility of interference to communications in other

radio services" much greater. The book is available from Amazon.com, btw, which has reported two consecutive quarters in the black after running in the read for almost all of its existence and piling up considerable debt.
>
>> It cannot be excused that these CHILDREN
>> will be operating under "parental supervision." Nothing in
>> the existing Part 97 regulations covers "parental supervision"
>> of very young amateurs. CHILDREN are simply too young,
>> too immagure to be entrusted with the responsibility of
>> lawful operation of radio transmitters."
>
>The individual addressing whether children are too "immagure" to obtain
>an amateur radio license write the following elsewhere:
>
>quote Tsk, tsk, tsk, another error. The pedantic parson is NOT
> representative of all US amateur radio. The dill sergeant is
> NOT representative of all US amateur radio. The robust
> oberst is NOT representative of all US amateur radio. The
> bus driver is NOT representative of all US amateur radio. unquote
>
>There is one fact here which is absolutely beyond dispute: Leonard H.
>Anderson is NOT representative of any or all U.S. amateur radio. Aside
>from that, he is simply too "immagure".

You want quotes, Dave? How about these? The parts identified with "LA>" are all by Mr. Anderson:

1996/09/02:

LA>I've always had trouble with integrating "youngsters" in what is
LA> a primarily _adult_ skill/technique recreational activity.

1999/02/16:

LA>The arbitrary age of 14 (approximate Grade 8 in USA) is considered
LA>to allow reasonable reading comprehension of the English language for
LA>the purposes of READING the written test elements.This would be much
LA>more honest than expecting anyone to believe that FOUR YEAR OLDS
LA>have reading comprehension."

LA>"Herr Breakup wants to have an amateur radio community of the future
LA>to be prepubescent children?!?!? Let's hear it for the four year old
LA>Novices who have READ and UNDERSTOOD the written test elements
LA>and realize their responsibility in having a license!!! Let's hear it for
the
LA>VEs who have PASSED those CHILDREN for the FCC!!!"

LA>Ah yes, the warm-hearted convivial stormtrooper from central africa
LA>MUST make his SUPERIORITY known! Four year olds who can beep
LA>(along with parents who have conned the VEs into passing them)
LA>are considered "superior" to those who are not licensed in the amateur
LA>radio service."

The "warm-hearted convivial stormtrooper from central africa" is a reference to K8MN.

Particularly illuminating is the phrase "parents who have conned the VEs into passing them", which is an accusation of fraud and dishonesty.

2002-12-02:

LA>Now go back to the famous/infamous ARRL news page that showed
LA>two darling six-year-olds who were reported to have "passed" written
LA>tests for Novice and Technician, respectively.

Hmm, those two four year olds have aged somewhat.

LA>Now let any, repeat ANY,
LA>first-grade teacher look at the written exam questions and decide for
LA>themselves whether SIX YEAR OLDS can read those questions well
LA>enough to answer even 70 percent of them. Just to READ them and
LA>be able to choose any answer.

Quite an odd test, really. However, note what happens if the teacher answers in the affirmative:

LA>If you say "yes they can, because...[for any reason]" then you MUST
LA>acknowledge that (1) You don't have slightest familiarity with
LA>six-year-olds' reading/writing comprehension;

So if any first grade teacher says "Yes, some six year olds could read that", said teacher's opinion is disregarded by Mr. Anderson, who proposes the test in the first place..

LA>or (2) You think
LA>anything labeled/stamped/categorized as "ham radio material" is
LA>somehow "special" over and above any other subject matter; or
LA>3) Any child who is "involved" in any way with amateur radio is
LA>somehow a "gifted child" or a "child prodigy." All of them are nonsense,
LA>ridiculous because of a way-too-strong identification (beyond rationality)
LA>with amateur radio.

LA> ARRL was being over-indulgent in that bit of "news" fluff and the
LA>VEC group who did the alleged testing thought it all cutesy-poo
LA>from a kindly grandfatherly feeling to kiddies (picture included one
LA>of the VEC proctors, smiling and no doubt feeling "proud" over the
LA>kiddies' "accomplishments."

Now for the really good stuff:

LA>I accuse ARRL of very mild fraud on the part of condoning
LA> such such things and hypocrisy on the implication of
LA> passing a ham written exam as a sort of academic
LA> certificate.

Accusations of "fraud" and "hypocrisy". But wait...

LA>No MORE evidence is needed...the evidence has
LA>already been presented although sugar-coated with

LA>parental pride and the usual propaganda of ARRL
LA>being all good things to US amateur radio and never
LA>making mistakes or illegalities.

Now the topper:

LA>On the charge of deliberate FALSIFICATION for
LA>whatever reason, ARRL VEC is GUILTY.

Prosecutor, judge and jury, all rolled into one. But then, Mr. Anderspn tells us:

2003-01-27:

LA>I never said ARRL was "dishonest,"
LA> just that their actions on "examining"
LA> two six-year-olds and "passing" them,
LA> then publicizing them on their website
LA>was SUSPICIOUS."

Fascinating how

"parents who have conned the VEs into passing them"

and

"I accuse ARRL of very mild fraud on the part of condoning
such such things and hypocrisy on the implication of
passing a ham written exam as a sort of academic certificate."

and

"On the charge of deliberate FALSIFICATION for
whatever reason, ARRL VEC is GUILTY."

got turned into "SUSPICIOUS".

The old razzle-dazzle from Mr. Anderson isn't convincing.

>
>> "It is suggested that a minimum age of amateur radio license
>> examinees be limited to at least age 14 or older, any license
>> class. [footnote 25] Proof of meeting minimum age limit
>> would be shown to the examining VE team. Exact age would
>> not be required to be submitted to the FCC, responsibility
>> would be put on the VE test team to state to the FCC that an
>> examinee met the minimum age requirement."
>>
>> Footnote 24: "ARRL Letter of March 20, 1998, Volume 17,
>> Number 12. The two 'youngest hams' were licensed as
>> KB9RYP (Samuel Lewis, Technician Plus) and KB9SEG
>> (Sarah Bruno, Novice) in late February 1998. The ARRL
>> Letter text indicated that their siblings and parents were all
>> licensed in various amateur radio classes."
>>

>> Footnote 25: "Most states have a minimum vehicle driving
>> license age of 16, usually as a "Learner's Permit" or similar.
>> Vehicle driving has a direct possibility of causing injury to
>> others. Radio transmitters do not have such a direct effect
>> on public safety but, irresponsibly operated, a transmitter
>> could cause interference to radio navigation aids or
>> emergency radio signalling devices. Federal Air Regulations
>> allow children to pilot certain aircraft types but only under the
>> direct supervision of an adult at the controls."

Note that Mr. Anderson does not provide any evidence that young hams have ever caused any problems on the air. Note also that he does not explain why the licensing of "FOUR YEAR OLDS" justifies an age requirement of fourteen.

>>
>> ----------
>> ----------
>>
>> That comment was responsible for some to take to pulpits of
>> righteousness and state condemnation of "keeping youth out
>> of ham radio!"

Seems like Mr. Anderson is outraged by the fact that some of us disagree with him.

>> Yes, FOUR-YEAR-OLDS. CHILDREN.
>> CHILDREN at age 0 through ENTRANCE to teen years.

Could the problem be caused by the fact that:

LA>I've always had trouble with integrating "youngsters" in what is
LA> a primarily _adult_ skill/technique recreational activity.

>Yep. Nine-year-olds, eleven-year-olds, twelve and thirteen-year-olds
>would be excluded if your comments were favorably acted upon by the
>FCC. Since there is no history of problems with young licensees and
>since there has never been a lower age limit in U.S. amateur licensing,
>what's it to you?
>>
>> Most of those in this newsgroup who got interested in ham
>> radio as teen-agers did so at around age 14. That age is
>> TEN YEARS PAST the ages of Samuel Lewis and Sarah
>> Bruno. Ten years to become literate through public school,
>> to be able to read written regulations with at least some
>> understanding. Age 14 is two years past "entrance to teen
>> years."
>
>When I was a fourteen-year-old Novice licensee in 1963, QST carried the
>story of a twelve-year-old who had passed the amateur Extra. That was
>back in the day when one had to hold a General Class ticket for two
>years before being able to take the Extra Class exam. Age 10 is two
>years prior to the "entrance" to teen years.

I didn't go to public school for grades 1 through 12, either.

Back about 1948, a local nine-year-old got her Class B license. That was back when the exams required writing essays, drawing diagrams, and passing 13 wpm code - sending and receiving. At the FCC office, in front of a real FCC examiner. Of course the kid had every advantage possible, but the FCC had no problem with it.
>
>> I wrote the quoted material on a Comment to NPRM 98-143
>> (indicated received 13 Jan 1999) and that is a publicly-
>> available document in the FCC files. One of the righteous
>> in here levelled the accusation of "continually harping on
>> the subject." I do not, only to do counterpoint to others'
>> off-tuned harps where they, looking for some "attack point"
>> want to dwell on four-year-old public material.
>
>You don't really need to continually harp on the subject. You sent your
>views directly to the FCC. Thankfully, FCC reaction to your idea
>was....silence.

Amen.
>
>> If the barring of CHILDREN is somehow the "death and
>> destruction of amateur radio," then a number of the
>> righteous in here have lost touch with reality. 30.
>
>If you see the barring of CHILDREN who are not now prevented from
>obtaining an amateur radio license, as a good thing, you've lost touch
>with reality. Numerous countries like the U.K. and Finland which
>formerly had such lower age limits in amateur radio licensing, have
>dropped such requirements. If you ever act on your decades long
>"interest" in amateur radio, you'll likely have to share the airwaves
>with CHILDREN.

LA>I've always had trouble with integrating "youngsters" in what is
LA> a primarily _adult_ skill/technique recreational activity.
>
>Thanks for clearing up the record. It looks just like it did before and
>my reaction to it is much the same.
>
Same here.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1781. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-08 19:49:55 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E455FA7.9FEB5780@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60914

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20030207203633.23139.00000232@mb-da.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:
>
> >In article <Pine.LNX.4.52.0302072325470.168@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>, "D.Stussy"
> ><kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> writes:
> > >
> > >>Subject: Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs
> > >>From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
> > >>Date: Fri, 07 Feb 2003 23:40:12 GMT
> > >>
> > >>On Fri, 7 Feb 2003, Len Over 21 wrote:
> > >>> ... "A COMMENT CONCERNING THE MINIMUM AGE OF A LICENSEE"
> > >>> ...
> > >>> "It is suggested that a minimum age of amateur radio license
> > >>> examinees be limited to at least age 14 or older, any license
> > >>> class. [footnote 25] Proof of meeting minimum age limit ...
> > >>
> > >>Although there may be some merit in the "4-year-old" case, I don't believe
> > >>that 14 is a proper age floor.
> > >
> > >The important question is: What problems has the lack of an age requirement
> > for
> > >an amateur license caused? The FCC and its predecessors have been licensing
> > >hams for over 90 years now, and there has never been an age limit. Mr.
> > Anderson
> > >does not give a single example of the youth of a ham being the source of any
> > >problems for the ARS or other radio services.
> >
> > Heh heh heh...I'm not 90, either. Ahem...it is 91 years...1912. See
> > Thomas H. White USA radio histories on the Internet. Interesting
> > stuff, not limited or biased as comes out of a small city near Boston.

"Over 90 years" isn't quite exact enough for Leonard. What's all this
talk of someone being pedantic?

> Parson, better stand away from the pulpit a bit further. Church
> committee is complaining about the teeth marks you put there...
>
> Why does there "have to be a problem" to streamline and reduce
> federal regulations in anything?

Streamline and reduce? Your proposed minimum age limit is an
additional regulation. There is no streamlining or reduction. Let me

introduce you to a new general class radio amateur *child* courtesy of the ARRL Letter:

==>SIX-YEAR-OLD OREGON GIRL GETS GENERAL TICKET

A six-year-old girl from Roseburg, Oregon, has upgraded from Technician to
General. Mattie Clauson, KD7TYN--a fourth-generation Amateur Radio operator in her family--could be the youngest General-class operator in the US. Her new ticket was granted January 13.

Mattie allowed that the Element 3 test "was pretty hard" and she had to study for a long time before passing it on her third attempt. "The Element
3 test was a lot harder than the Tech test," she said. She was ambivalent
about the 5 WPM Element 1 Morse code exam, characterizing it as "not too hard, just a little, but kind of easy too."

Her parents, Tim and Charlotte Clauson, AC7SP and KD7QZB, say Mattie became interested in Amateur Radio when she was five. The Clausons discovered "a kid-friendly study book," Ride the Airwaves with Alpha and Zulu by John Abbott, K6YPB (no longer in print--Ed). The Clausons say Mattie, who already knew how to read, dove into it right away. Her mom and
dad helped her to study, explained the "hard questions" and encouraged her
to take practice tests at various Web sites. She obtained her Technician license last July and became KD7SDF.

The Clausons said Mattie learned Morse code using several different computer programs, and they helped her practice by tapping out letters--and later words--for her. In the end, she passed her code exam on
the very first try. For the time being, Mattie says, she's sticking with phone operation but plans to give CW a try in the future. Mattie says she
prefers HF over VHF "because I can talk to people in other countries."

Homeschooled with her sisters, Mattie loves to read, and that may contribute to her precocity. Among her favorites books are those by Cynthia Wall, KA7ITT, Encyclopedia Brown, and Nancy Drew. Her parents say
ham radio has been a very useful tool in homeschooling--in terms of letter
recognition, spelling, science, geography and other subjects.

The Clausons say Mattie doesn't consider herself "someone special" since passing her General test, and neither do they. "We do not feel that Mattie
has any abilities above any other child," Charlotte Clauson said.

For her part, Mattie says she hopes that she can be an inspiration to other youngsters her age to get involved with Amateur Radio. "I think that
since I got my license, whether Tech or higher, other kids can do it also," she said. Mattie's late great grandfather, S.A. "Sam" Sullivan, was
W6WXU; his daughter, Joan Brady--Mattie's grandmother--now holds his former call sign.

"The ham community has also been very supportive, especially in the Roseburg area," said Charlotte Clauson. "Their enthusiasm has made Mattie's experience with ham radio very positive." A article on Mattie Clauson appeared February 3 in the Statesman Journal of Salem, Oregon <http://news.statesmanjournal.com/article.cfm?i=56021>.

Allow me to quote once again a part of the above:

"The Clausons say Mattie doesn't consider herself "someone special" since
passing her General test, and neither do they. "We do not feel that Mattie
has any abilities above any other child," Charlotte Clauson said."

There you have it. Yet little Mattie has something you don't, Len--an amateur radio license! In that respect, she is superior to you. That must sting.

Dave K8MN

1782. The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-08 20:41:07 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030208154107.29447.00000266@mb-cd.aol.com>
Source record: 60915

A number of spiteful regulars in here, unable to take strong opposition to their opinions, write about "having to pass a ham test" as an absolute must...as if the passing of that test and the grant of a license now has evidence of The RIGHT Attitude...all others are of inferior status.

Apparently there is some metaphysical transformation that occurs at VE test sessions. This is not pressent at COLEM test sessions, or at least not reported as such. It may or may not have been present at FCC field offices in Chicago in 1956. I'd like to find out the nature of this metaphysical phenomenon so as to fill in one more datum in all of science.

The phenomenon seems to involve some dawning light that comes about on passing a test. The successful enter a band of brothers community where they are now enobled, titled, and have met acceptance of these brothers? [non-gender-specific terms, of course] Or is it grander, like a sudden light shining from up above the ionosphere, a divine radiance the bestows all manner of virtues upon those filling in the correct squares on their multiple-choice tests?

Or does it occur on the receipt of a form, a certificate bearing very good printing the proclaims the recipient their very own radio station identification, thus becoming far greater than ordinary mortals' accomplishments? Is there radiance emanating from the nice certificate that infuses the soul? The radiance is not visible on older certificates...at least to ordinary mortals.

Is there a theological infusing of righteousness that occurs on a ham grant? Did that exist before or after the Test? There is much evidence in public domain that bearers of the certificate have strong leanings to righteousness. This is particularly true of those who manifestly support traditions of The Ham as they existed before their own life experience began.

Apparently there is considerable dichotomy in The Ham, shown by extreme conservatism and rigidity in activities versus the more liberal who consider The License as a mere regulation to allow them entrance to the enjoyment of a recreational activity.

The extreme conservatives bristle at the liberal thoughts. All must have the Right Attitude for The Ham is a serviceman ready and willing to do his nation's bidding at each and every emergency, disaster, and foot race events. All must march to

the drumbeats of the extreme conservatives in this service in correct mental uniform bearing proud medalions of extreme radio accomplishments (DXCC, WAZ, etc.) in order to Push The Envelope and advance the state of the amateur radio art. Extreme conservatives rigidly enforce "fun" according to their directives and definitions. "Fun" is the absolute correctness of their slavish devotion to tradition, lore, mythos as dictated.

It seems that the extreme conservatives are inculcated with some kind of abnormal behavior patterns on Passing a Test. A Transformation happened. They joined the sorted, sifted, Class Structure of rank, status, and privilege.

Liberals of The Ham are, well, more liberal. They are only having their own fun, enjoying a technically challenging recreational activity involving radio. They are not slavishly tied by conservative bonds. According to extreme conservatives these liberals do not have The RIGHT Stuff to be worthy of The Ham. Why is that?

Indeed, why are the liberals of The Ham not affected during the Transformation? The Test is the same. The Certificate is the same. Yet liberals are considered inferior.

Most curious. Answers sought for the benefit of science.

1783. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-08 20:41:08 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030208154108.29447.00000267@mb-cd.aol.com>
Source record: 60916

In article <3E44AB80.9A609B2F@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>When I was a fourteen-year-old Novice licensee in 1963, QST carried the
>story of a twelve-year-old who had passed the amateur Extra. That was
>back in the day when one had to hold a General Class ticket for two
>years before being able to take the Extra Class exam. Age 10 is two
>years prior to the "entrance" to teen years.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, Herr Robust couldn't hack it, ey? Couldn't get
past Novice as a 14-year-old? Must be a deficiancy you are
finally admitting...

I'm glad to see you are advancing in Remedial Arithmetic.
Have you gotten to 7 x 24 = 168 yet?

>You don't really need to continually harp on the subject. You sent your
>views directly to the FCC. Thankfully, FCC reaction to your idea
>was....silence.

Error...error...error! My document became public record on
13 January 1999. It is so stamped. Had it been "silenced,"
it would not have been visible.

On page 5 (of 14) of my document I proposed a single morse
code test rate instead of three rates. That became law with
R&O 99-412. :-)

Note: I wasn't the only one suggesting that one-rate Element
1 but it was a nice thought to see it implemented.

>If you see the barring of CHILDREN who are not now prevented from
>obtaining an amateur radio license, as a good thing, you've lost touch
>with reality. Numerous countries like the U.K. and Finland which
>formerly had such lower age limits in amateur radio licensing, have
>dropped such requirements. If you ever act on your decades long
>"interest" in amateur radio, you'll likely have to share the airwaves
>with CHILDREN.

I'm already sharing this newsgroup with some immature kiddies.
:-)

Now...let's go back to the ham version of "Doogie Howser, MD"
and how the amateur radio license makes every holder a
mature, reasonable, trustworthy adult regardless of age.

1784. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-08 20:51:53 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030208155153.16242.00000086@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 60918

In article <3E455FA7.9FEB5780@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>There you have it. Yet little Mattie has something you don't, Len--an
>amateur radio license! In that respect, she is superior to you. That
>must sting.

Not at all. :-)

Tsk, tsk, tsk, you mighty and noble examples of The Ham
are just equating The Ham collective to a bunch of kiddies
playing in radioland. That's a very poor picture to present.

Now go back to your dreams of glory and righteousness
in a hobby activity and continue your work on Remedial
Arithmetic. That's a good boy!

1785. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-08 20:51:54 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030208155154.16242.00000087@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 60917

In article <20030208143621.27873.00000507@mb-mj.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>>Thanks for clearing up the record. It looks just like it did before and
>>my reaction to it is much the same.
>>
>Same here.

Then why are the Robust and the Parson so disturbed about
it over four years later? :-)

1786. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-08 21:18:30 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v4at0j89b8dv8b@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 60919

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030208154107.29447.00000266@mb-cd.aol.com...
> A number of spiteful regulars in here, unable to take strong
> opposition to their opinions, write about "having to pass a
> ham test" as an absolute must...as if the passing of that
> test and the grant of a license now has evidence of The
> RIGHT Attitude...all others are of inferior status.
>

<SNIP>

If your not a MD Doctor you can't expect to discuss
medical treatments with a Doctor as an equal.

If your not a rocket scientist you can't expect to
discuss rockets with a rocket scientist as an equal.

If your not a race car driver you can't expect to discuss
race car driving with a race car driver as an equal.

If your not a Supreme Court Judge you can't expect to
discuss law with a Supreme Court Judge as an equal.

So why do you try to discuss AMATEUR RADIO
with LICENSED AMATEUR RADIO OPERATORS,
when you don't have an AMATEUR RADIO LICENSE
and expect to be accepted as an equal?

Get a license then we'll talk as equals, until then your
just an outsider and your not going to be heard here!

And if that makes you think I'm one of those "spiteful
regulars" here, who cares what you think! Your
opinions don't count here!!!!!
--
A child of five would understand this.
Send someone to fetch a child of five.
-Groucho Marx

KB9TMP

1787. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-08 22:26:27 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E45845A.E50FD9D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60920

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> A number of spiteful regulars in here, unable to take strong
> opposition to their opinions, write about "having to pass a
> ham test" as an absolute must...as if the passing of that
> test and the grant of a license now has evidence of The
> RIGHT Attitude...all others are of inferior status.

Spiteful regulars, huh? I can take "strong opposition" to my opinions but I've seen little evidence to suggest that you are mounting "strong opposition".
According to N2EY (and I subscribe to his views on the matter), "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact: No matter what job, educational level, employer, or government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr. Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior." Your behavior here results in the attitude which others develop toward you. Your legion of supporters seemingly consists of Brian Burke and (occasionally) the people-skill-challenged Carl Stevenson. A rational individual would likely get the message.

Now passing an amateur radio licensing exam of any class, instantly makes the examinee a member of the worldwide fraternity of radio amateurs. Now my late aunt--you remember, the one with lots of radios--had no interest whatever in becoming a radio amateur. Neither did she publicly lecture radio amateurs on how amateur radio should be regulated. You, on the other hand, have declared a several decade long interest in amateur radio. In all that time, you've never taken the first step toward becoming a radio amateur. Yet you presume to condescend to licensed radio amateurs, denigrate their traditions and insult the integrity of the largest U.S. amateur radio membership organization. You seldom miss an opportunity to point out your *professional* experience in radio and electronics and are quick to dismiss or denigrate the *professional* experience of others who post here who ARE radio amateurs.

<snip of large amount of stream of consciousness ramblings>

> It seems that the extreme conservatives are inculcated with
> some kind of abnormal behavior patterns on Passing a Test.
> A Transformation happened. They joined the sorted, sifted,
> Class Structure of rank, status, and privilege.

Those thoughts don't even represent a "nice try" on your part.
You're right about the transformation though. One can be a non-ham one day and and a part of amateur radio the next. What you call an abnormal behavior pattern is likely the exhilaration of becoming a licensed ham. Those folks are entitled to that "status". The "privilege" is that granted by their license class ("rank"). Don't have a license? You might have to wait for your transformation.

> Liberals of The Ham are, well, more liberal. They are only
> having their own fun, enjoying a technically challenging
> recreational activity involving radio. They are not slavishly
> tied by conservative bonds. According to extreme
> conservatives these liberals do not have The RIGHT Stuff
> to be worthy of The Ham. Why is that?

Radio amateurs may put as much into amateur radio as they desire. They may be as active or inactive as they choose or as their circumstances dictate. They may delve as deeply as they choose into the technical side of radio; they may devote their time to public service or they may spend their hours doing what their licenses actually permit: operating. You have not yet made any attempt to actually become a radio amateur. You are on the sidelines *talking* about amateur radio. Much of that talk smacks of envy.

You can perform your gruff, all-knowing geezer routine all you like, Leonard H.
Behind your curtain stands a humbug.

Dave K8MN

1788. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-08 22:34:35 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E458643.B0A2F614@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60921

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E44AB80.9A609B2F@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >When I was a fourteen-year-old Novice licensee in 1963, QST carried the
> >story of a twelve-year-old who had passed the amateur Extra. That was
> >back in the day when one had to hold a General Class ticket for two
> >years before being able to take the Extra Class exam. Age 10 is two
> >years prior to the "entrance" to teen years.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk, Herr Robust couldn't hack it, ey? Couldn't get
> past Novice as a 14-year-old? Must be a deficiancy you are
> finally admitting...

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:"

"No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

> I'm glad to see you are advancing in Remedial Arithmetic.
> Have you gotten to 7 x 24 = 168 yet?

"Go *such* an 807 plate cap"? "immagure"?

> >You don't really need to continually harp on the subject. You sent your
> >views directly to the FCC. Thankfully, FCC reaction to your idea
> >was....silence.
>
> Error...error...error! My document became public record on
> 13 January 1999. It is so stamped. Had it been "silenced,"
> it would not have been visible.

The error is yours. I didn't say you were silenced. I said the FCC
reaction was silence.

> On page 5 (of 14) of my document I proposed a single morse
> code test rate instead of three rates. That became law with
> R&O 99-412. :-)
>
> Note: I wasn't the only one suggesting that one-rate Element
> 1 but it was a nice thought to see it implemented.

Bully for you.

> >If you see the barring of CHILDREN who are not now prevented from
> >obtaining an amateur radio license, as a good thing, you've lost touch
> >with reality. Numerous countries like the U.K. and Finland which
> >formerly had such lower age limits in amateur radio licensing, have
> >dropped such requirements. If you ever act on your decades long
> >"interest" in amateur radio, you'll likely have to share the airwaves
> >with CHILDREN.
>
> I'm already sharing this newsgroup with some immature kiddies.
> :-)

Yep, Burke is still here but he considers you the leader of his play group.

> Now...let's go back to the ham version of "Doogie Howser, MD"
> and how the amateur radio license makes every holder a
> mature, reasonable, trustworthy adult regardless of age.

An amateur radio license makes every license holder a ham. I can't find a single Part 97 passage which speaks to the necessity of a radio amateur being mature, reasonable, trustworthy or an adult. Be that as it may, you aren't a ham so why are you worried about it?

Dave K8MN

1789. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-08 22:36:47 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E4586D6.5E960077@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60922

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E455FA7.9FEB5780@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >There you have it. Yet little Mattie has something you don't, Len--an
> >amateur radio license! In that respect, she is superior to you. That
> >must sting.
>
> Not at all. :-)

Boy, does that reply ring hollow. Even the smiley seems fake.

> Tsk, tsk, tsk, you mighty and noble examples of The Ham
> are just equating The Ham collective to a bunch of kiddies
> playing in radioland. That's a very poor picture to present.

It doesn't seem to trouble radio amateurs. Why should it bother you?

> Now go back to your dreams of glory and righteousness
> in a hobby activity and continue your work on Remedial
> Arithmetic. That's a good boy!

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

Dave K8MN

1790. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-08 22:37:33 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E458705.48F284A5@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60923

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20030208143621.27873.00000507@mb-mj.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:
>
> >>Thanks for clearing up the record. It looks just like it did before and
> >>my reaction to it is much the same.
> >>
> >Same here.
>
> Then why are the Robust and the Parson so disturbed about
> it over four years later? :-)

As usual, you have it backward. We brought it to light. You are
disturbed about it four years later.

Dave K8MN

1791. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-08 23:06:42 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030208180642.14740.00000127@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 60924

>Subject: Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/8/03 1:13 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030208141309.16242.00000081@mb-cv.aol.com>

>As children grow into teen years they begin to resent parental
> supervision over "their" activity. Every such case is different
> and must be handled appropriately...there is no one way to do
> that which will work every time.

Again, I ask you, Lennie, WHAT childrearing experience do you have?

Steve

1792. Re: New Field Day Entry Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-08 23:33:47 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0302081533.25326763@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60925

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030207221416.09289.00001231@mb-ch.aol.com>...
> In article <c2356669.0302061510.634b0c0d@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> (N2EY) writes:
>
> >Looks like some of the suggestions have been heard.
> >
> >FD 2003 will have a new "Class F" entry class, for stations set up at
> >EOCs (Emergency Operations Centers).
> >
> >See:
> >
> >http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2003/02/06/3/?nc=1
>
> What's the point of this? EOC stations are usually full-blown stations with
> high power capability, good antennas, and all the coffee and donuts you
> can consume. What does operating from one of these stations prove from
> a standpoint of true emergency communications capability? The operators
> at EOC's are usually the most obese, chain-smoking, technically
> incompetent and personality-challenged hams you'll find on-the-air. AFAIC,
> giving them their ever-so-appropriate "F" (for Failure) category is a good
> idea -- so us guys out there in the field will know who to avoid! However,
> if they add a rule stating that any EOC-station must change operators at
> least every four hours, and are not permitted to use HF SSB, then I'd begin
> to see some value to this category.

BAD Larry . . ! Welp, at least ya din suggest CW or fuhgeddit . .

>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

w3rv

1793. Re: n8wwm king of clowns busted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-08 23:35:07 UTC
From: cheesecutter@webhideout.com
Message-ID: <fef386d5.0302081535.569e4fd8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60926
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net> wrote in message
news:<zDqdnd8hQOoqztijXTWcqw@comcast.com>...
> <Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
> news:20030208131111.061$Pn@newsreader.com...
> > Life is good when you're not a fat blowhard like doug adair,n8wwm.
>
> The whole episode is a non-issue when you dig in to the facts Mopar.
> I've contacted several people directly involved and sorted out the
> facts for myself. Twisted hasn't been completely truthful in his posts
> it seems. Yes there where recordings of N8, however the recordings
> where of him chewing out several other Hams on the repeater for
> routinely causing interference, and his "strongly worded opinions"
> about the lack of action by the control operator(s) to correct the
> problem. Apparently one of the Hams involved in the interference made
> those tape recording in an attempt to cover his behind, and tried to
> get N8 to back off on his complaints, by sending them in to the FCC.
> If N8 is really guilty of anything its trying to clean up an existing
> problem on the Ham band in his local. This is something any really
> concerned Ham would do, a bit of self policing action where we try to
> clean up our own mess first before the FCC has to step in and do it
> for us. As far as I can tell there isn't going to be any action taken
> against N8 by the FCC.
>
>
> --
> Leland C. Scott
> KC8LDO
>
> ARRL Member
> NCI Member

oh and we are supposed to believe you?????

1794. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL support it ??)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-08 23:39:23 UTC
From: cheesecutter@webhideout.com
Message-ID: <fef386d5.0302081539.37247a58@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60927
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

"Stephen C. Robbins" <srobbinsNoSPaMDUDES@netacc.net> wrote in message
news:<3e448df8@news.netacc.net>...
> > > "Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
> news:<8VE0a.7858$mo6.1529@FE03>...
> > > > If you haven't done anything wrong, then you have nothing to worry
> about. So
> > > > what's the big problem??
> > > >
>
> Hmm, the name Richard Jewel comes to mind. Remember the security guard in
> Atlanta who discovered a bomb and warned people away, probably saving a
> dozen lives. The FBI destroyed the man in an attempt to convict him of
> placing the bomb. They got him fired from his job, destroyed his
> reputation in the community by releasing false stories about him, and even
> tried to get his family to turn on him. The real bomber is still on the
> loose and went on to bomb two more establishments while the FBI ignored
> him and went after the innocent.
>
> And now we also have all the death row prisoners who have been released
> since the advent of DNA evidence. Yea, right, if you havent done anything
> wrong, then you have nothing to worry about. Now that is one ignorant
> statement!

yeh they ruined that security guard guy, and i think eric rudolph did
that, and they tried for years to find him and have not as yet, and i
got a strange feeling they are doing the same thing to that white guy
who they blamed for that anthrax stuff.....the world's best police
force is just not living up to its billing.......j edgar must be
turning over in his grave.......of course he was rumored to be a cross
dresser but he did like to bust crooks and ran a tight ship........

1795. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-08 23:41:58 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030208184158.14740.00000128@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 60928

>Subject: Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/8/03 1:13 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030208141312.16242.00000082@mb-cv.aol.com>

>There are more radio amateurs in the USA now than 90 years ago.
> They have HF and higher power capability, relatively easy-to-use
> controls compared to 85 years ago. Did anyone talk about "skip"
> 80 years ago? No?

Was it called "skip" then? No. Was the phenomenon of long distance
communication discussed then? DEFINATELY!

Just one more example of talking without thinking, Lennie.

>Should radio amateurs have been thrown off MF in the US in the
> 1920s? Amateurs would have said, "of course not, we never
> 'caused any trouble!'" [they did, but ARRL won't tell that side of
> the story]

Sure they did. A very popular historical text published by the ARRL very
specifically discussed the problems of mutual interference, and yes,
interference BY Amateurs.

Of course Lennie would like folks to forget this as it once again torpedos
his anti-Amateur rants. it also further dispells his "the ARRL is dishonest"
lies.

>Back around 1980 every good catholic would have said "it's silly
> to have guards around the Pope...'nobody' would try to assasinate
> a Pope!" [despite one attempt in 1978] Then in 1981 John Paul II
> took a bullet and, afterwards, the "popemobile" was built. There
> "was no trouble" prior to 1978 so it was "unthinkable" that anyone
> would try to harm a Pope.

This is an Amateur Radio policy newsgroup, Lennie, not a
security-of-the-Pope newsgroup.

(Personally, I could care less, however Lennie is the first one to
chastise anyone who dares to make a "non-Amateur Radio" analogy...Putz that he
is)

>There's been "no trouble" about age for amateur licenses before
> according to the few, the proud, the hams. All children of hams
> lead exemplary lives, always obeying everything, always
> responsible, mature, trustworthy. Of course.

As it pertains to the operation of an Amateur Radio station, can you PROVE otherwise, Lennie?

>... and all the evil in radio exists solely on CB.

Forgot one, Lennie....And at 10048 Lanark Street, Sun Valley, CA

>The purpose of ANY test, academic or otherwise, is to determine
> the depth of understanding of the subjects in the test.

In the case of ANY test in which the question AND answers are known before hand, the only thing that is determined is how well the examinee can memorize lines.

>Miccolis
> seems to think an FCC test is just a form of lottery or bingo game.

In the case of present day Amateur and GROL tests, this is just about what it is. Get a sufficent number of questions on your "test" that you recall from "studying", and BINGO, you passed!

>"Just supply the correct answers" because, according to the
> parson, "the FCC does not require any understanding of the
> material!" Marvelous non-deduction by the parson. If that were
> the case, why is there a test at all?

I was hoping a PC liberal such as yourself could answer that.

>>Of course she knows what she's doing - at least as much as the test methods
>>allow that to be determined. The real test is how she behaves on the air.
>Any
>>problems you know of?
>
> According to the pedantic parson "the FCC does not require any
> understanding of the material." The "real test" is her behavior on
> the air...which is a "test" in front of the "ARS community?"

The real test >>IS<< her conduct on the air. It's the only real "test" left, regardless of mode.

>The pedantic parson is petulant. Tsk, tsk, tsk. He doesn't "know"
> what I "think" despite his self-proclaimed expertise in telepathy in
> "knowing what others think."

Sure we "know" what you think, Lennie! If WE can't make an informed assessment after being bombarded by your vile spewings from yeas of NG spamming, WHO can...?!?!

>Miccolis has NO qualifications in telepathy.

Who needs it, Lennie? You constantly harrass this NG with your lies, misconduct and story-telling. No telepathy needed here!

>>But it gets worse: He claims that the parents of the 4 year olds "conned the
>>VEs", and in another example, accused the ARRL and the VE team of "very mild
>>fraud". (Exact google quotes provided on request).

>
> Absolutely. Does Miccolis need a billboard size sign showing what
> I wrote four years ago? "Google" doesn't need to be quoted. The
> communication to the FCC became a public document on 13 Jan 99.

Obviously we must, Lennie. You at first tried to disclaim what you wrote,
then tried to claim you were quoted out of context. Probelm is that the ENTIRE
text WAS quoted, leaving you nothing to hide behind.

>Does Miccolis think Google is a better archive than the FCC's own
> public database?

When it comes to your misconduct, obfuscation and blatant lying in this
forum, it certainly is.

>>Now if there were a problem with sub-14-year-old hams breaking the rules,
>>perhaps age limits would be a good idea. However, the opposite seems to be
>>the case.
>
> What? No "thinking" elaborated there? No explanation of what
> really happened according to the parson? No telepathic insights
> to the deep, inner meanings of it all?
>
> THERE IS NO PROBLEM WITH AGE LIMITS according to the
> pedantic parson. There, that's the ruling. Da judge done spoke.

Damn, Lennie...You didn't even try to cut-and-paste your way out of a
stupid staement...Just went right ahead and humiliated yorself in public again.

He SAID that age limts would be a good idea >>IF<< there was a problem
with 14 year olds "breaking the rules".

>>IF<<

So far you have not only NOT made your "case" for age limits, you have
done a pretty good job of justifying keeping the "status quo", Lennie. That
must not sit well with you. Need a Zantac?

>Ok, folks, here's Da Word from the pedantic parson: I HAVE
> TROUBLE WITH OPPOSING VIEWPOINTS! Everyone laminate
> that and keep it in your wallets. Engrave it on marble or on a
> marble, put it in the Smithsonian on display, feature it on "60
> Minutes." Rev. Jimmie said it in here!

Jim's only states the obvious, Lennie. You DO have an authority figure
problem...Specifically you get real foul and profane when someone questions
YOUR "authority".

>Four years and three weeks ago I wrote something to the FCC
> and Jimmie can't let go of it.

Only because you first lie about it and then refuse to provide any
documentary evidence that it's warranted.

>He is a fedayin with a death grip
> on the past, avenging the honor, nobility, and sacredness of
> the old.

This from a putz whose only claim to fame in radiocommunications was a 3
year tour-of-duty at a rear area Army relay station IN THE FIFTIES...?!?!

BBBWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! !

What a sense of humor, Lennie! You're such a card!

1796. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-08 23:44:15 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0302081544.747a9849@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60929

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030208034452.27695.00000601@mb-mj.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: NR-1 Book
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >Date: 2/7/03 1:16 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20030207141657.19751.00001340@mb-cu.aol.com>
>
> >>> I don't find Leonard H. Anderson in the FAA database.
> >>
> >>Typical.
> >
> > Ahem...the pedantic parson penned a perfidy! This is not a
> > flying newsgroup, not for sport flying, not for commercial
> > flying, not about aeronautics. Tsk, tsk, tsk
>
> Nor is it about regular-vs-conscripted Army service in the 1950's,
> SINCGARS, IEEE-vs-ARRL, or a host of other topics that YOU rail on about at
> length. Nor is it about your rear-area war hero exploits, nor is it about the
> characteristics of the AMA -vs-ARRL. Again, other "topics" that you find
> "appropriate" for the forum.
>
> >The peripathetic pedantic parson...(SNIP)
>
> ...has pretty well nailed you down. He's much more civil about it...I
> just think you're a demented little troll, caught up in your own incredible web
> of deceit, lies and failures.
>
> "Putz", for short.

Rawther decent capsulization of The Putz in all his whacked-out
dimensions over the years Steven 'Ole Bean.

w3rv

1797. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-08 23:53:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030208185300.14740.00000129@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 60930

>Subject: Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/8/03 2:51 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030208155154.16242.00000087@mb-cv.aol.com>

>In article <20030208143621.27873.00000507@mb-mj.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>writes:
>
>>>Thanks for clearing up the record. It looks just like it did before and
>>>my reaction to it is much the same.
>>>
>>Same here.
>
> Then why are the Robust and the Parson so disturbed about
> it over four years later?

Personally, I enjoyed it because it does my heart good to see your nose rubbed in your own "business" so effectively and concisely. Jim does it so-much-more civilliy than I, but the punch in the gut is more effective. Way to go, Jim.

It's gonna take a LOT of "Vicks Vapo-Rub" before you can "smell the roses" again, Lennie.

Perhaps if you tried to keep your stories straight once in a while...?!?!

Or better yet, try using facts for a change. You may not like the results as much, but you won't look as stupid as you do now.

Steve, K4YZ

1798. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 00:00:28 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030208190028.14740.00000130@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 60931

>Subject: Re: NR-1 Book
>From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)
>Date: 2/8/03 5:44 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <d22b54c3.0302081544.747a9849@posting.google.com>

>Rawther decent capsulization of The Putz in all his whacked-out
>dimensions over the years Steven 'Ole Bean.

Viele Danke!

73

Steve, K4YZ

1799. Re: Getting old call sign back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 00:15:15 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.h9ysu53.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 60933

On Sat, 08 Feb 2003 01:41:54 +0000, DaveH wrote:

>Will the FCC re-issue original call signs? I did a search and WA3URR
>is not currently issued.

It's called the "Vanity Call Sign" program, and I got my original
call back, so I don't see why you can't get yours.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1800. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 00:15:16 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.h9ytel4.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 60932

On 07 Feb 2003 20:11:10 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:

> I stand corrected and the phrase "federal merit badge" was my
> intepretation of your 30 November 1998 Comment on 98-143
> which was "essentially a prize-awarding system, where
> personal status is conferred by the grade of license."

C'mon Len, quote the whole paragraph:

8. It should not be the function of a regulatory
Administration to set up and administer what is
essentially a prize-awarding system, where personal status
is conferred by the grade of license. The function of a
regulatory license system is to determine that the
applicant meets the uniform requirements to perform the
basic functions of the regulatee, and the issuance of
status symbols is best left to the private sector which is
replete with awards for Manual Morse Code speed and for
making various contacts under various conditions.

Even when someone agrees with your stand it gets twisted around into
an attack. Why does it have to be that way?
--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1801. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 00:15:17 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.ha0c6d5.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 60934

On 08 Feb 2003 01:23:07 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:

> The FCC "bandies about" a number of US amateur radio
> regulations yet no staffer or commissioner is required to
> be granted an amateur radio license. :-)

And there have been FCC executives over the years who believed
that no FCC staffer or decision-maker SHOULD hold an amateur
licence because of "conflict of interest". (I have been
unjustly accused of that several times when I worked on matters
involving amateur licensees.)

Fortunately they are/were in a minority and there are a number of
staffers and decision-makers who deal/have dealt with amateur
regulatory and enforcement issues who are/were amateur licensees.

But you, Len, are not a staffer or decision-maker of the FCC, nor
an amateur license holder, present or past. What, then, is YOUR
stake in amateur radio other than "critic from the sidelines" ?

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1802. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 00:37:05 UTC
From: Jackie <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com>
Message-ID: <Roh1a.40663$Ec4.34160@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 60935

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.ha0c6d5.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...

> But you, Len, are not a staffer or decision-maker of the FCC, nor
> an amateur license holder, present or past. What, then, is YOUR
> stake in amateur radio other than "critic from the sidelines" ?

This was my point exactly. While I certainly support Len's or anyone else's
right to have an opinion, Len seems to think he knows what's best for a
hobby/service that he does not partake of. Seems strange to me.

Jackie KC0ODY

1803. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 02:56:44 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030208215644.27873.00000519@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 60936

In article <Roh1a.40663$Ec4.34160@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net>, "Jackie"
<buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> writes:

>"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
>news:cuvyxnansvbet.ha0c6d5.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
>
>> But you, Len, are not a staffer or decision-maker of the FCC, nor
>> an amateur license holder, present or past. What, then, is YOUR
>> stake in amateur radio other than "critic from the sidelines" ?
>
>This was my point exactly. While I certainly support Len's or anyone else's
>right to have an opinion, Len seems to think he knows what's best for a
>hobby/service that he does not partake of. Seems strange to me.
>

The FCC is interested because they have to be - it's their job. Companies like Kenwood are interested because they want to sell radio equipment. (That's not necessarily a bad thing, btw, but it is not necessarily always a good thing thing either). Prospective hams are interested because they have to take the test, and hams are interested because they have a stake in what the ARS becomes if license requirements change.

The question of "why is Mr. Anderson so interested?" has been asked of him many times, but Mr. Anderson keeps his motivations to himself. He does, however, claim to know the motivations of all those who oppose his views. Interesting.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1804. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 02:56:44 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030208215644.27873.00000518@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 60937

In article <3E455FA7.9FEB5780@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <20030207203633.23139.00000232@mb-da.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>> writes:
>>
>> >In article <Pine.LNX.4.52.0302072325470.168@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>,
>"D.Stussy"
>> ><kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> writes:
>> >
>> >>Subject: Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs
>> >>From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
>> >>Date: Fri, 07 Feb 2003 23:40:12 GMT
>> >>
>> >>On Fri, 7 Feb 2003, Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >>> ... "A COMMENT CONCERNING THE MINIMUM AGE OF A LICENSEE"
>> >>> ...
>> >>> "It is suggested that a minimum age of amateur radio license
>> >>> examinees be limited to at least age 14 or older, any license
>> >>> class. [footnote 25] Proof of meeting minimum age limit ...
>> >>
>> >>Although there may be some merit in the "4-year-old" case, I don't
>believe
>> >>that 14 is a proper age floor.
>> >
>> >The important question is: What problems has the lack of an age
>requirement
>> for
>> >an amateur license caused? The FCC and its predecessors have been
>licensing
>> >hams for over 90 years now, and there has never been an age limit. Mr.
>> Anderson
>> >does not give a single example of the youth of a ham being the source of
>any
>> >problems for the ARS or other radio services.
>>
>> Heh heh heh...I'm not 90, either. Ahem...it is 91 years...1912.

And in those 91 years, can Mr. Anderson cite any cases where the youth of a ham
was related to an on-air problem? He apparently cannot.

>> See
>> Thomas H. White USA radio histories on the Internet. Interesting
>> stuff, not limited or biased as comes out of a small city near Boston.

"biased as comes out of a small city near Boston"....would that be

Peterborough, NH, home of the amateur radio magazine "73"?

or perhaps it's

Greenville, NH, where the now-defunct amateur radio magazine "Ham Radio" was published?

Both are small cities near Boston - Greenville is closer. Mr. Anderson claims to have written some articles for "Ham Radio", so perhaps that is the one he refers to. I haven't found Ham Radio historical accounts to be biased, however. Perhaps he knows more about that defunct mag.
>
>"Over 90 years" isn't quite exact enough for Leonard. What's all this
>talk of someone being pedantic?
>
>> Parson, better stand away from the pulpit a bit further. Church
>> committee is complaining about the teeth marks you put there...

The funny part about this is that I do not belong to any church.

>> Why does there "have to be a problem" to streamline and reduce
>> federal regulations in anything?
>
>Streamline and reduce? Your proposed minimum age limit is an
>*additional* regulation.

Additional and unnecessary regulation.

>There is no streamlining or reduction. Let me
>introduce you to a new general class radio amateur *child* courtesy of
>the ARRL Letter:
>
>==>SIX-YEAR-OLD OREGON GIRL GETS GENERAL TICKET
>
>A six-year-old girl from Roseburg, Oregon, has upgraded from Technician
>to
>General. Mattie Clauson, KD7TYN--a fourth-generation Amateur Radio
>operator in her family--could be the youngest General-class operator in
>the US. Her new ticket was granted January 13.

>Her parents, Tim and Charlotte Clauson, AC7SP and KD7QZB, say Mattie
>became interested in Amateur Radio when she was five.

>Homeschooled with her sisters, Mattie loves to read, and that may
>contribute to her precocity. Among her favorites books are those by
>Cynthia Wall, KA7ITT, Encyclopedia Brown, and Nancy Drew. Her parents
>say
>ham radio has been a very useful tool in homeschooling--in terms of
>letter

>recognition, spelling, science, geography and other subjects.

Where's that hypothetical first grade teacher who will pass judgement on Mattie's reading ability?

>There you have it. Yet little Mattie has something you don't, Len--an
>amateur radio license! In that respect, she is superior to you.
>That must sting.

Dave - given Mr. Anderson's behavior in this newsgroup, and his demonstrated disdain for many amateurs and amateur radio institutions, values and traditions, why would you want him to get a license?

Just remember these words by Mr. Anderson:

"I've always had trouble with integrating "youngsters" in what is a primarily _adult_ skill/technique recreational activity."

73 de Jim, N2EY

1805. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 02:56:46 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030208215646.27873.00000520@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 60939

In article <v4at0j89b8dv8b@corp.supernews.com>, "KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com>
writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030208154107.29447.00000266@mb-cd.aol.com...
>> A number of spiteful regulars in here, unable to take strong
>> opposition to their opinions, write about "having to pass a
>> ham test" as an absolute must...as if the passing of that
>> test and the grant of a license now has evidence of The
>> RIGHT Attitude...all others are of inferior status.
>>
>
><SNIP>
>
>If your not a MD Doctor you can't expect to discuss
>medical treatments with a Doctor as an equal.
>
>If your not a rocket scientist you can't expect to
>discuss rockets with a rocket scientist as an equal.
>
>If your not a race car driver you can't expect to discuss
>race car driving with a race car driver as an equal.
>
>If your not a Supreme Court Judge you can't expect to
>discuss law with a Supreme Court Judge as an equal.
>
>So why do you try to discuss AMATEUR RADIO
>with LICENSED AMATEUR RADIO OPERATORS,
>when you don't have an AMATEUR RADIO LICENSE
>and expect to be accepted as an equal?

You missed the point.

Mr. Anderson does not want to discuss amateur radio "as an equal" with you or
me or anyone else who disagrees with him. His behavior here over at least the
past 5 years has convinced me that he considers himself above all of those who
disagree with his views. He thinks that to talk with us as equals would be to
lower himself. This attitude comes through very clearly, particularly when he
attacks others' technical knowledge.

Now he will probably treat us to more posts about how nobody has telepathy, and
call me some more names.

>Get a license then we'll talk as equals, until then your
>just an outsider and your not going to be heard here!

Mr. Anderson has every right to post here - just like any other interested party. However, that right also means that others have the right to comment on his posts, and point out the logical errors and factual mistakes in them. But Mr. Anderson does not like it when those he considers his inferiors point out that the would-be emperor has no logical clothes.
>
Here's an example:

Mr. Anderson says he is interested discussing the entry requirements for amateur licenses. He also dismisses the views of those already licensed, particularly Extras, citing the fact that those who have the highest class of amateur license will probably never have to take another license test.

The problem with this argument is that it's illogical. Consider some of the ramifications of this line of "reasoning":

- Already-licensed drivers should not be interested in driver license requirements
- Those with college degrees should not be interested in the requirements for a degree, since they already have one

Better yet:

Since Mr. Anderson has already achieved the age of 14, he should not be interested in age requirements for an amateur license.

All completely illogical arguments, right? Try telling Mr. Anderson.

>And if that makes you think I'm one of those "spiteful
>regulars" here, who cares what you think! Your
>opinions don't count here!!!!!

I disagree. Everyone's opinion's count. How much they count depends on how well-founded they are. Many of Mr. Anderson's opinions have been shown to be full of logical holes.
>--
>A child of five would understand this.
>Send someone to fetch a child of five.
>-Groucho Marx
>
HAW!

73 de Jim, N2EY
>KB9TMP

1806. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 02:56:47 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030208215647.27873.00000521@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 60938

In article <3E45845A.E50FD9D@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> A number of spiteful regulars in here, unable to take strong
>> opposition to their opinions, write about "having to pass a
>> ham test" as an absolute must...as if the passing of that
>> test and the grant of a license now has evidence of The
>> RIGHT Attitude...all others are of inferior status.
>
>*Spiteful* regulars, huh?

Dave,

Note that Mr. Anderson does not say who these "spiteful regulars in here" are. Nor does he say who has written that having to pass a ham test is an absolute must. There's a big difference between saying it's an absolute must and wondering why someone who has never held any class of amateur is so interested in the entry requirements. This is particularly interesting in light of the fact that for almost 12 years, all amateur privileges for the bands above 30 MHz have been available without the Morse code test which Mr. Anderson opposes so strongly.

Any interested party has the right to comment, discuss, debate, and petition the government for changes. Nobody denies Mr. Anderson that right. But why is Mr. Anderson so interested, since it's obvious he has little intention of getting a license or setting up and operating an amateur station?

>I can take "strong opposition" to my opinions
>but I've seen little evidence to suggest that you are mounting "strong
>opposition".

>According to N2EY (and I subscribe to his views on the matter),
>"Besides, here's a simple, plain fact: No matter what job, educational
>level, employer, or government/military service that a radio amateur
>has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

Perhaps that's what Mr. Anderson considers "strong opposition".

>Your
>behavior here results in the attitude which others develop toward you.

>Your legion of supporters seemingly consists of Brian Burke and
>(occasionally) the people-skill-challenged Carl Stevenson.

>A rational
>individual would likely get the message.
>
>Now passing an amateur radio licensing exam of any class, instantly
>makes the examinee a member of the worldwide fraternity of radio
>amateurs. Now my late aunt--you remember, the one with lots of
>radios--had no interest whatever in becoming a radio amateur. Neither
>did she publicly lecture radio amateurs on how amateur radio should be
>regulated. You, on the other hand, have declared a several decade long
>interest in amateur radio. In all that time, you've never taken the
>first step toward becoming a radio amateur.

Not only that, but Mr. Anderson denigrates the accomplishment of actually
getting a license.

>Yet you presume to
>condescend to licensed radio amateurs, denigrate their traditions and
>insult the integrity of the largest U.S. amateur radio membership
>organization. You seldom miss an opportunity to point out your
>*professional* experience in radio and electronics and are quick to
>dismiss or denigrate the *professional* experience of others who post
>here who ARE radio amateurs.

The critical factor is that they disagree with Mr. Anderson.

><snip of large amount of stream of consciousness ramblings>
>
>> It seems that the extreme conservatives are inculcated with
>> some kind of abnormal behavior patterns on Passing a Test.
>> A Transformation happened. They joined the sorted, sifted,
>> Class Structure of rank, status, and privilege.
>
>Those thoughts don't even represent a "nice try" on your part.
>You're right about the transformation though. One can be a non-ham one
>day and and a part of amateur radio the next. What you call an abnormal
>behavior pattern is likely the exhilaration of becoming a licensed ham.
>Those folks are entitled to that "status". The "privilege" is that
>granted by their license class ("rank"). Don't have a license? You
>might have to wait for your transformation.
>
>> Liberals of The Ham are, well, more liberal. They are only
>> having their own fun, enjoying a technically challenging
>> recreational activity involving radio. They are not slavishly
>> tied by conservative bonds. According to extreme
>> conservatives these liberals do not have The RIGHT Stuff
>> to be worthy of The Ham. Why is that?
>
I have no idea what that last paragraph is supposed to mean.

>Radio amateurs may put as much into amateur radio as they desire. They
>may be as active or inactive as they choose or as their circumstances
>dictate. They may delve as deeply as they choose into the technical
>side of radio; they may devote their time to public service or they may
>spend their hours doing what their licenses actually permit: operating.
>You have not yet made any attempt to actually become a radio amateur.
>You are on the sidelines *talking* about amateur radio. Much of that
>talk smacks of envy.
>
>You can perform your gruff, all-knowing geezer routine all you like,
>Leonard H.
>Behind your curtain stands a humbug.

Perhaps we should consider what the Wizard said about the man behind the curtain.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1807. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 03:13:11 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E45C722.284A9516@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60940

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E44A300.93E473C0@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E440088.E93B9C61@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E43481B.F43E73EA@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E408CDA.35C3536B@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030204063616.05048.00000443@mb-cs.aol.com>...
> > > > > > > > > > In article <3E3F1CCC.180E41A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
<k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > > > > > > > > > writes:
> > >
> > > > > > > > > > >I generally have low noise here but I really having no way of knowing
if
> > > > > > > > > > >I could have heard AH3D on a T2FD without a preamp.
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > How far above the noise was he? WVA to Johnston Island is a fur piece
on 160.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Jim, Johnston Island is the same distance regardless of band.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Wow! If I'd only had your substantive knowledge, I could have skipped
> > > > > > > > that 160m QSO and just been satisified with working 'em on 10m SSB.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dave, please tell me how much further Johnston Island is on 160M then on 10M.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > A bigshot DXer like you should know.
> > > > >
> > > > > And you must believe me that I do know the distance, the bearing and the
> > > > > reciprocal bearing to Johnston Island. Jim's comment indicated that
> > > > > Johnston Island is a tough one from this part of the country. Then
> > > > > again you knew that.

> > > > > > All that's left to decide is the reason for your smart-assed comment.
> > Well there you have it.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I state something factual, and its now a smart-assed comment.
> > > > >
> > > > > That is correct to a point. You stated something factual as a
> > > > > smart-assed comment.
> > > >
> > > and Jim see's no insult in his "factual" statement.
> >
> > Assuming you refer to his comment about who might select a T2FD as a
> > choice for a suitable antenna, I don't see any insult in Jim's factual
> > statement either.
>
> I see it as an insult.

I understand that you do. In time, you may learn to live with it.
One of the things I've said more than once is that you seem to have a
perpetual chip on your shoulder.

> It certainly didn't single you out. Are you now
> > volunteering as an example of his comment?
>
> Don't own a T2FD, a TTFD, nor a non-tilted TTFD.

I'm sure you could entertain us for hours with tales of the "non-tilted
TTFD".
That'd be a non-tilted, tilted, terminated dipole, wouldn't it?

> > > You guys are a riot.
> >
> > Actually, you provide many of the punch lines.
>
> Another smart-assed comment, smug Dave?

I'd call it just another factual comment.

Dave K8MN

1808. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 03:26:00 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E45CA2E.43D6E8C1@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60941

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3E455FA7.9FEB5780@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:

> >There you have it. Yet little Mattie has something you don't, Len--an
> >amateur radio license! In that respect, she is superior to you.
> >That must sting.
>
> Dave - given Mr. Anderson's behavior in this newsgroup, and his demonstrated
> disdain for many amateurs and amateur radio institutions, values and
> traditions, why would you want him to get a license?

Len Anderson is a seventy-year-old who has not acted upon his declared
"interest" in amateur radio though he has told us that his "interest"
has spanned decades. The chances of Len moving toward actually
obtaining a license are remote at this point. I believe that he ever
did take and pass an amateur licensing exam, he'd find himself with a
familiar problem: dealing with his gift for honking people off.

> Just remember these words by Mr. Anderson:
>
> "I've always had trouble with integrating "youngsters" in what is a primarily
> _adult_ skill/technique recreational activity."

Len doesn't play well with others.

Dave K8MN

1809. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 03:36:52 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <o1k1a.42168$HN5.157753@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 60942

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030208154107.29447.00000266@mb-cd.aol.com...
> A number of spiteful regulars in here, unable to take

snippppppp ....

Len ... I have always viewed your posts with some degree of entertainment
that some view as pontification. I only have one question ..... what the
hell have you been smoking ??????

God Bless Tom KI3R Port Vue nr Pittsburgh

1810. OT - was Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 03:39:52 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.52.0302090337090.286@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 60943

On Sat, 8 Feb 2003, N2EY wrote:
>>---------
>>In Los Angeles County, on the 147.435(os) repeater, a "jamfest" is in progress.
>>You have the control operator codes. What should you do?
>>
>>a) Do nothing.
>>b) Use the control codes to turn the repeat function off.
>>c) Identify the jammers and report them to the local FCC field office.
>>d) Key up on top of them and repeat the 7 "naughty words" until they stop.
>>
>>Select the BEST answer.
>>
>GOOD QUESTION!!!!
>
>I'm debating between b) and c). I'll say b), because it stops the violation
>now. c) is good, but you also need a method of positively identifying the
>jammers and recording their jamming. OTOH, shutting down the repeater may
>simply cause them to go elsewhere.

Unfortunately, answer D is more likely to be the occurance here - with 10+ more individuals doing answer A and all laughing about it! :-(

Seriously: I personally would say answer B is the best answer. Answer C is a close second, but doesn't STOP the violation in progress. That's why it loses.

1811. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 03:44:44 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E45CE92.74E2E705@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60944

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3E45845A.E50FD9D@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:

> >> Liberals of The Ham are, well, more liberal. They are only
> >> having their own fun, enjoying a technically challenging
> >> recreational activity involving radio. They are not slavishly
> >> tied by conservative bonds. According to extreme
> >> conservatives these liberals do not have The RIGHT Stuff
> >> to be worthy of The Ham. Why is that?
> >>
> I have no idea what that last paragraph is supposed to mean.

I know political conservatives who are radio amateurs and I know
political liberals who are radio amateurs. Len Anderson is no radio
amateur. Note that he is using the adjective "extreme". "Extreme" in
this case seems to indicate anyone who disagrees with Leonard.

> >You can perform your gruff, all-knowing geezer routine all you like,
> >Leonard H.
> >Behind your curtain stands a humbug.
>
> Perhaps we should consider what the Wizard said about the man behind the
> curtain.

The Wizard revealed that, underneath all the smoke, noise and flames, he
was really a nice fellow. My dealings here with Leonard H. Anderson
date back for about seven years. I'm still waiting for his revelation.

Dave K8MN

1812. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 03:51:23 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E45D021.70930244@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60945

Jackie wrote:
>
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> news:cuvyxnansvbet.ha0c6d5.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
>
> > But you, Len, are not a staffer or decision-maker of the FCC, nor
> > an amateur license holder, present or past. What, then, is YOUR
> > stake in amateur radio other than "critic from the sidelines" ?
>
> This was my point exactly. While I certainly support Len's or anyone else's
> right to have an opinion, Len seems to think he knows what's best for a
> hobby/service that he does not partake of. Seems strange to me.
>
> Jackie KC0ODY

Before I forget, congrats on getting your station up and running.

Phil's comment and yours are what I've been saying about Len's posts for about seven years. Why would anyone follow the lead of someone who knows a few hams and has read some books and magazines over the views of those who have experience in amateur radio, who are enthusiastic in their support of amateur radio and who are active as radio amateurs?

Dave K8MN

1813. Re: Getting old call sign back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 03:55:08 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030208225508.08747.00000534@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 60946

In article <57C7FA5930616060.09C035F7088B4388.B256AC75093257C8@lp.airnews.net>,
DaveH <ddhartwick@NO_SPAMearthlink.net> writes:

>Larry,
>I've had a good search through VanityHQ and can't find where the
>availability of WA3URR is addressed.

Dave:

I simply plugged "WA3URR" in to the call sign search window at qrz.com,
and it came back as not being found in the database. Since the database
comes from the FCC, and is updated regularly, I just naturally ass-u-&-me
that the call is available at this time. Most Vanity call sign sites usually
don't provide listings of 2x3 calls available, therefore the
process-of-elimination
method is the usual way of telling whether or not a specific call is available.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1814. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 03:55:08 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030208225508.08747.00000533@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 60947

In article <20030208154107.29447.00000266@mb-cd.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>
> It seems that the extreme conservatives are inculcated with
> some kind of abnormal behavior patterns on Passing a Test.
> A Transformation happened. They joined the sorted, sifted,
> Class Structure of rank, status, and privilege.

Lennie:

Nah, that's not it at all. Those of us who became licensed radio amateurs
(something you can't seem to accomplish even at the entry level) and
upgraded to Amateur Extra class simply did so because the challenge
was there, the effort was rewarded with increased operating privileges, and
we were intellectually and emotionally disposed to take on the task and
succeed. Unfortunately, we've always been the object of jealous scorn by
the likes of ham radio wannabes like yourself, who find it easier to stew
in your invidious resentment of our accomplishment, and accuse of
all sorts of imaginary character flaws. We've got your number, Lennie.

> Liberals of The Ham are, well, more liberal. They are only
> having their own fun, enjoying a technically challenging
> recreational activity involving radio. They are not slavishly
> tied by conservative bonds. According to extreme
> conservatives these liberals do not have The RIGHT Stuff
> to be worthy of The Ham. Why is that?

Lennie, getting a ham radio license is now falling-off-a-log easy.
Getting one would at the very least qualify you in some marginal way to
make the judgments you indulge in on this newsgroup without benefit
of a license. What we all want to know is -- why don't you?

> Indeed, why are the liberals of The Ham not affected during
> the Transformation? The Test is the same. The Certificate
> is the same. Yet liberals are considered inferior.
>
> Most curious. Answers sought for the benefit of science.

No, Lennie, liberals in amateur radio (or, in your case, NOT in ham
radio) are all the same -- they want something for nothing. They're
not willing to give something of themselves in order to earn privileges
others seem able to achieve with little or no effort. The difference is
that the conservatives are willing to make the effort -- they try.
Sometimes they fail, but they go back and try it again. Eventually
they succeed -- and don't stand on a street corner denouncing those

who make the requirements and uphold the standards. The thing now, Lennie, is that you liberals have won -- ham radio licensing standards have now been reduced to insignificance, yet you persist in railing against them anyway. The only impact you're having is to give a negative image of yourself and other liberals -- but the world is finally starting to see all of you for what you are -- and you are now losing your power just as incrementally as you gained it.

Lennie -- you're the Wicked Witch of the West -- and the Scarecrow just tossed a bucket of water on you!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1815. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 04:11:40 UTC
From: Jackie <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com>
Message-ID: <0yk1a.42510$HN5.158783@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 60948

> Liberals of The Ham are, well, more liberal. They are only having their own fun, enjoying a technically challenging
> recreational activity involving radio. They are not slavishly tied by conservative bonds. According to extreme
> conservatives these liberals do not have The RIGHT Stuff to be worthy of The Ham. Why is that?

Len, have you and Vipul met? If not, you guys should get together over a nice latte' at Starbucks and discuss how both of you can solve all of the problems of amateur radio while at the same time turning it into the hobby you both want it to become. Howzabout it?

Meanwhile, the rest of us will be enjoying the privileges our licenses grant us, and we'll be having fun with it, whatever that means to each of us. If the two of you overthinking, killjoy brain trusts don't like it, tough bird droppings. You can proselytize over our supposed deficiencies all you like, but the more you criticize us for pursuing our goals in this hobby, the more ridiculous you look for wasting your time.

Jackie KC0ODY

1816. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 04:13:21 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v4blajbpids962@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 60949

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030208215647.27873.00000521@mb-mj.aol.com...
> In article <3E45845A.E50FD9D@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
<k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:

<SNIP>

> >You can perform your gruff, all-knowing geezer routine all you like,
> >Leonard H.
> >Behind your curtain stands a humbug.
>
> Perhaps we should consider what the Wizard said about the man behind the
> curtain.

If I remember my movie correctly was it something like "pay no attention
to the man behind the curtain" If so I agree 100% !!!
--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

1817. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 04:20:13 UTC
From: Jackie <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com>
Message-ID: <1Gk1a.41861$vm2.23772@rwcrnsc54>
Source record: 60950

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3E45D021.70930244@earthlink.net...

> Before I forget, congrats on getting your station up and running.

Thanks-- it's sort of running-- I'm planning on putting down some radials below the borrowed vertical tomorrow. The 12' high clothesline dipole isn't really satisfying my urge to do DX, although I can do stateside with it fairly well. :-)

> Phil's comment and yours are what I've been saying about Len's posts for
> about seven years. Why would anyone follow the lead of someone who
> knows a few hams and has read some books and magazines over the views of
> those who have experience in amateur radio, who are enthusiastic in
> their support of amateur radio and who are active as radio amateurs?

Len is a mystery. He's obviously knowledgeable about some things, so why does he waste so much time criticizing this hobby? I place him and Vipul in the same category- I respect them for their knowledge of electronics (which I know little about presently) but disdain their efforts to slam people who are in this hobby. I have to wonder why they waste so much time. I mean, there are so many other things they could be doing than griping on an amateur radio policy group. Griping about policies is one thing; griping about the perceived problems with the entire culture of the hobby is something else.

Jackie KC0ODY

1818. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 04:22:35 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v4blrojrm6879c@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 60951

"Jackie" <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> wrote in message
news:0yk1a.42510$HN5.158783@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net...
> > Liberals of The Ham are, well, more liberal. They are only having
their
> own fun, enjoying a technically challenging
> > recreational activity involving radio. They are not slavishly tied by
> conservative bonds. According to extreme
> > conservatives these liberals do not have The RIGHT Stuff to be worthy of
> The Ham. Why is that?
>
> Len, have you and Vipul met? If not, you guys should get together over a
> nice latte' at Starbucks and discuss how both of you can solve all of the
> problems of amateur radio while at the same time turning it into the hobby
> you both want it to become. Howzabout it?
>

Jackie
Do you think Vipul might BE Lenny?
--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx

> Meanwhile, the rest of us will be enjoying the privileges our licenses
grant
> us, and we'll be having fun with it, whatever that means to each of us. If
> the two of you overthinking, killjoy brain trusts don't like it, tough
bird
> droppings. You can proselytize over our supposed deficiencies all you
like,
> but the more you criticize us for pursuing our goals in this hobby, the
more
> ridiculous you look for wasting your time.
>
> Jackie KC0ODY
>
>
>

1819. Re: Getting old call sign back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 04:36:48 UTC
From: W7TI <jamspam@upyours.now>
Message-ID: <Xns931CD1AFBE333pookster@216.168.3.50>
Source record: 60952

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in
news:20030208225508.08747.00000534@mb-cg.aol.com:

> Since the database
> comes from the FCC, and is updated regularly, I just naturally ass-u-&-me
> that the call is available at this time.

Isn't there still a two year waiting period before a call can be
reassigned? There is a small but non-zero chance the call is within that
period.

Bill, W7TI

1820. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 04:45:03 UTC
From: Jackie <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com>
Message-ID: <j1l1a.43110$Ec4.36478@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 60953

"KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com> wrote in message
news:v4blrojrm6879c@corp.supernews.com...

> Do you think Vipul might BE Lenny?

There does seem to be an odd resemblance-- inasmuch as you can get a picture
via this admittedly-limited media... I do have to wonder though...

Jackie KC0ODY

1821. Re: n8wwm king of clowns busted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 05:20:38 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <A7ecnSCO2Pu6eNijXTWcrg@comcast.com>
Source record: 60954
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

<Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
news:20030208140431.643$8H@newsreader.com...
> Yea Lee,I beleive you as much as a would dogie. Why doesn't the fat
bastard
> speak for himself,instead of posting gay shit all the time?
>
> Why are you defending such an obvious asshole? Cuz he's a fucking
coward?

Did you even try to contact him by E-mail Mopar? I suspect most on here wouldn't because they're afraid to reveal their real E-mail address, names etc. And you talk about cowards Mopar, well what's your real name - address - etc. Why do you have to hide it? I've been posting on this news group for a long while now using my real name, callsign, and I haven't had anything serious happen as a result. So it appears I have a lot more guts that most of the posters on this group including you. Even Doug posted using his real name and callsign at the beginning. If you call Doug a coward for no longer using his real name and callsign, well he's just taken a page out of your book, i.e. using made up screen nics and posting through anonymous mail servers, like "hotmail.com" just like you do Mopar. You call him a coward then include yourself.

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

Saw this on a Tee-shirt:

"I am a
bomb
technician
if you see me
running
try to keep up "

1822. Re: n8wwm king of clowns busted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 05:39:13 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <TwqdnYlhdJQfdNijXTWcpg@comcast.com>
Source record: 60955
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"chessecutter" <cheesecutter@webhideout.com> wrote in message
news:fef386d5.0302081535.569e4fd8@posting.google.com...
> "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net> wrote in message
news:<zDqdnd8hQOoqztijXTWcqw@comcast.com>...
> > <Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
> > news:20030208131111.061$Pn@newsreader.com...
> > > Life is good when you're not a fat blowhard like doug
adair,n8wwm.
> >
> > The whole episode is a non-issue when you dig in to the facts
Mopar.
> > I've contacted several people directly involved and sorted out the
> > facts for myself. Twisted hasn't been completely truthful in his
posts
> > it seems. Yes there where recordings of N8, however the recordings
> > where of him chewing out several other Hams on the repeater for
> > routinely causing interference, and his "strongly worded opinions"
> > about the lack of action by the control operator(s) to correct the
> > problem. Apparently one of the Hams involved in the interference
made
> > those tape recording in an attempt to cover his behind, and tried
to
> > get N8 to back off on his complaints, by sending them in to the
FCC.
> > If N8 is really guilty of anything its trying to clean up an
existing
> > problem on the Ham band in his local. This is something any really
> > concerned Ham would do, a bit of self policing action where we try
to
> > clean up our own mess first before the FCC has to step in and do
it
> > for us. As far as I can tell there isn't going to be any action
taken
> > against N8 by the FCC.

> oh and we are supposed to believe you?????

You too lazy to spend a few minutes to contact the people involved and
find out for yourself? Or would you rather let Twisted hand you a line
of crap, stick up for him without checking the facts, and then find
out later he's wrong so you end up looking dumb for believing him in
the first place. I posted the message as a simple "heads up" for
others to read. I fully expect anybody of reasonable IQ to check the
facts for themselves, and not to depend on Twisted, or even me, and

make their own INFORMED judgment.

Twisted has been wrong far to many times to trust him. He has his agenda and he doesn't really care who gets burned in the process, including his fellow CBers, as long as they help further his campaign of misinformation and revenge.

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

Saw this on a Tee-shirt:

"I am a
bomb
technician
if you see me
running
try to keep up "

1823. ARNewsline 1330 - Feb 7 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 07:28:48 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030209022848.09959.00000269@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 60956

Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1330 - February 7, 2003

++
+++

A NOTE ABOUT WHAT YOU ARE ABOUT TO READ

For those of you who only know of the Amateur Radio Newsline (tm) as a text newsletter we would strongly urge you to listen to the audio version this week. Our service is best described as "audio intensive" and all Amateur Radio Newsline (tm) scripts are specifically written for the "spoken word." Because of this there is no way to convey in print the emotion of what you "hear" when you listen rather than read.

Candidly, you are really missing what Amateur Radio Newsline is really all about by only reading it. The newscast is recorded each week by professional broadcasters and is available for private listening or rebroadcast over your repeater. Two methods of delivery are available: FTP downloadable MP3 files or dial-in telephone.

Please visit our website at http://www.arnewsline.org for a list of telephone numbers (you have to pay your own long distance charges) and links to our voice newscast. Free FTP Downloads are available at our site by clicking on the newscast number at the top of the page.

de
The Newsline Production Team

++
+++

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1330 with a release date of Friday, February 7 2003 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T. The space shuttle Columbia falls from the sky and all on-board are lost. Three were radio amateurs. More on the tragedy and the search for answers comes your way right now:

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: HAM RADIO OPERATORS LOST IN COLUMBIA TRAGEDY

Three ham radio operators were among the seven member crew of the space shuttle Columbia who were killed when the orbiter broke up during re-entry over Texas on Saturday February 1st. Amateur Radio Nesline's Norm Seeley, KI7UP, has the details:

--
President Bush Audio: Audio only report. Hear it at
http://www.arnewsline.org
--

Those were the words of President George W. Bush expressing the grief of the world on learning that that the spaceship Columbia had fallen from the sky. That it's crew of seven astronasuts was lost.

On board was a 7 member crew that included three ham radio operators. Killed in there tragedy were Mission Commander Rick Husband, and Pilot William McCool. Also lost were Mission Specialists Michael Anderson, David Brown KC5ZTC, Laurel Clark, KC5ZSU, Kalpana Chawla, KD5ESI and Israeli Payload Specialist Ilan Ramon. Ramon was a well-known Israeli Air Force pilot became the first man from his country to fly in space.

Columbia was at an altitude of about 203,000 feet over north-central Texas and traveling at 12,500 mph, when Mission Control lost all contact and tracking data. It was about 9 a.m Eastern time. That was almost the same moment when residents in the Dallas area reported hearing a gigantic sonic boom. The loudest anyone had ever heard. Witnesses who looked up reported seeing a bright flash followed by smoke plumes streaking across the sky. Several people grabbed their home video cameras and caught the tragedy. Tape shows debris appearing to break off into separate balls of light and falling back to Earth.

What actually happened is still very much unclear. The shuttle is essentially a glider during the hour-long decent from orbit. It is covered by some 20,000 thermal tiles to protect against temperatures as high as 3,000 degrees.

The space agency is already looking at a liftoff incident where a part of the center fuel tank's foam insulation broke away and impacted one of the Columbia's wings. NASA saus that just before it disintegrated Columbia experienced an abnormal rise in temperature and wind resistance. That forced the shuttle's automatic pilot to make rapid changes to its flight path. Some experts say that this is possible evidence that some heat-protection tiles were missing or damaged.

Administration officials said there was no immediate indication of terrorism but accounts from those on the ground have lead to speculation of a explosion somewhere on board the orbiter. Others say the abnormally high sound level was the result of multiple pieces of Columbia all breaking the sound barrier at slightly different times and creating an ongoing sonic boom.

Debris from Columbia fell along Northern Texas and into Louisiana. NASA declared an emergency after losing contact with the crew and sent search teams to the Dallas-Fort Worth area. It also warned people to stay well clear of any debris field they might encounter because of chemical contamination from the very toxic fuel. But that was easier said than done. Residents of the town of Nacogdoches say they found bits of metal strewn all across the city and a local dentist reported that a metal

bracket about a foot long crashed through his office roof.

STS-107 was NASA's 144th shuttle mission.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Norm Seeley, KI7UP.

--

On January 28th, 1986, the space shuttle Challenger exploded shortly after liftoff but in 42 years of U.S. human space flight, there had never been an accident during the descent to Earth or landing until now. NASA has grounded all of its space shuttles, but there's no word yet that the Columbia tragedy will affect the current Expedition 7 crew's future aboard the International Space Station. (ARNewsline™ from published news reports)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: TEXAS HAMS ASSIST IN SHUTTLE DEBRIS HUNT

Amateur Radio played a signifigant role in the debris recovery efforts after Columbia broke up over Texas. Amateur Radio Newsline's David Black, KB4KCH, has that part of the story.

--
A family member gets a close-up view to the tragedy. One of the Columbia's heat protective tiles was found near my nephew's college dorm in north central Texas. My newphew took a picture of it, which you can see on the Amateur Radio Newsline website. While the tile survived re-entry, the Columbia did not.

Within hours of the accident, Amateur Radio Emergency Service volunteers with the Nacogdoches Amateur Radio Club began helping Emergency Management officials and NASA teams in locating and cataloging debris falling from the shuttle.

Tim Lewallen, KD5ING, is the Public Information Officer for the Nacogdoches Amateur Radio Club. He says the hams worked in tandem with students from a local college's Geographical Information Systems lab. Together, they surveyed the city and county looking for shuttle debris. When any was located it was photographed and its exact position determined using a G-P-S. The data was later downloaded into a database that will be superimposed over terrain maps. Local officials say debris was found in nearly 2,000 sites, including some 1,200 places in Nacogdoches County.

As we go to air, well over 12,000 pieces of Columbia had been found, from as far west as New Mexico eastward into Louisiana. NASA hopes the position of the debris field will give it some insight into what caused Columbia to disintegrate.

Reporting for the Amateur Radio Newsline, I',m David Black, KB4KCH.

--

Lewallan says that the entire effort was coordinated by the ARES group. He adds that ARES volunteers were also directed to coordinates given by NASA that the space agency believed might contain missing parts of the Columbia. The recovery and cataloging effort went on for several days. (Nacogdoches Amateur Radio Club via KD5ING)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: AMSAT MOURNS COLUMBIA LOSS

Its no secret that Amateur Radio and the space program have had a very close association since the very first Orbiting Satellite Carrying Amateur Radio or OSCAR was launched back on December 12th 1961. It was carried into space by a United States built Thor Agena launch vehicle from Vandenberg Air Force Base in California. OSCAR 1 was a tiny 4.5 kg package that made only 312 orbits before re-entering the Earths atmosphere. But it set the stage for four decades of ham radio in space. A lot of it took place from the space shuttles including Columbia. In fact it was from Columbia that ham radio's first man in space, Owen Garriott, W5LFL, talked to a senator and a king:

--
Audio only. Hear it in the audio version at http://www.arnewsline.org
--

And so it was when news of the Columbia's demise began to settle in that the representatives of AMSAT groups from around the world began paying their respects. Perhapps none was more poignant than the words of AMSAT North America President Robin Haighton, VE3FRH. His statement is read by Amateur Radio Newsline's Newsline's Henry Feinberg, K2SSQ:

--

"It is with great sadness that I have learnt of the Columbia disaster. AMSAT has always been a strong supporter of the Shuttle program and of ARISS. We have had many interactions with the astronauts who have fearlessly ridden the shuttle into space. Currently several are AMSAT members and supporters.

On this sad occasion on behalf of the Board of Directors, Officers and Members of AMSAT, I wish to send our deep sympathy to the families, relatives and friends of those who undertook this Columbia mission. Their understanding of the risks taken on this and other missions did not prevent them from performing at the highest level, and, unfortunately paying the ultimate price.

To our friends at NASA, we at AMSAT send our understanding and our sympathy,
knowing that the exploration of space and carrying out important experiments
for the benefit of humanity will continue to be your mission."

--

AMSAT France, AMSAT Germany, AMSAT Itlaly, AMSAT Sri Lanka and other AMSAT groups the world over also offered words of condolence an consolation.

Frank H. Bauer, KA3HDO, the Chairman of ARISS International issued a statement that read in part -- and we quote: "This is a difficult time for all of us. Let's work together to keep the torch of space travel alive in the hearts and spirits of humans worldwide. And most importantly, please keep the astronauts, their family and friends in your thoughts and prayers." (AMSAT-NA, ARISS, others)

**

Break 1

From the United States of America, we are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including the W4BBB Radio Amateurs Club of Knoxville repeater serving Knoxville Tennessee.

(5 sec pause here)

**
RESCUE RADIO: TENNESSEE HAMS HELP AFTER TORNADO

The January 8th issue of the Knoxville News-Sentinel tells the story of Sheila Tailent, KB4G, and how she came to the rescue after a tornado ripped through Morgan County Tennessee. Tailent is the state ARES coordinator realized a need to provide reliable communications following the storm. Thanks to her efforts, within 15 minutes after the twister struck hams with emergency communications gear were on their way.

According to the News-Sentinel, for the next 48 hours ham radio volunteers relayed communications among police departments, firefighters, rescue squads, demolition units, repair crews the Red Cross and many others. The article says that dozens of radio amateurs worked around the clock with many taking vacation days from work and donating the time to the community.

The newspaper says that a conservative estimate of the value of the communications provided free of charge by hams to Morgan County could be upward of $80,000. (W5YI Report)

**

RESCUE RADIO: BE PREPARED - PART 2

The Columbia tragedy and the Morgan County tornado are two incidents that again bring home just how important it is for ham radio operators to be prepared. The ARES members in Nacogdoches Texas had no idea that their training would involve them in trying to find out why a space shuttle fell from the sky. But thats excatly the role that they played -- and continue to play.

Last Week, Lloyd Colston, KC5FM, was here to explain the importance of emergency preparedness. Now says Colston, its time for some personal

preparations:

--
Audio only report. Hear it at http://www.arnewsline.org
--

Lloyd Colston, KC5FM, is with the Mayes County Emergency Management in Pryor Oklahoma. He will be back from time to time with other tips on how hams can be ready for any emergency that may come their way. (KC5FM)

**

RADIO LAW: FCC AND NTIA TO IMPROVE FREQUENCY COORDINATION

The FCC and the Commerce Department's National Telecommunications and Information Administration have signed a new Memorandum of Understanding on spectrum coordination. According to the C-G-C Communicator, the agreement calls for the FCC to responsible for non-federal frequency users such as broadcast, commercial, public safety and even Amateur Radio. The N-T-I-A will hold responsibility for all federal government users. The full document is on line at http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/DOC-230835A1.doc (CGC Communicator)

**

SPECTRUM ISSUES: FCC REALLOCATES SPECTRUM FOR NEW WIRELESS SERVICES

Also from the C-G-C Communicator word that the FCC has reallocated 30 megahertz of spectrum from the 2 GHz Mobile Satellite Service to fixed and mobile services. The purpose is to provide frequencies for a variety of new wireless applications. The Commission is seeking comments on potential uses of an additional 15 megahertz of spectrum previously identified for new wireless services. It also wants comments on increased flexibility in the Unlicensed Personal Communications Service band. This too is on the web. You will find it at: http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/DOC-230754A1.doc (CGC Communicator)

**

CONVENTIONS AND HAMFESTS: SUPERFEST 2003

A-E-S has gotten it's Superfest 2003 registration form online. The Superfest takes place April 4th and 5th at Amateur Electronic Supply in Milwaukee. To register take your web browser to www.aesham.com and take the link to the Superfest menu. If you need help or have any questions, please contact Molly Schreiber at A-E-S. Her e-mail is molly@aesham.com (AES)

**

HAMFESTS AND CONVENTIONS: RADIOFEST IN SEASIDE CALIFORNIA

The Naval Postgraduate School Amateur Radio Club will host RadioFest 2003 on Saturday, February 22nd. This is a West Coast hamfest and will be held at the General Stilwell Community Center in Seaside, California. The show includes a flea market, vendor booths, demonstrations, license exams, door prizes and more. Among the forum presenters scheduled are Leslie Ragghianti from the 911 Emergency Communications Center, Jeff Orr, K-G-6-K-C-O, discussing "Echo Link" along with Don Carlson , KQ6FM, and Glenn Thomas, WB6W discussing ARES. Sound interesting? For more information go to the web at www.radiofest.org (W6FVI)

**

RADIO MEETINGS: SCADS IN SEAL BEACH CALIFORNIA

Also in the Golden State the Southern California Area DXer's shortwave listeners monthly meeting takes place on Saturday February 15th from noon to 4:00 p.m. Pacific time. The venue is the F&M Bank Community Room in Seal Beach California. This months subject is Radio Communication Listening Worldwide. For more information e-mail Bill Fisher at billfishernow@netzero.net (SCADS)

**

BREAK 2

This is ham radio news for today's radio amateur. From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org and being relayed by the volunteer services of the following radio amateur:

(5 sec pause here)

**
THE FUTURE: HOW TO MAKE HAM RADIO MORE KID FRIENDLY

"How to Make Ham Radio More Kid Friendly" is the topic that Amateur Radio Newsline has chosen for this years Ham Radio Town Meeting and we are looking for some younger hams who might want to take part.

The Town Meeting is held each May at the Dayton Hamvention. This years Hamvention theme is the "Year of the Young" and planners tell us that the three day show will focus on the young ham and on bringing 12 to 18 year olds into amateur radio.

Its no secret that recruiting youngsters into the hobby is getting harder and harder. Keeping most of them is all but impossible. There is organized sports. There are those numerous after school activities. And lets not forget the lure of the World Wide Web with its license free ham-radio like chat rooms. All of this makes it a real challenge to get youngsters licensed and keep them interested.

Obviously the old ways of recruiting young people no longer work. So we are going to take two hours and give you the chance to come up with some new ways.

If you are a young ham planning to attend Hamvention 2003 and would like 10 minutes to present your ideas, drop us an e-mail. We will go through what you send us and some of you might be invited to be a part of our all-star panel.

The best way to contact us is by e-mail. Mark your note Town Meeting and send it to newsline@arnewsline.org. (ARNewsline™)

**

ON THE WEB: REPEATER LINKING POWERPOINT PRESENTATION

If you are into repeater linking, this one is for you. Kevin Custer, W3KKC, reports over the VHF Reflector on a new Repeater Linking presentation using Microsoft's Power Point Presentation format. It was produced by Douglas Otoupal, N5HYD, is 131 kilobytes in and available at http://www.repeater-builder.com/rbtip/pdfindex.html. (VHF Reflector)

**

INTERNATIONAL - GREECE: NEW VHF/UHF ONLY LICENSE CLASS

The V-H-F Reflector says that Greece now has its own, entry level VHF only license. The new ticket use the prefix SW1 through SW9 with priveleges on 2 meters and above. SV1 through SV9 prefixes indicate Greek stations that have full High Frequency operating privileges. (VHF REflector)

**

INTERNATIONAL - GERMANY: DEUTSCHE WELLE DROPPING NORTH AMERICAN SERVICE

Germany's premiere shortwave station says that transmissions to North America will soon cease. This with confirmation by Margot Forbes of the broadcaster Deutsche Welle that it will be terminating the long running service at the end of March.

Up until now, there have been several claims made by various sources that Deutsche Welle would be shutting down its broadcasts to North America this spring. The station would not deny or confirm this directly until now.

According to Forbes, the stations budget has been slashed time and time again by the German Government. Forbes says that maintaining shortwave transmissions are particularly expensive and the decision has been made to cancel operation on some frequencies. This includes the very popular transmissions to North America

Forbes says that there are no plans yet for a replacement service. but says there is the possibility of somthing being worked out using satellite delivery or over the Internet. (shortwavedxing.com)

**

PROPAGATION: SA 100 MICROWATT 7 MHZ BEACON HERARD IN USA

And a possible record for a high frequency beacon transmitter. Over the last 4 months, an extremely low power beacon transmitter has been operating from the QTH of ZS1J at Plettenberg Bay, South Africa. The measured power output of the 7.029 MHz transmissions is 100 microwatts and reception reports from all over South Africa, up to 1100 kilometers, have been received. But the big surpriose came on Tuesday January 29th. Bill Diggens, WA8LXJ, in West Union Ohio made a positive identification of the beacon transmiutter.

Diggens gave it a Readability 2, Signal strength 1 and tone T 9. He also made a tape recording of the signal received and played it back to amazed South African amateurs on the daily, split frequency net. A newt that can be found 7.095 and 7.177 MHz in the 40 meter band. (ZS6AKV)

**

DX

In DX, PS7AB says that Mexiana Island will be on the air May 21st through the 25th. Five operators will activate Mexiana on 40 through 10 meters on SSB only. Mexiana is considered the most wanted Islands on the Air group in all of South America. More information is on the web at http://www.mexianaisland2003.hpg.com.br (Press release)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: HAM RADIO AND THE SPACESHIP COLUMBIA

And finally this week, we like many other Amateur Radio operators around the world felt a special loss following the Columbia space shuttle disaster. As we already mentioned, three of the astronauts on board were licensed Amateur Radio operators. And Amateur Radio has had close ties to the space program, to the astronauts, and to the ill-fated Columbia since the very early days of shuttle flights.

It was on board the Columbia during the STS-9 mission in November of 1983 that Dr. Owen Garriott, W5LFL, became the first person ever to operate a ham radio station from space. In case you have forgotten, this is how that historic contact sounded:

--
Audio only. Hear it in the audio version at http://www.arnewsline.org

--

That QSO marked the first time that astronauts could communicate directly with people on Earth. And they did it without going through the normal NASA's communications channels.

In 1990, NASA, the ARRL and AMSAT formed SAREX -- The Shuttle Amateur Radio Experiment. This was a program to schedule regular contacts between school students and the astronauts on-orbit using Amateur Radio. Astronauts were encouraged to obtain Amateur Radio licenses. Many did and they used them to talk with kids in schools the world over. A lot of those contacts took place from the mid-deck of the spaceship

Columbia.

--
Audio only. Hear it in the audio version at http://www.arnewsline.org
--

In addition to the SAREX contacts, astronauts were encouraged to spend some of their free time making random contacts with hams on Earth. Open contacts they were called and they became a new form of radiosport. A kind of contest with radio amateurs everywhere vying to be the first in the city or neighborhood to talk to a ham radio operator in space.

Then Russia entered the realm of ham radio on-orbit. Amateur Radio gear was installed on its MIR space station and talking with cosmonauts soon became almost commonplace. Who can forget British astronaut Helen Sharman when she visited the MIR and took to the airwaves using ham radio.

--
Audio only. Hear it in the audio version at http://www.arnewsline.org
--

SAREX has now given weay to ARISS -- Amateur Radio on the International Space Station. But it all had to have a beginning and from its earliest days on-orbit until it disintegrated in the sky above Texas the space ship Columbia and ham radio have shared history together. Now the Columbia is now gone, but the world of Amateur Radio will never, ever forget it or the seven human beings who were on it when it met its firey demise. (From the combined thoughts of the worlds radio amateurs as posted to various Internet remailers, by e-mail and numerous other sources.)

***

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, Amateur News Weekly, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline @arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I'm Jim Damron, N8TMW and I'm Jeff Clark, K8JAC,saying 73 and we thank you for listening." Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2002. All rights reserved.

1824. ID???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 09:57:40 UTC
From: YoYo <Repeat@Anon.com>
Message-ID: <b258mt$5e7$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 60957

Should I ID now or wait? If I give my call as per FCC rules, is that enough
or should I ID and say, "W7xxx for ID"?
Only the no-coders know for sure.

1825. Re: Getting old call sign back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 11:36:05 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030209063605.29016.00000178@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 60958

In article <Xns931CD1AFBE333pookster@216.168.3.50>, W7TI <jamspam@upyours.now>
writes:

>Isn't there still a two year waiting period before a call can be
>reassigned? There is a small but non-zero chance the call is within that
>period.
>
The wait depends on who had the call previously. This is done to give family
members preference towards reissue of a call held by an SK family member.

It is my understanding that back in the mid-70s or so, FCC stopped routinely
reissuing callsigns that had been issued sequentially. IOW, when FCC reached
WA3ZZZ, they went on to WB3AAA, even though there were a number of calls in the
WA3AAA-WA3ZZZ block that were no longer held. This method hasseveral
benefits:

- Less work for FCC
- New hams almost all get new, never-held-before calls
- Maximizes the chances that former holders of calls (like WA3URR) can get them
back through the vanity callsign program.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1826. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 11:36:06 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030209063606.29016.00000179@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 60959

In article <v4blajbpids962@corp.supernews.com>, "KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com>
writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030208215647.27873.00000521@mb-mj.aol.com...
>> In article <3E45845A.E50FD9D@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>
><SNIP>
>
>> >You can perform your gruff, all-knowing geezer routine all you like,
>> >Leonard H.
>> >Behind your curtain stands a humbug.
>>
>> Perhaps we should consider what the Wizard said about the man behind the
>> curtain.
>
>If I remember my movie correctly was it something like "pay no attention
>to the man behind the curtain"

YESSS!!!

>If so I agree 100% !!!

'zactly

73 de Jim, N2EY

1827. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 12:13:22 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030209071322.23508.00000210@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 60960

>Subject: Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs
>From: "Jackie" buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com
>Date: 2/8/03 6:37 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <Roh1a.40663$Ec4.34160@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net>
>
>
>"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
>news:cuvyxnansvbet.ha0c6d5.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
>
>> But you, Len, are not a staffer or decision-maker of the FCC, nor
>> an amateur license holder, present or past. What, then, is YOUR
>> stake in amateur radio other than "critic from the sidelines" ?
>
>This was my point exactly. While I certainly support Len's or anyone else's
>right to have an opinion, Len seems to think he knows what's best for a
>hobby/service that he does not partake of. Seems strange to me.

I think Lennieboy is just "criticly ill" from the sidelines, myself.

73

Stve, K4YZ

1828. Re: ID???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 14:02:29 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <Ubt1a.3445$4y4.1619375@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 60961

"YoYo" <Repeat@Anon.com> wrote in message news:b258mt$5e7$0@pita.alt.net...
> Should I ID now or wait? If I give my call as per FCC rules, is that
enough
> or should I ID and say, "W7xxx for ID"?
> Only the no-coders know for sure.
>
>

Just say your call sign. The "for ID" is unnecessary. Afterall, the
purpose of saying your call sign is for identification anyway.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

1829. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 14:07:58 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E4660C5.6020604@adelphia.net>
Source record: 60962

Phil Kane wrote:

> On 08 Feb 2003 01:23:07 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:

> But you, Len, are not a staffer or decision-maker of the FCC, nor
> an amateur license holder, present or past. What, then, is YOUR
> stake in amateur radio other than "critic from the sidelines" ?

I think his interest is as a master fisherman, trolling, trolling, trolling. Otherwise intelligent members of the group are happy to oblige. I think he has just found a place where the fishin's easy and the fish always rise to the bait.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1830. Re: New Field Day Entry Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 14:24:20 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302090624.c619cab@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60963

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030207221416.09289.00001231@mb-ch.aol.com>...
> In article <c2356669.0302061510.634b0c0d@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> (N2EY) writes:
>
> >Looks like some of the suggestions have been heard.
> >
> >FD 2003 will have a new "Class F" entry class, for stations set up at
> >EOCs (Emergency Operations Centers).
> >
> >See:
> >
> >http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2003/02/06/3/?nc=1
>
> What's the point of this?

Training and exercise. To put the amateur volunteers into the EOC and
exercise their skill and equipment, and to show their customer their
capabilities. Makes perfect sense to me, I only wonder why it took so
long to do it.

EOC stations are usually full-blown stations with
> high power capability, good antennas, and all the coffee and donuts you
> can consume.

Sounds like an official bulletin station.

What does operating from one of these stations prove from
> a standpoint of true emergency communications capability?

Larry, what is the point of any emergency exercise?

The operators
> at EOC's are usually the most obese, chain-smoking, technically
> incompetent and personality-challenged hams you'll find on-the-air.

Maybe they're good emergency communicators. We'll see.

AFAIC,
> giving them their ever-so-appropriate "F" (for Failure) category is a good
> idea -- so us guys out there in the field will know who to avoid!

Avoid? Like in your "broken leg on the mountain side" scenario?
Refusing help from a no-coder? Fine, just lay there and die.

However,
> if they add a rule stating that any EOC-station must change operators at

> least every four hours, and are not permitted to use HF SSB, then I'd begin
> to see some value to this category.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Why would you pick on the ARRL for doing something smart?

You're trolls were better back in your "favorite black on the bus"
days.

1831. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 14:54:43 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030209095443.08956.00000513@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 60964

From: lenover21@aol.com
> A number of spiteful regulars in here, unable to take strong
> opposition to their opinions, write about "having to pass a
> ham test" as an absolute must...as if the passing of that
> test and the grant of a license now has evidence of The
> RIGHT Attitude...all others are of inferior status.

The way the tests are given, one does not have to know the material to pass it. Also, the general class incorrectly indicates more technical competence, when all it really does is proved one passed a Morse code test.

> Apparently there is considerable dichotomy in The Ham, shown
> by extreme conservatism and rigidity in activities versus the
> more liberal who consider The License as a mere regulation to
> allow them entrance to the enjoyment of a recreational activity.

>This is particularly true
> of those who manifestly support traditions of The Ham as they
> existed before their own life experience began.

HAM radio is a cult. Others have an AMATEUR radio licence. Those that believe in the traditions of Ham also believe in rigidity in activities to fit those traditions. The often use absurd rationalizations to justify their views.

One example is when my club showed that they homebrewed. They posed for a photograph (several months before I joined), got listed in QST. Then after the cameras were gone they went onto their normal activities, as they weren't interested in homebrewing. I asked people if they wanted to do any homebrewing projects and no one wanted to do any. So, the photograph pictured something that was not really there and gave a false impression.

More recently, my local club thought about getting loaner HTs for new Hams. In the newsletter, they said the main purpose was to promote Ham radio and "the advancement of the radio art". I can see HTs promoting HAM radio, but I did not see these actions or any others related to "the advancement of the radio art". This was so absurdly incorrect, I wanted to point this out to someone in the club, but I though it wouldn't be worth it. Also at least one other person told me he did not see the point, but there was no discussion on the matter, as this is a HAM club. I'm going to "let" my membership expire.

These phrasings are <the rationalizations> used. They are incorrect, but make them look good to those who do not investigate its accuracy.

>All must march to
> the drumbeats of the extreme conservatives in this service in
> correct mental uniform bearing proud medalions of extreme
> radio accomplishments (DXCC, WAZ, etc.) in order to Push

> The Envelope and advance the state of the amateur radio art.

There's that phrase again. Yes, they use rationalizations to say that
contesting contributes to "advancement of the state of the amateur radio art".
Also, acommplishments are all of this type: DXCC,WAZ, etc).

>Extreme conservatives rigidly enforce "fun" according to their
> directives and definitions. "Fun" is the absolute correctness
> of their slavish devotion to tradition, lore, mythos as dictated.

Well put. That's correct.

>Liberals of The Ham are, well, more liberal. They are only
> having their own fun, enjoying a technically challenging
> recreational activity involving radio. They are not slavishly
> tied by conservative bonds. According to extreme
> conservatives these liberals do not have The RIGHT Stuff
> to be worthy of The Ham. Why is that?

> Indeed, why are the liberals of The Ham not affected during
> the Transformation? The Test is the same. The Certificate
> is the same. Yet liberals are considered inferior.

You cannot simply be a radio amateur. You must follow the Ham traditions to be
a <true> "Ham".

1832. Re: More Ideas to eliminate CB intruders on 10m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 15:47:09 UTC
From: "Vinnie S." <enzo@reemoovthis.monmouth.com>
Message-ID: <bttc4vc51mdad0e175flrfsng8v92h2btd@4ax.com>
Source record: 60965
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On 09 Feb 2003 15:39:55 GMT, Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:

>He's rain report doug's buddy. He's looking out for his own kind.

I want to see what he has to say. But even if that is the case, exactly how is his presence here, supposed to help his cause? Does he really think the entire CB community in the US is here in this NG?

Vinnie S.

1833. Re: ID???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 16:08:19 UTC
From: AC6V <none@nowhere.com>
Message-ID: <T1v1a.16890$LW1.830226@news1.west.cox.net>
Source record: 60966

97.119 Station identification.
(a) Each amateur station, except a space station or telecommand station, must transmit its assigned call sign on its transmitting channel at the end of each communication, and at least every ten minutes during a communication, for the purpose of clearly making the source of the transmissions from the station known to those receiving the transmissions. No station may transmit unidentified communications or signals, or transmit as the station call sign, any call sign not authorized to the station.

Nothing there "for ID" you do ID when you simply state ur callsign as per the rules. You can even do it in Morse as repeaters do even though they are "voice" devices.

--
Caveat Lector - Ya All
I Doubt, Therefore I Might Be
73 From AC6V, who is QBF most of the time !!
Rod In Oceanside, CA
Home Page http://ac6v.com
DX Book http://ac6v.com/DXSAMPLE.htm

"YoYo" <Repeat@Anon.com> wrote in message news:b258mt$5e7$0@pita.alt.net...
> Should I ID now or wait? If I give my call as per FCC rules, is that enough
> or should I ID and say, "W7xxx for ID"?
> Only the no-coders know for sure.
>
>

1834. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 16:15:03 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0302090815.11935e25@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60967

Bill Turner <jamspam@nowhere.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns931A3FDBAD532w7tidslextremecom@216.168.3.50>...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in news:d22b54c3.0302060603.26d8f4b7
> @posting.google.com:

I shoulda gotten back to you sooner but I haven't been wasting much
time in this loony bin recently . .

>
> > the 160 hotshot ops gotta be as good as they come when it gets down to
> > weak signal work and antenna smarts. Ears, it's all about the ears . .
>
> ____
>
> Also patience and timing.

Heaps of both!

> W1GKK, the only ham to ever work ALL countries,
> not just the active ones,

Interesting topic. Over the years a number of ops have held that
distinction. W6AM was one, W3GHD was another as was W1FH, all of whom
are SKs now. And George W1GKK. But that bunch is an endangered species
bordering extinction because in order to have "worked 'em all" today
the op would have to have been on the air in 1945-1946 when the HF
hams bands were reopened and 1948 when VO became the first DXCC
deletion. That's a *very* narrow window! I guess George is the last of
those Mohicans.

I've been thumping for years for a DXCC progam which has a built-in
drop-dead date, restart the whole thing every twenty years or so to
level the playing field. Goes over like the usual lead balloon every
time I bring it up.

> said the key to DXing is to "be there when
> they're there".

It was much more difficult to "be there" back then. The only heads-up
vehicles they had for getting "spots" were mailed newsletters, word of
mouth, the telephone, etc. Today all ya hafta do is Telnet into a
spider node . .

> Oddly, his accomplishment was done solely on 20 meters.

20 ssb is the centroid of the DXCC planet, I don't remember a new one
(new dxcc country) coming on which didn't operate on 20 phone right

off. There have been others who simply "parked" on 14.200 and "worked 'em all" or very close to that. A bunch of years ago I visited Bob Stankus W2VCZ in north Jersey. Huge Collins station, a 130 foot tower with a 20m Long John and that was *it*. Wouldn't work for me.

>
> 73, Bill W7TI

w3rv

1835. Re: More Ideas to eliminate CB intruders on 10m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 16:30:56 UTC
From: BC-610 <Mike@Listen14275and14313.net>
Message-ID: <b25vof$qn7$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 60968
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In my neck of the woods we have an easy cure for CB
ten meter intruders. I have a great old BC-610 which I
rebuilt a few years ago. When we get a local CBer intruding
on ten meters, I lay a steady nonstop 750 watt AM carrier on
top of him wherever he goes, until he gets the idea to get the
hell out of the 10m band!!!!!! Works like a charm every time.

Mike/14313

1836. Re: Getting old call sign back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 16:55:15 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0302090855.3f41ee6d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60969

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message news:<20030209063605.29016.00000178@mb-fy.aol.com>...
> In article <Xns931CD1AFBE333pookster@216.168.3.50>, W7TI <jamspam@upyours.now>
> writes:
>
> >Isn't there still a two year waiting period before a call can be
> >reassigned? There is a small but non-zero chance the call is within that
> >period.
> >
> The wait depends on who had the call previously. This is done to give family
> members preference towards reissue of a call held by an SK family member.

Something is not right here. My little blonde Tech Plus in
Indianapolis pondered getting her recently-deceased husband's callsign
but it was reissued to a complete stranger within 2-3 months after the
guy's passing. Frigging ghoul.

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

1837. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 16:56:36 UTC
From: W7TI <jamspam@upyours.now>
Message-ID: <Xns931D5AFA55085pookster@216.168.3.50>
Source record: 60970

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in news:d22b54c3.0302090815.11935e25
@posting.google.com:

> A bunch of years ago I visited Bob
> Stankus W2VCZ in north Jersey. Huge Collins station, a 130 foot tower
> with a 20m Long John and that was *it*. Wouldn't work for me.
>

Me neither. If you limit yourself to one band - even 20 meters - you are
constrained by time of day more than anything. The Curse of the Working
Class. :-)

--
Bill, W7TI

1838. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 16:58:16 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0302090858.4b8efd55@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60971

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.h9ytel4.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> On 07 Feb 2003 20:11:10 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> > I stand corrected and the phrase "federal merit badge" was my
> > intepretation of your 30 November 1998 Comment on 98-143
> > which was "essentially a prize-awarding system, where
> > personal status is conferred by the grade of license."
>
> C'mon Len, quote the whole paragraph:
>
> 8. It should not be the function of a regulatory
> Administration to set up and administer what is
> essentially a prize-awarding system, where personal status
> is conferred by the grade of license. The function of a
> regulatory license system is to determine that the
> applicant meets the uniform requirements to perform the
> basic functions of the regulatee, and the issuance of
> status symbols is best left to the private sector which is
> replete with awards for Manual Morse Code speed and for
> making various contacts under various conditions.
>
> Even when someone agrees with your stand it gets twisted around into
> an attack. Why does it have to be that way?

Because he's an incorrigible PUTZ.

1839. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 17:09:48 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <wXv1a.210618$HG.35249296@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 60972

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:6rZ0a.169945$HG.28632745@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> Imagine that...a young person
> actually having Morse code!

Oops, that was supposed to read "Imagine that...a young person actually
having <fun with> Morse code!"

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

1840. Re: Ask an honest ham? Ping JJ

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 17:25:40 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E468F14.4060509@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 60985
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:
> Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:
>
>>N8WWM Doug Adair(Anti Keyclown Control Center) wrote:
>>
>>>remember when CB'ers weren't federal criminals? remember when they
>>>werent little pink muffin weeners like you guys?
>>>
>>
>>.
>>Remember when your name made the rain report,asshole?
>>
>
> Hey JJ,if I may ask,what's your opinion of n8wwm so far?

He isn't worthy of an opinion.

>

1841. Re: OT - was Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 17:36:36 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030209123636.23598.00000196@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 60973

In article <Pine.LNX.4.52.0302090337090.286@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>, "D. Stussy"
<kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> writes:

>On Sat, 8 Feb 2003, N2EY wrote:
>>>---------
>>>In Los Angeles County, on the 147.435(os) repeater, a "jamfest" is in
>progress.
>>>You have the control operator codes. What should you do?
>>>
>>>a) Do nothing.
>>>b) Use the control codes to turn the repeat function off.
>>>c) Identify the jammers and report them to the local FCC field office.
>>>d) Key up on top of them and repeat the 7 "naughty words" until they stop.
>>>
>>>Select the BEST answer.
>>>
>>GOOD QUESTION!!!!
>>
>>I'm debating between b) and c). I'll say b), because it stops the violation
>>now. c) is good, but you also need a method of positively identifying the
>>jammers and recording their jamming. OTOH, shutting down the repeater may
>>simply cause them to go elsewhere.
>
>Unfortunately, answer D is more likely to be the occurance here - with 10+
>more
>individuals doing answer A and all laughing about it! :-(

Dang.

You should submit various versions of that question to the QPC, though.
>
>Seriously: I personally would say answer B is the best answer. Answer C is
>a
>close second, but doesn't STOP the violation in progress. That's why it
>loses.
>
That's what we do in these parts on the rare occasion when repeater behavior
gets out of hand.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1842. Re: Lennie, You're OUTTED, Now Get Over It

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 17:52:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030209125204.03273.00000426@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 60979

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.h9ytel4.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 07 Feb 2003 20:11:10 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>> I stand corrected and the phrase "federal merit badge" was my
>> intepretation of your 30 November 1998 Comment on 98-143
>> which was "essentially a prize-awarding system, where
>> personal status is conferred by the grade of license."
>
> C'mon Len, quote the whole paragraph:

If I hadn't mentioned it, Phil, your words would have lain
quietly in the FCC database with a thousand-plus other
Comments. Now you get an extra Warhol fifteen minutes!

> 8. It should not be the function of a regulatory
> Administration to set up and administer what is
> essentially a prize-awarding system, where personal status
> is conferred by the grade of license. The function of a
> regulatory license system is to determine that the
> applicant meets the uniform requirements to perform the
> basic functions of the regulatee, and the issuance of
> status symbols is best left to the private sector which is
> replete with awards for Manual Morse Code speed and for
> making various contacts under various conditions.

Nice. A bit wordy, I thought, but it's good lawyerese. :-)

> Even when someone agrees with your stand it gets twisted around into
> an attack. Why does it have to be that way?

Who said it was an "attack?" I don't object to it and quite
agree with it. I didn't "twist" anything that wasn't already
on the public record. <shrug>

A problem with too many using computer-modem communications
is that they aren't biased linear...they are usually biased Class B
(right at cut-off) and generate their own intermodulation distortion
that wasn't there to begin with...or a few are running Class C
already cut-off to anything but their own personal drive, and aren't
neutralized properly. The latter frequently go into oscillation and
overheat their plates, tripping their own breakers.

An extra class amateur I worked with some time ago used to
have fun with the conservative traditionalist ham steeped in the
emotional-content cheering of ARRL propaganda. He used to

quietly state the following definition to them:

"Ham is the butchered meat of swine."

Oy veh, such a commotion it caused! Breakers popped all the way to the power distribution center! When the paramedics removed the straightjacket from the offended, all could find absolutely nothing wrong with his definition...it is true. Those too caught up in a singular definition of "ham" are already emotionally loading their brains to absolute non-acceptance of anything they don't want. No one can argue anything with those people. Their minds are made up and their lifestyle is rigidly in place, bound tightly to their Handbooks. <shrug>

Life is interesting. One doesn't need a license to enjoy it. Once in a while it IS fun to push a button now and then and watch some fury erupt like a volcano from the conservative-traditionalists in a hobby activity. They think only They can push buttons. Tsk, tsk, tsk. :-)

1843. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 17:52:05 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030209125205.03273.00000427@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 60974

In article <o1k1a.42168$HN5.157753@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net>, "garigue"
<garigue@attbi.com> writes:

>Len ... I have always viewed your posts with some degree of entertainment
>that some view as pontification. I only have one question ..... what the
>hell have you been smoking ??????

I gave up smoking in 1986. Now I only smoke DURING
sex... :-)

[BTW, that's another button push...the manly morsemen
are bound to take that up as another sub-thread...they
can't take little asides as jokes...:-)]

Wow, those regulars are sure thin-skinned SERIOUS types!

They seem to regard all this as a textual battle-to-the-death,
take no prisoners! :-)

[...paging the Hostile Action Hero...paging the Hostile Action
Hero...]

Over and out...

1844. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 17:52:05 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030209125205.03273.00000428@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 60976

In article <3E45845A.E50FD9D@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>You have not yet made any attempt to actually become a radio amateur.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Das Oberst is guessing, only guessing... :-)

>You are on the sidelines *talking* about amateur radio.

Would you prefer morse code keying instead of talking? :-)

>Much of that talk smacks of envy.

Hardly, Herr Oberst. :-)

Now you watch all those after-dinner smacks...your waistline
in that photo is rather large...

>You can perform your gruff, all-knowing geezer routine all you like,
>Leonard H.

Ooooo! "Gruff!" Achtung, achtung, listen to das Orders
from der Commandant! :-)

>Behind your curtain stands a humbug.

Hummmmmmmmmmmmmmmmmmm. :-)

1845. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 17:52:06 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030209125206.03273.00000429@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 60977

In article <v4at0j89b8dv8b@corp.supernews.com>, "KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com>
writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030208154107.29447.00000266@mb-cd.aol.com...
>> A number of spiteful regulars in here, unable to take strong
>> opposition to their opinions, write about "having to pass a
>> ham test" as an absolute must...as if the passing of that
>> test and the grant of a license now has evidence of The
>> RIGHT Attitude...all others are of inferior status.
>
><SNIP>
>
>If your not a MD Doctor you can't expect to discuss
>medical treatments with a Doctor as an equal.

Who is the Doogie Howser, MD, equivalent in here? :-)

>If your not a rocket scientist you can't expect to
>discuss rockets with a rocket scientist as an equal.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. I worked at Rocketdyne division of
Rockwell International for a number of years,
including some work on the SSMEs (Space Shuttle
Main Engines). No problem working with REAL
rocket scientists.

>If your not a race car driver you can't expect to discuss
>race car driving with a race car driver as an equal.

Oh, yes, I agree after watching Saturday's Bud 500
Warm-up, Dale Jr. winning with Jeff Gordon in a very
close second. Running 195+ in an automobile is
exceptional driving skill. Sorry, but I don't find any
equal to that analagous skill in ham radio here.

>If your not a Supreme Court Judge you can't expect to
>discuss law with a Supreme Court Judge as an equal.

Ahem...nobody here is the analagous equivalent of any
supreme. This ain't no "court" either, "counsellor." :-)

>So why do you try to discuss AMATEUR RADIO
>with LICENSED AMATEUR RADIO OPERATORS,
>when you don't have an AMATEUR RADIO LICENSE
>and expect to be accepted as an equal?

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Plate overload! Breaker tripped! :-)

Please...neutralize that tube final properly before
key-down, okay? The transmitter you save may be
your own...

>Get a license then we'll talk as equals, until then your
>just an outsider and your not going to be heard here!

Who wants to talk like "equals?" There's no
consensus in here on "equality." It's the conservative
traditionalists with their Handbook bible against all
others. Dichotomy. Schism. Two opposing camps
with the conservative traditionalists wanting to "rub
the others' noses in their 'business.'"

>And if that makes you think I'm one of those "spiteful
>regulars" here, who cares what you think! Your
>opinions don't count here!!!!!

Of course they don't. That's why you didn't reply to
my initial posting, right? :-)

1846. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 17:52:07 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030209125207.03273.00000430@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 60975

In article <Roh1a.40663$Ec4.34160@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net>, "Jackie"
<buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> writes:

>"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
>news:cuvyxnansvbet.ha0c6d5.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
>
>> But you, Len, are not a staffer or decision-maker of the FCC, nor
>> an amateur license holder, present or past. What, then, is YOUR
>> stake in amateur radio other than "critic from the sidelines" ?
>
>This was my point exactly. While I certainly support Len's or anyone else's
>right to have an opinion, Len seems to think he knows what's best for a
>hobby/service that he does not partake of. Seems strange to me.

Many things in life are "strange." :-)

Computer-modem communications is one of the strangest.

1847. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 17:52:08 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030209125208.03273.00000431@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 60978

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.ha0c6d5.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 08 Feb 2003 01:23:07 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>> The FCC "bandies about" a number of US amateur radio
>> regulations yet no staffer or commissioner is required to
>> be granted an amateur radio license. :-)
>
> And there have been FCC executives over the years who believed
> that no FCC staffer or decision-maker SHOULD hold an amateur
> licence because of "conflict of interest". (I have been
> unjustly accused of that several times when I worked on matters
> involving amateur licensees.)

THAT wasn't my fault, Phil. :-)

> Fortunately they are/were in a minority and there are a number of
> staffers and decision-makers who deal/have dealt with amateur
> regulatory and enforcement issues who are/were amateur licensees.

There we have it. Oddly, though, ARRL requests don't seem
to be getting through to all those staffers and decision-makers
who are/were amateur licensees. How can that be?

> But you, Len, are not a staffer or decision-maker of the FCC, nor
> an amateur license holder, present or past. What, then, is YOUR
> stake in amateur radio other than "critic from the sidelines" ?

Oh, it might be a fun hobby or something like that. You know,
a recreation thing. Not as a lifestyle, counsellor, nope...not
interested in becoming a mighty macho morseman of the
hamways proclaiming their vaunted accomplishments to all who
get tired of listening.

Funny thing...all those who shout "stay the hell out of Our place"
will, at the drop of an eyelash, pontificate in no uncertain terms
about national politics, the qualifications of any president, etc.,
etc., etc., yet they've never been IN office or made political
decisions or have any "qualifications" in political science other
than a civics high school class. :-)

Must be a "different thing" in amateur radio, right? Ham radio is
a different thing than any other radio, right? The ARS community
decides who gets in and who stays and who is important, right?
Yes, I understand perfectly well...gots to have the Right Attitude!
:-)

1848. Re: n8wwm king of clowns busted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 18:02:46 UTC
From: Landshark
Message-ID: <aJw1a.61$fi7.12@newssvr19.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 60980
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net> wrote in message
news:A7ecnSCO2Pu6eNijXTWcrg@comcast.com...
>
> <Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
> news:20030208140431.643$8H@newsreader.com...
> > Yea Lee,I beleive you as much as a would dogie. Why doesn't the fat
> bastard
> > speak for himself,instead of posting gay shit all the time?
> >
> > Why are you defending such an obvious asshole? Cuz he's a fucking
> coward?
>
> Did you even try to contact him by E-mail Mopar? I suspect most on
> here wouldn't because they're afraid to reveal their real E-mail
> address, names etc.

LOL!!!! You are joking? right Leland?

>And you talk about cowards Mopar, well what's your
> real name - address - etc. Why do you have to hide it?

His name along with mine, Twist, Chris, Jay's etc etc etc
has been blasted so many times, you must have had selective
amnesia to miss all those posts.

> I've been
> posting on this news group for a long while now using my real name,
> callsign, and I haven't had anything serious happen as a result.

Well good for you, probably 90 + % of Cb'ers don't have a
call sign, most use handles. As for nothing happening to you, Steve's address along with
mine,
twist and probably a dozen others have had them posted here, nothings happened to them
either.

>So it
> appears I have a lot more guts that most of the posters on this group
> including you. Even Doug posted using his real name and callsign at
> the beginning. If you call Doug a coward for no longer using his real
> name and callsign, well he's just taken a page out of your book, i.e.
> using made up screen nics and posting through anonymous mail servers,
> like "hotmail.com" just like you do Mopar. You call him a coward then
> include yourself.

Actually I'll call him a coward for flooding this newsgroup with all sorts of porn, foul language, obscene pictures, abusive accusatory troll posts. It's the old saying of "what goes
around, comes around" He'll get what ever the FCC thinks he deserve.
As for this newsgroup, again as others have pointed out, why are you here? You don't use a cb radio, you despise the cb band, you are defending a person that was proven to post all of the
stuff mentioned above, but he's inocent when it come to the rain report.
Well you, Doug, George amongst others have been badgering this group for years with "pirates"
"federal criminals" "keyclowns" etc etc, so now that the table has turned, you
have the gall to try to defend Doug?
You asked if Mopar tried to e mail him to find out
what happened, why? I tried to e mail him to stop the
flooding of the newsgroup, what did I get in return?
Forging of my account on this group, so you ask
did we ask him, who cares?

Landshark

--
Any day riding, is better than
being a newsgroupie

73 Baja Stroppe Bronco
98 Buell S3 Thunderbolt
99 Ford F-150 Supercab 4X4 (antenna platform)

1849. Re: New Field Day Entry Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 18:04:40 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0302091004.6f15bdc5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60981

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0302061510.634b0c0d@posting.google.com>...
> Looks like some of the suggestions have been heard.
>
> FD 2003 will have a new "Class F" entry class, for stations set up at
> EOCs (Emergency Operations Centers).
>
> See:
>
> http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2003/02/06/3/?nc=1

Ducky wunnerful. One more mindless shot at overcomplicating FD.

So I dumped the whole enchilada in last nite, all 28 pages of the FD rules .pdf file. All I need to know is my entry class this year, I already know what little more I need to know and I could care less abt the pages of rules for GOAT stations, etc. Single op, single transmitter, mains powered. How simple izzat? I think I'll be a 1B but I'm still not sure. I gotta get my lawyer into it I guess.

Then comes next weekend's ARRL CW DX contest. The rules are one page of HTML.

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

1850. Re: New Field Day Entry Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 18:13:48 UTC
From: W7TI <jamspam@upyours.now>
Message-ID: <Xns931D68110D1A4pookster@216.168.3.50>
Source record: 60982

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in news:d22b54c3.0302091004.6f15bdc5
@posting.google.com:

> Ducky wunnerful. One more mindless shot at overcomplicating FD.
>
>

Yup. The ARRL sees FD as a Public Relations Event, not a contest. As a result, the rules exist to maximize PR, not to maximize fun. You can have both of course, but just remember where the priorities are.

--
Bill, W7TI

1851. Re: ID???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 18:18:55 UTC
From: perry chamberlain <kato@qnet.com>
Message-ID: <3E469B8F.60505@qnet.com>
Source record: 60983

OH MY GOD, NOT THIS THREAD AGAIN
KE6ANM for id eh.
er,,, I mean ke6anm over,
or KE6ANM , over and out, roger wilko.
the last time this thread hit the group it gathered 60 or so responses
saying things to the effect of
OH YA
SAYS YOU
OH YA
YA
WELL YOUR WRONG
OH YA
YA
ETC.
The rules simply state you must id every 10 minutes or when finishing
your last transmission
I think
over and out eh!
roger wilko and ten 4
see you later alligator

Perry Chamberlain
Kato@qnet.com
Liv'n on de Edge n de Desert
Everyone has someone in their family who is crazy,
if you don't know who it is, its you!

1852. Re: ID???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 18:26:26 UTC
From: W7TI <jamspam@upyours.now>
Message-ID: <Xns931D6A352B52Apookster@216.168.3.50>
Source record: 60984

perry chamberlain <kato@qnet.com> wrote in news:3E469B8F.60505@qnet.com:

> the last time this thread hit the group it gathered 60 or so responses
> saying things to the effect of
> OH YA
> SAYS YOU
> OH YA
<snip>
> ____

Gosh, that's useful information. Thank you so much.

--
Bill, W7TI

1853. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL support it ??)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 19:07:52 UTC
From: N9NWO@amsat.org
Message-ID: <d1b0ff4b.0302091107.76f64d74@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60986
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

John <Y4@datbehappn'.net> wrote in message news:<v43q6llfh3mlc5@corp.supernews.com>...
> Sounds like John Aschcroft is gettin' bored again. How did this
> jackmeat get so much power, he wasn't elcted to office. Come to think
> of it, neither was his boss.....What the F**K is Ashcroft doing,
> just 'cause he got beat in the last election he ran in by a dead guy
> doesn't mean he has the right to totally trash OUR Constitution and OUR
> rights. "OUR" includes you..... Thank God we only have 2 more
> years of this crap. Hopefully we'll survive it but I have my doubts.

It that type of attitude that has
caused so much problems. Yes, you
have rights. The problem is that
people like you abuse those rights.
Every right has assumed responsibilities.

In the old days we did not have to use
government, the police or the courts.
We took assholes and non conformists
out and lynched them.

Ashcroft is a member of the Assemblies
of God, as is Pat Robertson and Adm.
Vern Clark (Navy CNO). The AG church is
one of the first churches to stand for
freedom.

The reason that we are in this mess in
the first place is that people like you
elected Clinton and other liberals. It
is the democrats who are the root of all
evil in America. They have become the
party of the well educated and the powerful.
It is now the party of the yuppies, not the
working man.

1854. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 19:18:10 UTC
From: Jackie <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com>
Message-ID: <SPx1a.51589$vm2.28905@rwcrnsc54>
Source record: 60987

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030209125207.03273.00000430@mb-

> Many things in life are "strange." :-)
>
> Computer-modem communications is one of the strangest.

Just curious... how are you defining "strange" here?

Jackie KC0ODY

1855. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 19:20:55 UTC
From: Jackie <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com>
Message-ID: <rSx1a.52645$Ec4.42806@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 60988

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030209125205.03273.00000427@mb-mb.aol.com...

> Wow, those regulars are sure thin-skinned SERIOUS types!

I'm not overly serious about any of my hobbies. If I become too serious about them, they cease to be fun and therefore cease to be hobbies. I tend to think of you and Vipul as being too serious about amateur radio in the sense that you two are always finding something to pick on about it. Lighten up, guys. It's just a hobby.

Jackie
KC0ODY

1856. Re: More Ideas to eliminate CB intruders on 10m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 19:34:47 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E46AD57.2030305@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 60998
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

sideband wrote:
> Too bad that's just as illegal as the unlicensed people on 10M.
>
> -SSB

The only thing illegal about it is the fact that he is
transmitting without identifying. He cannot illegally interfere
with the 10 meter intruder as they are not licensed to be on those
frequencies, so a licensed station can transmit on top of them and
the FCC does not consider it interference.

1857. Re: More Ideas to eliminate CB intruders on 10m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 19:38:35 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E46AE3B.9090708@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 60852
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

BC-610 wrote:
> Nope! Not one bit illegal, as long as the signal is identified
> with a proper and legal call sign. Here, we'll even give you
> as sample ID, "W4??? testing a3e emission......W4???
> transmitting a3e for test purposes."
>
> Mike/14313

Correct, it is not considered interference to transmit on top of an unlicensed station. They have no authority to be there so any intereference they get is just too bad.

1858. Re: New Field Day Entry Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 19:39:58 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E46AE95.8070102@adelphia.net>
Source record: 60989

W7TI wrote:

> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in news:d22b54c3.0302091004.6f15bdc5
> @posting.google.com:
>
>
>>Ducky wunnerful. One more mindless shot at overcomplicating FD.
>>

>
> Yup. The ARRL sees FD as a Public Relations Event, not a contest. As a
> result, the rules exist to maximize PR, not to maximize fun. You can have
> both of course, but just remember where the priorities are.

Are both of you going to protest this crime by not participating in FD?

There are 5 pages of rules, the rest is submission and log forms, and
some Q and A. Is that too complicated?

The "GOAT" station is a great way to get some newbies or the unlicensed
on the air without disturbing the sometimes cranky more experienced
hams.(tho none like that in my club) I've found it a great compromise
setup.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1859. Re: More Ideas to eliminate CB intruders on 10m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 19:51:32 UTC
From: BC-610 <Mike@Listen14275and14313.net>
Message-ID: <b26bgl$p7a$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 60991
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Nope! Not one bit illegal, as long as the signal is identified
with a proper and legal call sign. Here, we'll even give you
as sample ID, "W4??? testing a3e emission......W4???
transmitting a3e for test purposes."

Mike/14313

"sideband" <KRNO8SPAMLR@cac.net> wrote in message
news:3E46AE88.90309@cac.net...
> Too bad that's just as illegal as the unlicensed people on 10M.
>
> -SSB
>
> BC-610 wrote:
> > In my neck of the woods we have an easy cure for CB
> > ten meter intruders. I have a great old BC-610 which I
> > rebuilt a few years ago. When we get a local CBer intruding
> > on ten meters, I lay a steady nonstop 750 watt AM carrier on
> > top of him wherever he goes, until he gets the idea to get the
> > hell out of the 10m band!!!!!! Works like a charm every time.
> >
> > Mike/14313
> >
> >
> >
>

1860. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 20:09:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030209150930.03943.00000367@mb-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 60996

In article <20030209095443.08956.00000513@mb-mf.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>From: lenover21@aol.com
>> A number of spiteful regulars in here, unable to take strong
>> opposition to their opinions, write about "having to pass a
>> ham test" as an absolute must...as if the passing of that
>> test and the grant of a license now has evidence of The
>> RIGHT Attitude...all others are of inferior status.
>
>The way the tests are given, one does not have to know the material to pass it.
>Also, the general class incorrectly indicates more technical competence, when
>all it really does is proved one passed a Morse code test.

Heh heh...this will be the beginning of another set of spiteful posts denouncing you. Obviously not the Right Stuff for being a strong macho morseman capable of leaping tall pileups with a single cuesoe. :-)

One has to remember the audience in here and how they Speak For ALL Amateurs. Possession of a license is a Nobel Award of Excellence In Radio that only a talented few can achieve...and morsemanship is the very Highest of the high in amateurism according to these Spokesmen of thousands. :-)

>HAM radio is a cult. Others have an AMATEUR radio licence. Those that believe
>in the traditions of Ham also believe in rigidity in activities to fit those
>traditions. The often use absurd rationalizations to justify their views.

Yes, and their rationalizations have appeared in here. :-)

Their rigidity in following lore, mythos, ancient rituals, etc. is paramount. Problem is, Paramount isn't doing a documentary on them yet. :-)

Nobody can have any fun in a hobby unless all Work and Slave at being the Absolutely Correctest Hammus Superioris as they. They define fun as being what They enjoy. All must be oriented to Their Fun or be thought perverse. :-)

>One example is when my club showed that they homebrewed. They posed for a
>photograph (several months before I joined), got listed in QST. Then after the
>cameras were gone they went onto their normal activities, as they weren't
>interested in homebrewing. I asked people if they wanted to do any homebrewing
>projects and no one wanted to do any. So, the photograph pictured something

>that was not really there and gave a false impression.

Over in rec.radio.amateur.homebrew there's a long discussion
thread about adding a speaker to a crystal set. State of the
art? [not even state of the kindergarten radio art considering
the thread originator did not want to add any amplifier... :-)]

On ARRL Letter each week, they describe many radio
amateurs who are in other work (such as astronauts) as
"ham-astronaut" as if they were radio amateurs first, then
decided to become astronauts. ARRL uses a pinpoint
spotlight to emphasize amateur radio (for ARRL's benefit)
but that gets a bit ridiculous in PR fluffiness in print. In one
way it is excellent propaganda for ARRL, creating the
impression of connecting hobbyists to the space program
and thus the illusion of "advancing the state of the art"
through membership in ARRL.

>More recently, my local club thought about getting loaner HTs for new Hams.
In
>the newsletter, they said the main purpose was to promote Ham radio and "the
>advancement of the radio art". I can see HTs promoting HAM radio, but I did
not
>see these actions or any others related to "the advancement of the radio art".
>This was so absurdly incorrect, I wanted to point this out to someone in the
>club, but I though it wouldn't be worth it. Also at least one other person
told
>me he did not see the point, but there was no discussion on the matter, as
>this is a HAM club. I'm going to "let" my membership expire.

Two conditions apply there: First, so many are too ignorant of
radio art to "see any point." Second, the way of thinking (now
apparently the most common) is about territorial imperative in
a fraternal organization...it is "their" club and "they" decide,
based on what "they" want. They "own" the club. They decide
on all points. Period. <shrug>

Some get those two points mixed up. All discussion must be
about The Ham as amateur radio may be considered the "only"
radio activity having nothing to do with millions of other radio
transmitters in the world. Their vision of amateur radio (which
must be shortened to "ham" because the "amateur" adjective
is somehow repugnant) is defined and detailed only in official
amateur radio publications and advertisements.

Those who think for themselves are unwanted. They are not
of the glorious group who want to be movers and shakers. In
short, they've become just another fraternal order.

>These phrasings are <the rationalizations> used. They are incorrect, but make
>them look good to those who do not investigate its accuracy.

IMAGE is everything. :-)

>There's that phrase again. Yes, they use rationalizations to say that
>contesting contributes to "advancement of the state of the amateur radio
>art". Also, acommplishments are all of this type: DXCC,WAZ, etc).

It's part of the certificatism...show and tell for adults.

Never mind that half a century ago HF communications was the
primary means of worldwide radio communications and done by
commercial, military, and government communications people
on a 24-hours-a-day, 7-days-a-week basis. [I was there, doing
that, but a minor player in that later game wants only to quibble
about phraseology...:-)]

Part of that is confusion of REAL state of the radio art with just
personal accomplishments. There's nothing wrong with the latter,
but HF comm has been done continuously since before WW2 so
"DXing" goes into the personal fun category. State of the Real
radio art it is NOT. Such was done before most newsgroupies
here were born.

Certification complexes are about Image...pointing to pieces of
paper to show others they are a Somebody. :-)

In about four decades of designing electronics circuits and
systems, I've never once had any electrons or fields and waves
be impressed by certificates or titles or rank or emotion. They
just shrug their little physics shoulders and go "echhh" and
won't do your bidding unless you obey their physical laws. :-)

>>Extreme conservatives rigidly enforce "fun" according to their
>> directives and definitions. "Fun" is the absolute correctness
>> of their slavish devotion to tradition, lore, mythos as dictated.
>
>Well put. That's correct.

...but saying so arouses Fury and Contempt among the
traditionalist conservatives of The Ham, doesn't it? :-)

QED. Not a "Q code" but the Latin acronym for 'quod
erat demonstrandum,' or "it is as demonstrated." The
utter Contempt demonstrated by these conservative-
traditionalists (who fancy themselves "spokespersons"
for thousands) on others not following their dictates is
almost wondrous to behold.

>You cannot simply be a radio amateur. You must follow the Ham traditions to
>be a <true> "Ham".

Quite so. :-)

Not only that, one cannot possibly say anything about the
hobby without first obtaining an amateur license! Nobody
can "understand" them or radio without that certificate even
though they are in a minority of all radio users and have
been so for over a half century. Remarkable demand.

The unfortunate part of it is that these conservative-traditionalists are trying desperately to lead when they are holding back, contemptuosly exaggerating their expertise when they are largely ignorant, demanding respect and admiration for accomplishments which are not of scientific or physical importance. They have, as you've already observed, established themselves as quasi-cult-leaders in worship of the past.

Cults transcend hobbies and recreation. Cultists give themselves over to all-embracing lifestyles. One must be of their faith or be dismissed as unbelievers. Those not of The Faith are heretics and must be burned at the stake to purify them. :-)

1861. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 20:09:31 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030209150931.03943.00000369@mb-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 60993

In article <20030208225508.08747.00000533@mb-cg.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>Lennie -- you're the Wicked Witch of the West -- and the Scarecrow
>just tossed a bucket of water on you!

In your dreams coachman...this ain't the NFL.

Larrie, you are a bus driver after being summa cum laude in personnel management and ex-USAF desk ace who shot down officers (according to your own words). You've never done any military or commercial or government radio communications on any continuous basis, have no expertise in radio except having a lot of certificates and fantasizing a lot of hypothetical emergencies. You DO have a computer-modem and some experience in that, are usually a good typist.

Beyond those narrow boundaries all you have is fantasy about radio. You've never been IN any big leagues in anything other than the military. Don't run up your little flag on the pole because nobody cares to salute it...

1862. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 20:09:31 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030209150931.03943.00000368@mb-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 60994

In article <0yk1a.42510$HN5.158783@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net>, "Jackie"
<buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> writes:

>Len, have you and Vipul met? If not, you guys should get together over a
>nice latte' at Starbucks and discuss how both of you can solve all of the
>problems of amateur radio while at the same time turning it into the hobby
>you both want it to become. Howzabout it?

Translation: "get the hell out of this newsgroup because I don't
like it..." :-)

>Meanwhile, the rest of us will be enjoying the privileges our licenses grant
>us, and we'll be having fun with it, whatever that means to each of us. If
>the two of you overthinking, killjoy brain trusts don't like it, tough bird
>droppings.

Yes, dear. :-)

>You can proselytize over our supposed deficiencies all you like,
>but the more you criticize us for pursuing our goals in this hobby, the more
>ridiculous you look for wasting your time.

"Proselytes?!?" To be against rigid cultism? Tsk, tsk.

Who was "criticizing your own pursuance of hobby goals?"

The criticism was on the newsgroupies in here for their
contemptuous denunciation of persons, not subjects, who
voice opposition to their dictates of what is "fun" or what
is "state of the radio art" or even what is "important in life!"
Oh, my, those newsgroupies are SO serious! :-)

Please do not make statements of "looking ridiculous"
when there are so many mirrors around...

1863. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 20:09:32 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030209150932.03943.00000370@mb-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 60992

In article <3E4660C5.6020604@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

> I think his interest is as a master fisherman, trolling, trolling,
>trolling. Otherwise intelligent members of the group are happy to
>oblige. I think he has just found a place where the fishin's easy and
>the fish always rise to the bait.

You are getting warm, Mike. :-)

Those newsgroupies are terribly easy to catch, but they
taste bad. Ptui. I'm rowing back to shore where normal
people live...

1864. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 20:09:32 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030209150932.03943.00000371@mb-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 60995

In article <1Gk1a.41861$vm2.23772@rwcrnsc54>, "Jackie"
<buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> writes:

>Len is a mystery. He's obviously knowledgeable about some things, so why
>does he waste so much time criticizing this hobby?

Wrong, Jackie, since I have no amateur radio license (only a
commercial one) "I cannot possibly know anything about ham
radio." You've heard the words in hear, shouted at tops of
little lungs, overdriving their tiny amplifiers.

>I place him and Vipul in
>the same category- I respect them for their knowledge of electronics (which
>I know little about presently) but disdain their efforts to slam people who
>are in this hobby.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Out of 670 thousand or so licensed radio
amateurs in the USA there are only a handfull of
newsgroupies who've staked out this territory as "theirs."
They (and ARRL) "represent" thousands of hams
nationwide and what they do is what all the others do.
QED.

>I have to wonder why they waste so much time. I mean,
>there are so many other things they could be doing than griping on an
>amateur radio policy group.

I have to wonder why those few newsgroupies are on a
newsgroup "wasting their time" in computer-modem
communications when they have those fabulous,
important certificates allowing them to use radio... :-)

>Griping about policies is one thing; griping
>about the perceived problems with the entire culture of the hobby is
>something else.

Gosh and golly, a desire to remove the amateur license
examination morse code test is "griping about the
perceived problems of the entire culture of the hobby?!?"

"Culture?" Yoghurt is culture. These conservative-
traditionalist newsgroupies know only Cultism, not Culture.

1865. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 20:27:30 UTC
From: Jackie <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com>
Message-ID: <SQy1a.51652$be.38132@rwcrnsc53>
Source record: 60997

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030209150932.03943.00000371@mb-fj.aol.com...

> Wrong, Jackie, since I have no amateur radio license (only a
> commercial one) "I cannot possibly know anything about ham
> radio." You've heard the words in hear, shouted at tops of
> little lungs, overdriving their tiny amplifiers.

I never said that you don't know anything about ham radio, Len. I just wonder why you care so much about changing policies in a hobby that you don't partake in. Is it the deal that if those policies are changed to your satisfaction, then you'll join?

> Tsk, tsk, tsk. Out of 670 thousand or so licensed radio
> amateurs in the USA there are only a handfull of
> newsgroupies who've staked out this territory as "theirs."
> They (and ARRL) "represent" thousands of hams
> nationwide and what they do is what all the others do.
> QED.

I never claimed such a thing, but thanks for placing me in a neat little category. As for me, I represent only myself, and I don't wish to tell others how to do their hobbies. I don't own this NG nor have I "staked it out" as my territory.

> I have to wonder why those few newsgroupies are on a
> newsgroup "wasting their time" in computer-modem
> communications when they have those fabulous,
> important certificates allowing them to use radio... :-)

That's what I'm doing now... listening to propagation come and go on 10 meters. I look at my AR license as something that allows me to communicate with others around the world and locally. I don't think of it as a license to tell others what to do, nor does it make me superior to someone who does not have an AR license.

> Gosh and golly, a desire to remove the amateur license
> examination morse code test is "griping about the
> perceived problems of the entire culture of the hobby?!?"

I don't recall taking issue with you on that, although I know where you stand on this. I am, out of respect for hams who do or do not agree with the code requirement for tests, neutral on the subject. Is it the code that's keeping you back from getting licensed? Or don't you really care to get a license? Your opinions would resonant much more if you showed at least some respect for those who have a license, not that we've asked you to bow down to us because our tickets somehow make us 'better than you'. Ridiculous.

> "Culture?" Yoghurt is culture. These conservative-
> traditionalist newsgroupies know only Cultism, not Culture.

Cult? Gee, if I would've thought that I was joining a cult, I would not have bothered to get an AR license. "Cults" consists of pods of people who are usually brainwashed by a central authority figure who commands power and demands obedience of those who are in the cult. I don't see any of that in amateur radio. So some people are drawn to various aspects of AR and that may seem odd to those outside the hobby. So? The ARRL doesn't tell me what to do. I joined them of my own free will. The FCC lays down some rules to keep the bands running smoothly for all that use them. This doesn't elicit the appellation of "cult" to me.

Jackie

1866. Re: More Ideas to eliminate CB intruders on 10m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 20:37:08 UTC
From: sideband <KRNO8SPAMLR@cac.net>
Message-ID: <3E46AE88.90309@cac.net>
Source record: 60990
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Too bad that's just as illegal as the unlicensed people on 10M.

-SSB

BC-610 wrote:
> In my neck of the woods we have an easy cure for CB
> ten meter intruders. I have a great old BC-610 which I
> rebuilt a few years ago. When we get a local CBer intruding
> on ten meters, I lay a steady nonstop 750 watt AM carrier on
> top of him wherever he goes, until he gets the idea to get the
> hell out of the 10m band!!!!!! Works like a charm every time.
>
> Mike/14313
>
>
>

1867. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 20:38:38 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E46BC3D.465156B6@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60999

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E45C722.284A9516@earthlink.net>...
>
> > I'd call it just another factual comment.

> You're always right, Dave. You are God-like.

You have a unique ability to understand other than what is written.
I've never claimed to always be right. I've never claimed to be a god.
I'm just a guy who has more experience in and knowledge of amateur radio
than you. Others know more than me. That is the way of the world.

> Why didn't I see it your way earlier?

Beats me.

> When viewed in those terms, I am completely unworthy.

Have it your way.

> I'm just another worthless lower class ham who dared to question your
> authority and mastery of the amateur communication art.

Your difficulties do not come from license class. You have a chip on
your shoulder. I don't know how long it has been there but I've noted
its presence since my first encounter with you.

> I see the light, now.

I'm happy for you. What you see may be a reflection off your monitor.

> Long Live Heil!!!

Thank you.

Dave K8MN

1868. Re: New Field Day Entry Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 20:42:45 UTC
From: "Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now>
Message-ID: <Xns931D8151D8BF0pookster@216.168.3.50>
Source record: 61000

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in news:3E46AE95.8070102
@adelphia.net:

> There are 5 pages of rules, the rest is submission and log forms, and
> some Q and A. Is that too complicated?
>

Five pages of rules? I think the question is self-answering.

This is a hobby, not a Federal Project.

--
Bill, W7TI

1869. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 20:45:10 UTC
From: Jackie <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com>
Message-ID: <q5z1a.51802$be.37062@rwcrnsc53>
Source record: 60851

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030209150931.03943.00000368@mb-fj.aol.com...

> Translation: "get the hell out of this newsgroup because I don't
> like it..." :-)

Now that just smacks of paranoia. I have no desire to kick you or anyone else out of the newsgroup.Not that I could anyway, but even if I could, I wouldn't. If I don't want to read what someone posts, then i'll killfile them, but that's an extreme measure as far as I am concerned, and one I reserve for the abusive and for trolls. I have no problem with anyone having their opinions and I will not attack you personally for having them- but I do think you think too much when it comes to this subject. Geez Len, lighten up a bit man.

> "Proselytes?!?" To be against rigid cultism? Tsk, tsk.

Do you think you are accomplishing your goals against rigid cultism here, Len? If not, then what remains to be done?

> Who was "criticizing your own pursuance of hobby goals?"

What if I happen to like some aspects of AR that you hate? I fail to see how that reflects upon you anyway, however.

> The criticism was on the newsgroupies in here for their
> contemptuous denunciation of persons, not subjects, who
> voice opposition to their dictates of what is "fun" or what
> is "state of the radio art" or even what is "important in life!"
> Oh, my, those newsgroupies are SO serious! :-)
>
> Please do not make statements of "looking ridiculous"
> when there are so many mirrors around...

I don't believe I look ridiculous in my posts, Len. I dare say that others might agree, but I'm not really soliciting opinions on that.

Jackie KC0ODY

1870. Re: More Ideas to eliminate CB intruders on 10m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 20:45:53 UTC
From: "Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now>
Message-ID: <Xns931D81DA4D5B7pookster@216.168.3.50>
Source record: 60853
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"BC-610" <Mike@Listen14275and14313.net> wrote in news:b25vof$qn7$0
@pita.alt.net:

> In my neck of the woods we have an easy cure for CB
> ten meter intruders. I have a great old BC-610 which I
> rebuilt a few years ago. When we get a local CBer intruding
> on ten meters, I lay a steady nonstop 750 watt AM carrier on
> top of him wherever he goes, until he gets the idea to get the
> hell out of the 10m band!!!!!! Works like a charm every time.
>

Hypothetical question: If the FCC fined both you and the CB'er, who
would get the biggest fine?

My money's on you. Supposedly you know the law, supposedly he doesn't.

--
Bill, W7TI

1871. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL support it ??)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 20:49:24 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns931DA0EABB44Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 60854
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

N9NWO@amsat.org (N9NWO) wrote in
news:d1b0ff4b.0302091107.76f64d74@posting.google.com:

> John <Y4@datbehappn'.net> wrote in message
> news:<v43q6llfh3mlc5@corp.supernews.com>...
>> Sounds like John Aschcroft is gettin' bored again. How did this
>> jackmeat get so much power, he wasn't elcted to office. Come to think
>> of it, neither was his boss.....What the F**K is Ashcroft
>> doing, just 'cause he got beat in the last election he ran in by a
>> dead guy doesn't mean he has the right to totally trash OUR
>> Constitution and OUR rights. "OUR" includes you..... Thank God
>> we only have 2 more years of this crap. Hopefully we'll survive it but
>> I have my doubts.
>
> It that type of attitude that has
> caused so much problems. Yes, you
> have rights. The problem is that
> people like you abuse those rights.
> Every right has assumed responsibilities.
>
> In the old days we did not have to use
> government, the police or the courts.
> We took assholes and non conformists
> out and lynched them.

Thank god the old days are gone.

>
> Ashcroft is a member of the Assemblies
> of God, as is Pat Robertson and Adm.
> Vern Clark (Navy CNO). The AG church is
> one of the first churches to stand for
> freedom.

Not something to boast about. (The membership part, not the freedom part)

>
> The reason that we are in this mess in
> the first place is that people like you
> elected Clinton and other liberals. It
> is the democrats who are the root of all
> evil in America. They have become the
> party of the well educated and the powerful.

> It is now the party of the yuppies, not the
> working man.
>

1872. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 21:00:51 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030209160051.16280.00001787@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 60855

In article <rSx1a.52645$Ec4.42806@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net>, "Jackie" <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> writes:

>I'm not overly serious about any of my hobbies. If I become too serious >about them, they cease to be fun and therefore cease to be hobbies. I tend >to think of you and Vipul as being too serious about amateur radio in the >sense that you two are always finding something to pick on about it. Lighten >up, guys. It's just a hobby.

What?!? "Just a hobby?!?" How can that be?

Several other newsgroupies have shouted "it's a SERVICE!"

:-)

1873. Re: n8wwm king of clowns busted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 21:17:18 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <TDmdncgmeZvCWNujXTWc3A@comcast.com>
Source record: 60856
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

<Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
news:20030209004047.928$lZ@newsreader.com...
> Heh..you should see the shit he was sending me.

I haven't. If you want to sent me a sample to read that's fine Mopar.
Just make sure its marked clearly in the subject line what it is so it
doesn't automatically get canned.

> If I ever meet him,I'm
> busting his lip. Fuck the handshake.

He's been at several Hamfests in Ohio where I've seen him. There's
another one coming up just outside of Toledo, in Maumee to be exact,
on March 16, 2003. Go take a chance and meet him then. It'll be the
first time somebody had the nerve to meet him face to face from the CB
side of the fence. Then you'll have something to brag about.

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

Saw this on a Tee-shirt:

"I am a
bomb
technician
if you see me
running
try to keep up "

1874. N4FZ on 14.313 this afternoon

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 21:37:17 UTC
From: haaaynorton@aol.comnojunk
Message-ID: <20030209163717.11231.00000544@mb-cl.aol.com>
Source record: 60857

I heard that "Festering Zit" N4FZ on .313 this afternoon, then the qrm'ers started in with the music.....john da blabtist was complaining.....That sanctimonious piece of shit didn't mind it when those jamming tapes he made for the Stumpjumpers were being used in that manner. What a two faced piece of shit!

Ed Norton

1875. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL support it ??)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 21:43:20 UTC
From: "Eric F. Richards" <efricha@dim.com>
Message-ID: <dbhd4vks3sjobd1glj89ttt04011385d9k@4ax.com>
Source record: 60858
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

N9NWO@amsat.org (N9NWO) wrote:

>
> Ashcroft is a member of the Assemblies
> of God, as is Pat Robertson and Adm.
> Vern Clark (Navy CNO). The AG church is
> one of the first churches to stand for
> freedom.
>

That may be true of the church but is not true of either Ashcroft or Robertson. We should never ever under any circumstances have any individuals in this country -- citizen or not -- locked up without the ability to communicate with family or an attorney, or not be able to communicate with an attorney privately, or to be locked up without charges.

These are Constitutional rights: The right to legal Consul. The right to a speedy trial. Innocent until proven guilty. The right to know the charges against you.

We are a nation where the phrase "prove your innocence" was something only the grossly ignorant would say.

We were once a nation where one could speak to your attorney without being listened in on.

We were a nation where anyone on our soil -- citizen or not -- was given equal protection under the law.

All those things are relics because of your "religious man" Ashcroft.

> The reason that we are in this mess in
> the first place is that people like you
> elected Clinton and other liberals. It
> is the democrats who are the root of all
> evil in America. They have become the
> party of the well educated and the powerful.
> It is now the party of the yuppies, not the
> working man.

No, I have no love for clinton, but evil is the root of all evil in america. Ideology -- left or right -- is a convenient place to hide your evil. Clinton was dangerously irresponsible. Ashcroft is

dangerous. Clinton's sexual exploits won't scar america 100 years
from now, but Ashcroft just might.

--
Eric F. Richards
efricha@dim.com
"The weird part is that I can feel productive even when I'm doomed."
- Dilbert

1876. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 21:43:42 UTC
From: Jackie <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com>
Message-ID: <iYz1a.52359$be.39252@rwcrnsc53>
Source record: 60859

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030209160051.16280.00001787@mb-

> What?!? "Just a hobby?!?" How can that be?
>
> Several other newsgroupies have shouted "it's a SERVICE!"

Some people are into it for the hobby and others for the services, yet
others are in it for both.

J.

1877. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 21:46:56 UTC
From: AC6V <none@nowhere.com>
Message-ID: <k%z1a.19937$LW1.923039@news1.west.cox.net>
Source record: 60860

Where in part 97 does it say hobby ?? (nope)
Where in Part 97 does it say service ?? (yep)
These and many other debates such as WAA6XYZ for ID can be found in part 97
of the FCC rules and Regs.
http://www.arrl.org/FandES/field/regulations/news/part97/

And if we don't believe the FCC -- who do we believe ??? You, me, them, us
??
No smart retorts accepted

--
Caveat Lector - Ya All
I Doubt, Therefore I Might Be
73 From AC6V, who is QBF most of the time !!
Rod In Oceanside, CA
Home Page http://ac6v.com
DX Book http://ac6v.com/DXSAMPLE.htm

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030209160051.16280.00001787@mb-mo.aol.com...
> In article <rSx1a.52645$Ec4.42806@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net>, "Jackie"
> <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> writes:
>
> >I'm not overly serious about any of my hobbies. If I become too serious
> >about them, they cease to be fun and therefore cease to be hobbies. I
tend
> >to think of you and Vipul as being too serious about amateur radio in the
> >sense that you two are always finding something to pick on about it.
Lighten
> >up, guys. It's just a hobby.
>
> What?!? "Just a hobby?!?" How can that be?
>
> Several other newsgroupies have shouted "it's a SERVICE!"
>
> :-)

1878. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 22:00:31 UTC
From: "Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now>
Message-ID: <Xns931D8E8122EFEpookster@216.168.3.50>
Source record: 60861

"AC6V" <none@nowhere.com> wrote in news:k%z1a.19937$LW1.923039
@news1.west.cox.net:

> Where in part 97 does it say hobby ?? (nope)
> Where in Part 97 does it say service ?? (yep)
>

Where in part 97 does it say hobby-type operation is forbidden?
Where in part 97 does it say operations must be service-oriented?

--
Bill, W7TI

1879. Re: More Ideas to eliminate CB intruders on 10m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 22:12:08 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v4dkhpt5f3bpfb@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 60862
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now> wrote in message
news:Xns931D81DA4D5B7pookster@216.168.3.50...
> "BC-610" <Mike@Listen14275and14313.net> wrote in news:b25vof$qn7$0
> @pita.alt.net:
>
> > In my neck of the woods we have an easy cure for CB
> > ten meter intruders. I have a great old BC-610 which I
> > rebuilt a few years ago. When we get a local CBer intruding
> > on ten meters, I lay a steady nonstop 750 watt AM carrier on
> > top of him wherever he goes, until he gets the idea to get the
> > hell out of the 10m band!!!!!! Works like a charm every time.
> >
> ----------
>
> Hypothetical question: If the FCC fined both you and the CB'er, who
> would get the biggest fine?
>
> My money's on you. Supposedly you know the law, supposedly he doesn't.
>
> --
> Bill, W7TI

But calling CQ using CW is not illegal, and will serve the same purpose!
--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx

1880. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 22:23:17 UTC
From: AC6V <none@nowhere.com>
Message-ID: <pxA1a.20220$LW1.933190@news1.west.cox.net>
Source record: 60864

--
Caveat Lector - Ya All
I Doubt, Therefore I Might Be
73 From AC6V, who is QBF most of the time !!
Rod In Oceanside, CA
Home Page http://ac6v.com
DX Book http://ac6v.com/DXSAMPLE.htm

"Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now> wrote in message
news:Xns931D8E8122EFEpookster@216.168.3.50...
> "AC6V" <none@nowhere.com> wrote in news:k%z1a.19937$LW1.923039
> @news1.west.cox.net:
>
> > Where in part 97 does it say hobby ?? (nope)
> > Where in Part 97 does it say service ?? (yep)
> >
>
> Where in part 97 does it say hobby-type operation is forbidden? No Place
> Where in part 97 does it say operations must be service-oriented? No Place

But you are dodging the issue -- the FCC sez we are the

Part 97 definition 2) Amateur radio services. The amateur service, the
amateur-satellite service and the radio amateur civil emergency service.

So that is good enough for me. Of course we conduct hobby type operations
but as Part 97 sez we are in their eyes as in the definition 2) above.
> --
> Bill, W7TI

1881. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 22:39:44 UTC
From: "Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now>
Message-ID: <Xns931D95270E30Dpookster@216.168.3.50>
Source record: 60865

"AC6V" <none@nowhere.com> wrote in
news:pxA1a.20220$LW1.933190@news1.west.cox.net:

> But you are dodging the issue -- the FCC sez we are the
> Part 97 definition 2) Amateur radio services. The amateur service, the
> amateur-satellite service and the radio amateur civil emergency
> service.
>
>

I know. It's been argued forever and never settled. The FCC "knows"
it is hobby/service/education/etc and doesn't much care what we do
with it, within reason. The only thing that really gets their undies in
a twist is when we interfere with commercial or emergency services.
That will get you a knock on the door in a hurry.

Otherwise, kick back and enjoy whatever rings your bell.

--
Bill, W7TI

1882. Re: More Ideas to eliminate CB intruders on 10m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 22:47:39 UTC
From: BC-610 <Mike@Listen14275and14313.net>
Message-ID: <b26lrp$i53$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 60866
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now> wrote in message
news:Xns931D81DA4D5B7pookster@216.168.3.50...
> "BC-610" <Mike@Listen14275and14313.net> wrote in news:b25vof$qn7$0
> @pita.alt.net:
>
> > In my neck of the woods we have an easy cure for CB
> > ten meter intruders. I have a great old BC-610 which I
> > rebuilt a few years ago. When we get a local CBer intruding
> > on ten meters, I lay a steady nonstop 750 watt AM carrier on
> > top of him wherever he goes, until he gets the idea to get the
> > hell out of the 10m band!!!!!! Works like a charm every time.
> >
> ----------
>
> Hypothetical question: If the FCC fined both you and the CB'er, who
> would get the biggest fine?
>
> My money's on you. Supposedly you know the law, supposedly he doesn't.
>
> --
> Bill, W7TI

Now that sounds really funny, coming from a no-code tech.

Mike/14313

1883. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 23:02:54 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v4dngvfe2o4q8a@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 60868

"AC6V" <none@nowhere.com> wrote in message
news:k%z1a.19937$LW1.923039@news1.west.cox.net...
> Where in part 97 does it say hobby ?? (nope)
> Where in Part 97 does it say service ?? (yep)

If it is a service ONLY does that make all who
are in it service men/women? Will that qualify
me for a GI loan?

The way I see it it is the Amateur Radio SERVICE.
And we who are licensed are in the hobby of
radio in that service. And we can do the community
a SERVICE by putting our hobby to work during
times of need. But we don't have to because the Part
97 does NOT say you MUST do emergency service
to be a ham.

> These and many other debates such as WAA6XYZ for ID can be found in part
97
> of the FCC rules and Regs.
> http://www.arrl.org/FandES/field/regulations/news/part97/
>
> And if we don't believe the FCC -- who do we believe ???

I always believe the highest authority that can
cause me the most trouble. And on radio it IS the FCC!

> You, me, them, us
> ??
> No smart retorts accepted

You'll never get a SMART retort in here,
just a smart A-- retort! ;^)

>
>
> --
> Caveat Lector - Ya All
> I Doubt, Therefore I Might Be
> 73 From AC6V, who is QBF most of the time !!

What is QBF? I've not heard of that one before.

> Rod In Oceanside, CA
> Home Page http://ac6v.com
> DX Book http://ac6v.com/DXSAMPLE.htm
>

<SNIP>

--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx

1884. Re: More Ideas to eliminate CB intruders on 10m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 23:05:21 UTC
From: David Robbins <k1ttt@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <WRCdnb5QEuUqQ9ujXTWcpw@crocker.com>
Source record: 60869
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

please cite the section of part 97 that stops us from interfering with
intruders.

"sideband" <KRNO8SPAMLR@cac.net> wrote in message
news:3E46D417.9080803@cac.net...
> An amateur radio operator may not interfere with any signal,
> regardless of whether it's a legal transmission or not. You might want
> to look through part 97 again...
>
> -SSB
>
> BC-610 wrote:
> > Nope! Not one bit illegal, as long as the signal is identified
> > with a proper and legal call sign. Here, we'll even give you
> > as sample ID, "W4??? testing a3e emission......W4???
> > transmitting a3e for test purposes."
> >
> > Mike/14313
> >
> > "sideband" <KRNO8SPAMLR@cac.net> wrote in message
> > news:3E46AE88.90309@cac.net...
> >
> >>Too bad that's just as illegal as the unlicensed people on 10M.
> >>
> >>-SSB
> >>
> >>BC-610 wrote:
> >>
> >>> In my neck of the woods we have an easy cure for CB
> >>> ten meter intruders. I have a great old BC-610 which I
> >>>rebuilt a few years ago. When we get a local CBer intruding
> >>>on ten meters, I lay a steady nonstop 750 watt AM carrier on
> >>>top of him wherever he goes, until he gets the idea to get the
> >>>hell out of the 10m band!!!!!! Works like a charm every time.
> >>>
> >>>Mike/14313
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>
> >
> >
>

1885. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 23:09:15 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0302091509.5343063f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 60870

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0302091119.1ef3bbb0@posting.google.com>...
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E45C722.284A9516@earthlink.net>...
>
> > I'd call it just another factual comment.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> You're always right, Dave. You are God-like.
>
> Why didn't I see it your way earlier?
>
> When viewed in those terms, I am completely unworthy.
>
> I'm just another worthless lower class ham who dared to question your
> authority and mastery of the amateur communication art.
>
> I see the light, now.
>
> Long Live Heil!!!

It's Heil Heil Brainiac . . .

1886. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 23:16:02 UTC
From: AC6V <none@nowhere.com>
Message-ID: <SiB1a.20620$LW1.945289@news1.west.cox.net>
Source record: 60871

QBF (inside joke) can be found at URL:
http://www.wemsi.org/qsigs.html
Covers not only Ham but aeronautical, maritime, weather et al -- hundreds of
em from days of yore to the present.
QSL ?

--
Caveat Lector - Ya All
I Doubt, Therefore I Might Be
73 From AC6V, who is QBF most of the time !!
Rod In Oceanside, CA
Home Page http://ac6v.com
DX Book http://ac6v.com/DXSAMPLE.htm

"KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com> wrote in message
news:v4dngvfe2o4q8a@corp.supernews.com...
>
> "AC6V" <none@nowhere.com> wrote in message
> news:k%z1a.19937$LW1.923039@news1.west.cox.net...
> > Where in part 97 does it say hobby ?? (nope)
> > Where in Part 97 does it say service ?? (yep)
>
> If it is a service ONLY does that make all who
> are in it service men/women? Will that qualify
> me for a GI loan?
>
> The way I see it it is the Amateur Radio SERVICE.
> And we who are licensed are in the hobby of
> radio in that service. And we can do the community
> a SERVICE by putting our hobby to work during
> times of need. But we don't have to because the Part
> 97 does NOT say you MUST do emergency service
> to be a ham.
>
>
>
>
> > These and many other debates such as WAA6XYZ for ID can be found in part
> 97
> > of the FCC rules and Regs.
> > http://www.arrl.org/FandES/field/regulations/news/part97/
> >
> > And if we don't believe the FCC -- who do we believe ???
>
> I always believe the highest authority that can

> cause me the most trouble. And on radio it IS the FCC!
>
> > You, me, them, us
> > ??
> > No smart retorts accepted
>
>
> You'll never get a SMART retort in here,
> just a smart A-- retort! ;^)
>
> >
> >
> > --
> > Caveat Lector - Ya All
> > I Doubt, Therefore I Might Be
> > 73 From AC6V, who is QBF most of the time !!
>
> What is QBF? I've not heard of that one before.
>
>
> > Rod In Oceanside, CA
> > Home Page http://ac6v.com
> > DX Book http://ac6v.com/DXSAMPLE.htm
> >
> <SNIP>
>
>
> --
> '73' From KB9TMP
> "The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
> if you can fake that, you've got it made."
> -Groucho Marx
>
>
>

1887. Re: More Ideas to eliminate CB intruders on 10m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 23:17:24 UTC
From: sideband <KRNO8SPAMLR@cac.net>
Message-ID: <3E46D417.9080803@cac.net>
Source record: 60863
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

An amateur radio operator may not interfere with any signal,
regardless of whether it's a legal transmission or not. You might want
to look through part 97 again...

-SSB

BC-610 wrote:
> Nope! Not one bit illegal, as long as the signal is identified
> with a proper and legal call sign. Here, we'll even give you
> as sample ID, "W4??? testing a3e emission......W4???
> transmitting a3e for test purposes."
>
> Mike/14313
>
> "sideband" <KRNO8SPAMLR@cac.net> wrote in message
> news:3E46AE88.90309@cac.net...
>
>>Too bad that's just as illegal as the unlicensed people on 10M.
>>
>>-SSB
>>
>>BC-610 wrote:
>>
>>> In my neck of the woods we have an easy cure for CB
>>> ten meter intruders. I have a great old BC-610 which I
>>>rebuilt a few years ago. When we get a local CBer intruding
>>>on ten meters, I lay a steady nonstop 750 watt AM carrier on
>>>top of him wherever he goes, until he gets the idea to get the
>>>hell out of the 10m band!!!!!! Works like a charm every time.
>>>
>>>Mike/14313
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>
>
>

1888. Re: More Ideas to eliminate CB intruders on 10m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 23:23:54 UTC
From: LostBoy <Repeat@Anon.com>
Message-ID: <b26nujmfp0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 60872
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"BC-610" <Mike@Listen14275and14313.net> wrote in message
news:b26lrp$i53$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> "Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now> wrote in message
> news:Xns931D81DA4D5B7pookster@216.168.3.50...
> > "BC-610" <Mike@Listen14275and14313.net> wrote in news:b25vof$qn7$0
> > @pita.alt.net:
> >
> > > In my neck of the woods we have an easy cure for CB
> > > ten meter intruders. I have a great old BC-610 which I
> > > rebuilt a few years ago. When we get a local CBer intruding
> > > on ten meters, I lay a steady nonstop 750 watt AM carrier on
> > > top of him wherever he goes, until he gets the idea to get the
> > > hell out of the 10m band!!!!!! Works like a charm every time.
> > >
> > > ----------
> >
> > Hypothetical question: If the FCC fined both you and the CB'er, who
> > would get the biggest fine?
> >
> > My money's on you. Supposedly you know the law, supposedly he doesn't.
> >
> > --
> > Bill, W7TI
>
> Now that sounds really funny, coming from a no-code tech.
>
> Mike/14313

Get rid of them the easy and legal way. Just send gasbag Preacher John down
to talk to them. That would be enough to drive anybody off the bands!!

1889. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 23:47:43 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v4dq51pb14aj30@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 60873

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030209125206.03273.00000429@mb-mb.aol.com...
> In article <v4at0j89b8dv8b@corp.supernews.com>, "KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com>
> writes:
>
> >"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20030208154107.29447.00000266@mb-cd.aol.com...
> >> A number of spiteful regulars in here, unable to take strong
> >> opposition to their opinions, write about "having to pass a
> >> ham test" as an absolute must...as if the passing of that
> >> test and the grant of a license now has evidence of The
> >> RIGHT Attitude...all others are of inferior status.
> >
> ><SNIP>
> >
> >If your not a MD Doctor you can't expect to discuss
> >medical treatments with a Doctor as an equal.
>
> Who is the Doogie Howser, MD, equivalent in here? :-)

Irrelevant comment! & Personal attack!

>
> >If your not a rocket scientist you can't expect to
> >discuss rockets with a rocket scientist as an equal.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. I worked at Rocketdyne division of
> Rockwell International for a number of years,
> including some work on the SSMEs (Space Shuttle
> Main Engines). No problem working with REAL
> rocket scientists.

Good for you! Since I'm not a rocket scientest I am
not going to discuss it with you, it's not in my area
of knowlage.

>
> >If your not a race car driver you can't expect to discuss
> >race car driving with a race car driver as an equal.
>
> Oh, yes, I agree after watching Saturday's Bud 500
> Warm-up, Dale Jr. winning with Jeff Gordon in a very
> close second. Running 195+ in an automobile is
> exceptional driving skill. Sorry, but I don't find any
> equal to that analagous skill in ham radio here.

You expect to talk about radios when you can't understand
how the above applies to you.

>
> >If your not a Supreme Court Judge you can't expect to
> >discuss law with a Supreme Court Judge as an equal.
>
> Ahem...nobody here is the analagous equivalent of any
> supreme. This ain't no "court" either, "counsellor." :-)

Irrelevant comment! It's another example of being one
before being taken seriously.

>
> >So why do you try to discuss AMATEUR RADIO
> >with LICENSED AMATEUR RADIO OPERATORS,
> >when you don't have an AMATEUR RADIO LICENSE
> >and expect to be accepted as an equal?
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. Plate overload! Breaker tripped! :-)
>
> Please...neutralize that tube final properly before
> key-down, okay? The transmitter you save may be
> your own...

Irrelevant comment!

>
> >Get a license then we'll talk as equals, until then your
> >just an outsider and your not going to be heard here!
>
> Who wants to talk like "equals?" There's no
> consensus in here on "equality." It's the conservative
> traditionalists with their Handbook bible against all
> others. Dichotomy. Schism. Two opposing camps
> with the conservative traditionalists wanting to "rub
> the others' noses in their 'business.'"

And for the most part they are all Ham Radio Operators,
except for you and a couple of others.

>
> >And if that makes you think I'm one of those "spiteful
> >regulars" here, who cares what you think! Your
> >opinions don't count here!!!!!
>
> Of course they don't. That's why you didn't reply to
> my initial posting, right? :-)

Sorry I normally don't read your initial posts just the
later ones but I'm afraid I'll not be doing that any more.
You don't answer the points made, you just sling crap,
and try to put down the other person by attacking them.
I have had a nice qso with Larry K3LT and found him

to be a very nice person even though he doesn't sound
like that here sometimes. You on the other hand will
NEVER have a nice qso with anyone here on the radio
because you'll never "lower" yourself to become a
licensed ham operator. And even if you do become
a ham you never be nice, so PLEASE don't become
a ham and lower "OUR" standards by your presence.

I can only please one person per day.
Today is not your day.
Tomorrow is not looking good either.
-- Dilbert

KB9TMP

1890. Re: More Ideas to eliminate CB intruders on 10m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-09 23:56:48 UTC
From: sideband <KRNO8SPAMLR@cac.net>
Message-ID: <3E46DD53.4060503@cac.net>
Source record: 60867
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Hrm..

a 1x2 call... and he's a no-code tech? Methinks BC-610 is full of crap.

Last time I checked, only Extra class operators could have 1x2 and 2x1
calls.

But then again, what do I know? I'm just a HAM and a CBer and a Truck
Driver and a computer geek....

-SSB

BC-610 wrote:
> "Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now> wrote in message
> news:Xns931D81DA4D5B7pookster@216.168.3.50...
>
>>"BC-610" <Mike@Listen14275and14313.net> wrote in news:b25vof$qn7$0
>>@pita.alt.net:
>>
>>
>>> In my neck of the woods we have an easy cure for CB
>>> ten meter intruders. I have a great old BC-610 which I
>>>rebuilt a few years ago. When we get a local CBer intruding
>>>on ten meters, I lay a steady nonstop 750 watt AM carrier on
>>>top of him wherever he goes, until he gets the idea to get the
>>>hell out of the 10m band!!!!!! Works like a charm every time.
>>>
>>
>>____
>>
>>Hypothetical question: If the FCC fined both you and the CB'er, who
>>would get the biggest fine?
>>
>>My money's on you. Supposedly you know the law, supposedly he doesn't.
>>
>>--
>>Bill, W7TI
>
>
> Now that sounds really funny, coming from a no-code tech.
>
> Mike/14313
>
>
>

1891. Re: More Ideas to eliminate CB intruders on 10m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 00:18:25 UTC
From: Scott <scott@scotti.sh!t>
Message-ID: <htOcnROQIZtVctujXTWcpg@comcast.com>
Source record: 60874
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

sideband wrote:
>
> Hrm..
>
> a 1x2 call... and he's a no-code tech? Methinks BC-610 is full of crap.
>
> Last time I checked, only Extra class operators could have 1x2 and 2x1
> calls.
>
> But then again, what do I know? I'm just a HAM and a CBer and a Truck
> Driver and a computer geek....

Vanity call. But what do I know? I'm just a CBer and computer tech.

1892. Re: More Ideas to eliminate CB intruders on 10m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 00:29:23 UTC
From: "Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now>
Message-ID: <Xns931DA7BED22EDpookster@216.168.3.50>
Source record: 60875
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

sideband <KRNO8SPAMLR@cac.net> wrote in news:3E46DD53.4060503@cac.net:

> a 1x2 call... and he's a no-code tech? Methinks BC-610 is full of crap.
>

Of course he is. A real ham would go to www.qrz.com and look it up, click on "detailed info" and see what class the call was. A CB'er would be clueless.

--
Bill, W7TI

1893. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL support it ??)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 01:22:10 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <dpud4v4eho8vq85viqhv258eqs4tu3qf5u@4ax.com>
Source record: 60878
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

On 9 Feb 2003 11:07:52 -0800, N9NWO@amsat.org (N9NWO) wrote:
>It that type of attitude that has
>caused so much problems. Yes, you
>have rights. The problem is that
>people like you abuse those rights.
>Every right has assumed responsibilities.

True, but you do not have the right to impose your interpretation on
the rest of us.

>In the old days we did not have to use
>government, the police or the courts.
>We took assholes and non conformists
>out and lynched them.

Those days are gone, so don't tell us what would have been done during
them.

>Ashcroft is a member of the Assemblies
>of God, as is Pat Robertson and Adm.
>Vern Clark (Navy CNO). The AG church is
>one of the first churches to stand for
>freedom.

Assemblies of God? Whose God? It certainly isn't my God, if there is
one.

>The reason that we are in this mess in
>the first place is that people like you
>elected Clinton and other liberals. It
>is the democrats who are the root of all
>evil in America. They have become the
>party of the well educated and the powerful.
>It is now the party of the yuppies, not the
>working man.

That's a laugh! In the 80s,the Republicans were the yuppy party.

1894. Re: More Ideas to eliminate CB intruders on 10m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 01:36:29 UTC
From: Kilroy <kilroy@washere.com>
Message-ID: <sTOdnf1vc8GDn9qjXTWcpA@comcast.com>
Source record: 60879
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

<Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
news:20030209105436.291$Xg@newsreader.com...

> It's an age old argument here. We get harassed by the hams who are getting
> popped,or shed.
>

What hams are harrasing you here? an which one's are getting popped??

> Leland lives in an apartment,and uses a gutter mount for his base antenna.
> He's JOE walkie talkie.

Who cares where he lives I know of apartments that cost more than your home
and land combined 3x over.

>
> A sad sack.

Your a nut sack.

>
> --
> Go# 40 42 12
> ---------- http://NewsReader.Com/ ----------
> 50GB/Month

1895. Davies arrested again!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 01:36:36 UTC
From: llgpt@aol.commcenter
Message-ID: <20030209203636.11474.00000463@mb-cl.aol.com>
Source record: 60880

Police arrested Lloyd A. Davies, a 27 year old white male, resident of Athens, Alabama in the Anderson Pumpkin patch at 11:38pm Friday. Davies will be charged with lewd and lascivious behavior, public indecency, and public intoxication at the Athens Municipal Courthouse Monday. The suspect allegedly stated that as he was passing a pumpkin patch, he decided to stop. "You know, a pumpkin is soft and squishy inside, and there was no one around here for miles. At least I thought there wasn't." he stated in a phone interview from the Athens Municipal Courthouse Jail.
Davies went on to state that he pulled over to the side of the road, picked out a pumpkin that he felt was appropriate to his purposes, cut a hole in it, and proceeded to satisfy his alleged "need". "I guess I was just really into it, you know?" he commented with evident embarrassment. In the process, Davies apparently failed to notice the Athens Municipal police car approaching and was unaware of his audience until officer Brenda Taylor approached him. "It was an unusual situation, sure." said officer Taylor. "I walked up to (Davies) and he's... just working away at this pumpkin."
Taylor went on to describe what happened when she approached Davies. "I just went up and said, 'Excuse me sir, but do you realize that you are screwing a pumpkin?' He got real surprised as you'd expect, and then looked me straight in the face and said,
'A pumpkin? Damn, I thought it was my neighbor's cow".

Mr. Davies will be arraigned in Superior Court Monday February 10, 2003. No bail has been posted as of this time, as Mr. Davies has said to the jailer, "me and Big Bubba is good friends".

1896. Re: More Ideas to eliminate CB intruders on 10m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 01:37:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030209203727.27873.00000537@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 60881

In article <3E46DD53.4060503@cac.net>, sideband <KRNO8SPAMLR@cac.net> writes:

>Last time I checked, only Extra class operators could have 1x2 and 2x1
>calls.
>
True abut the 2x1 calls, but it is still theoretically possible for a 1x2 to
not have an Extra. However, a non-Extra 1x2 would probably be in his 90s today.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1897. Re: More Ideas to eliminate CB intruders on 10m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 01:39:05 UTC
From: Kilroy <kilroy@washere.com>
Message-ID: <LA-dnTFtELQnn9qjXTWc2Q@comcast.com>
Source record: 60882
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

<Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
news:20030209113308.119$gi@newsreader.com...
> "BC-610" <Mike@Listen14275and14313.net> wrote:
> > In my neck of the woods we have an easy cure for CB
> > ten meter intruders. I have a great old BC-610 which I
> > rebuilt a few years ago. When we get a local CBer intruding
> > on ten meters, I lay a steady nonstop 750 watt AM carrier on
> > top of him wherever he goes, until he gets the idea to get the
> > hell out of the 10m band!!!!!! Works like a charm every time.
> >
> > Mike/14313
> >
> Have you figured out how to quote the text you're responding to yet?

He doesn't have to dick breath, ask tnom if you don't know how to use the
news groups he will help you out He says you don't need to quote who your
replying to if the person on the reading end has any skills.

1898. Re: More Ideas to eliminate CB intruders on 10m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 01:51:44 UTC
From: Randy <rchapman8@houston.rr.REMOVEcom>
Message-ID: <QAD1a.40262$yb.2741682@twister.austin.rr.com>
Source record: 60883
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Kilroy" <kilroy@washere.com> wrote in message
news:LA-dnTFtELQnn9qjXTWc2Q@comcast.com...
>
> <Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
> news:20030209113308.119$gi@newsreader.com...
> > "BC-610" <Mike@Listen14275and14313.net> wrote:
> > > In my neck of the woods we have an easy cure for CB
> > > ten meter intruders. I have a great old BC-610 which I
> > > rebuilt a few years ago. When we get a local CBer intruding
> > > on ten meters, I lay a steady nonstop 750 watt AM carrier on
> > > top of him wherever he goes, until he gets the idea to get the
> > > hell out of the 10m band!!!!!! Works like a charm every time.
> > >
> > > Mike/14313
> > >
> > Have you figured out how to quote the text you're responding to yet?
>
>
> He doesn't have to dick breath, ask tnom if you don't know how to use the
> news groups he will help you out He says you don't need to quote who your
> replying to if the person on the reading end has any skills.
>
>

Welcome back, George.

1899. Re: n8wwm king of clowns busted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 01:57:37 UTC
From: Kilroy <kilroy@washere.com>
Message-ID: <_mKdndOBKNGJmtqjXTWcow@comcast.com>
Source record: 60884
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Landshark" <S3Buell@SBCGlobal.Net.> wrote in message
news:aJw1a.61$fi7.12@newssvr19.news.prodigy.com...

> His name along with mine, Twist, Chris, Jay's etc etc etc
> has been blasted so many times, you must have had selective
> amnesia to miss all those posts.

Your such a liar FagBoy the only reason your name has been posted on here was not from you telling anyone what your name is, Chris(ssb) has put his name out here on his own account, Twsited will not reveal his real name and it has never been posted to this Ng, if it has then prove me wrong. Mopars name was not put out on this ng by him. So don't act like you guys are giving out your names you remained anonymous until someone catches up with your lies,

1900. Re: n8wwm king of clowns busted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 01:59:04 UTC
From: Kilroy <kilroy@washere.com>
Message-ID: <AG6dnfpZ6ev0mtqjXTWc2Q@comcast.com>
Source record: 60885
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"chessecutter" <cheesecutter@webhideout.com> wrote in message
news:fef386d5.0302081535.569e4fd8@posting.google.com...
> "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net> wrote in message
news:<zDqdnd8hQOoqztijXTWcqw@comcast.com>...
> > <Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
> > news:20030208131111.061$Pn@newsreader.com...
> > > Life is good when you're not a fat blowhard like doug adair,n8wwm.
> >
> > The whole episode is a non-issue when you dig in to the facts Mopar.
> > I've contacted several people directly involved and sorted out the
> > facts for myself. Twisted hasn't been completely truthful in his posts
> > it seems. Yes there where recordings of N8, however the recordings
> > where of him chewing out several other Hams on the repeater for
> > routinely causing interference, and his "strongly worded opinions"
> > about the lack of action by the control operator(s) to correct the
> > problem. Apparently one of the Hams involved in the interference made
> > those tape recording in an attempt to cover his behind, and tried to
> > get N8 to back off on his complaints, by sending them in to the FCC.
> > If N8 is really guilty of anything its trying to clean up an existing
> > problem on the Ham band in his local. This is something any really
> > concerned Ham would do, a bit of self policing action where we try to
> > clean up our own mess first before the FCC has to step in and do it
> > for us. As far as I can tell there isn't going to be any action taken
> > against N8 by the FCC.
> >
> >
> > --
> > Leland C. Scott
> > KC8LDO
> >
> > ARRL Member
> > NCI Member
>
>
>
> oh and we are supposed to believe you?????

Chessehead are we to beleive twisty? he has been caugt in many lies

1901. Re: More Ideas to eliminate CB intruders on 10m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 02:13:13 UTC
From: sideband <KRNO8SPAMLR@cac.net>
Message-ID: <3E46FD4A.9070606@cac.net>
Source record: 60876
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Ok.. here it is...

ï¿½97.101 General standards.
(d) No amateur operator shall willfully or maliciously interfere
with or cause interference to any radio communication or signal.

Excerpted from:
http://www.arrl.org/FandES/field/regulations/news/part97/b.html
---

This regulation does not state anything about the legality of the
existing signal being interfered with... it says ANY COMMUNICATION OR
SIGNAL..

Hope that clears that up...

-SSB

P.S. That search took around three minutes.. You could have looked it
up yourself, Dave.

-SSB

David Robbins wrote:
> please cite the section of part 97 that stops us from interfering with
> intruders.
>
> "sideband" <KRNO8SPAMLR@cac.net> wrote in message
> news:3E46D417.9080803@cac.net...
>
>>An amateur radio operator may not interfere with any signal,
>>regardless of whether it's a legal transmission or not. You might want
>>to look through part 97 again...
>>
>>-SSB
>>
>>BC-610 wrote:
>>
>>> Nope! Not one bit illegal, as long as the signal is identified
>>>with a proper and legal call sign. Here, we'll even give you
>>>as sample ID, "W4??? testing a3e emission......W4???
>>>transmitting a3e for test purposes."
>>>
>>>Mike/14313
>>>

>>>"sideband" <KRNO8SPAMLR@cac.net> wrote in message
>>>news:3E46AE88.90309@cac.net...
>>>
>>>
>>>>Too bad that's just as illegal as the unlicensed people on 10M.
>>>>
>>>>-SSB
>>>>
>>>>BC-610 wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> In my neck of the woods we have an easy cure for CB
>>>>>ten meter intruders. I have a great old BC-610 which I
>>>>>rebuilt a few years ago. When we get a local CBer intruding
>>>>>on ten meters, I lay a steady nonstop 750 watt AM carrier on
>>>>>top of him wherever he goes, until he gets the idea to get the
>>>>>hell out of the 10m band!!!!!! Works like a charm every time.
>>>>>
>>>>>Mike/14313
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>
>

1902. Re: More Ideas to eliminate CB intruders on 10m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 02:17:15 UTC
From: sideband <KRNO8SPAMLR@cac.net>
Message-ID: <3E46FE3D.5040608@cac.net>
Source record: 60877
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

vanity call? Not likely.. If he were a Tech, the only options open to
him are 1x3's and 2x3's... no 1x2's or 2x1... apparently, Scott, you
don't know a whole heck of alot.

Besides, looking the callsign up on QRZ reveals he's an amateur Extra,
so even then BC is still full of BS. UC?

-SSB

Scott wrote:
>
> sideband wrote:
>
>>Hrm..
>>
>>a 1x2 call... and he's a no-code tech? Methinks BC-610 is full of crap.
>>
>>Last time I checked, only Extra class operators could have 1x2 and 2x1
>>calls.
>>
>>But then again, what do I know? I'm just a HAM and a CBer and a Truck
>>Driver and a computer geek....
>
>
>
> Vanity call. But what do I know? I'm just a CBer and computer tech.

1903. Re: n8wwm king of clowns busted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 02:26:32 UTC
From: Landshark
Message-ID: <s5E1a.242$SF4.135@newssvr19.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 60887
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"sideband" <KRNO8SPAMLR@cac.net> wrote in message news:3E4707EA.3060504@cac.net...
> Um, guys.. I don't use "Chris".. I use the last half... "Topher"... My
> friends call me Toph or Topher... George and Doug and Chuckie can call
> me Chris or SSB.
>
> Not that it matters much...
>
> -SSB
>
> Kilroy wrote:
> > "Landshark" <S3Buell@SBCGlobal.Net.> wrote in message
> > news:aJw1a.61$fi7.12@newssvr19.news.prodigy.com...
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >>His name along with mine, Twist, Chris, Jay's etc etc etc
> > >>has been blasted so many times, you must have had selective
> > >>amnesia to miss all those posts.
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > > Your such a liar FagBoy the only reason your name has been posted on here
> > > was not from you telling anyone what your name is, Chris(ssb) has put his
> > > name out here on his own account, Twsited will not reveal his real name and
> > > it has never been posted to this Ng, if it has then prove me wrong. Mopars
> > > name was not put out on this ng by him. So don't act like you guys are
> > > giving out your names you remained anonymous until someone catches up with
> > > your lies,

LMAO!!! George WA3MOJ, some 550+
anonymous screen names, would you like
some cheese with that whine <G>
As if your comments have any merit
anymore, with all the garbage you post
plus your defense of one of the worst
trolls other than you.

As for you Sideband, duly noted and
will be respected.

Landshark

1904. Re: More Ideas to eliminate CB intruders on 10m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 02:33:21 UTC
From: Landshark
Message-ID: <RbE1a.247$KS4.221@newssvr19.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 60888
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

<Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
news:20030209204201.501$QH@newsreader.com...
> "Kilroy" <kilroy@washere.com> wrote:
> > <Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
> > news:20030209105436.291$Xg@newsreader.com...
> >
> > > It's an age old argument here. We get harassed by the hams who are
> > > getting popped,or shed.
> > >
> >
> > What hams are harrasing you here? an which one's are getting popped??
> >
> > > Leland lives in an apartment,and uses a gutter mount for his base
> > > antenna. He's JOE walkie talkie.
> >
> > Who cares where he lives I know of apartments that cost more than your
> > home and land combined 3x over.
> >
> > >
> > > A sad sack.
> >
> > Your a nut sack.
> >
> I own apartments in lakewood,boss.

Careful Mopar, he checking the county
tax records again.....................

Landshark

--
Any day riding, is better than
being a newsgroupie

73 Baja Stroppe Bronco
98 Buell S3 Thunderbolt
99 Ford F-150 Supercab 4X4 (antenna platform)

1905. Re: More Ideas to eliminate CB intruders on 10m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 02:48:50 UTC
From: Landshark
Message-ID: <lqE1a.265$mw4.23@newssvr19.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 60889
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

<Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
news:20030209214042.776$vl@newsreader.com...
> "Landshark" <S3Buell@SBCGlobal.Net.> wrote:
> > <Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
> > news:20030209204201.501$QH@newsreader.com...
> > > "Kilroy" <kilroy@washere.com> wrote:
> > > > <Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:20030209105436.291$Xg@newsreader.com...
> > > >
> > > > > It's an age old argument here. We get harassed by the hams who are
> > > > > getting popped,or shed.
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > > What hams are harrasing you here? an which one's are getting popped??
> > > >
> > > > > Leland lives in an apartment,and uses a gutter mount for his base
> > > > > antenna. He's JOE walkie talkie.
> > > >
> > > > Who cares where he lives I know of apartments that cost more than
> > > > your home and land combined 3x over.
> > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > A sad sack.
> > > >
> > > > Your a nut sack.
> > > >
> > > I own apartments in lakewood,boss.
> > >
> > Careful Mopar, he checking the county
> > tax records again.....................
> >
> > Landshark
> >
> Thanks Shark,dooon't tell him the name of my management > company,please. <g>

Not a problem guy, only with your
permission. Hey, I'll be at Fabulous Fords
at Knotsberry Farm in April. Come on
out, we'll have a grand old time.

Landshark

--
Any day riding, is better than

being a newsgroupie

73 Baja Stroppe Bronco
98 Buell S3 Thunderbolt
99 Ford F-150 Supercab 4X4 (antenna platform)

1906. Re: n8wwm king of clowns busted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 02:58:33 UTC
From: sideband <KRNO8SPAMLR@cac.net>
Message-ID: <3E4707EA.3060504@cac.net>
Source record: 60886
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Um, guys.. I don't use "Chris".. I use the last half... "Topher"... My
friends call me Toph or Topher... George and Doug and Chuckie can call
me Chris or SSB.

Not that it matters much...

-SSB

Kilroy wrote:
> "Landshark" <S3Buell@SBCGlobal.Net.> wrote in message
> news:aJw1a.61$fi7.12@newssvr19.news.prodigy.com...
>
>
>
>>His name along with mine, Twist, Chris, Jay's etc etc etc
>>has been blasted so many times, you must have had selective
>>amnesia to miss all those posts.
>
>
>
> Your such a liar FagBoy the only reason your name has been posted on here
> was not from you telling anyone what your name is, Chris(ssb) has put his
> name out here on his own account, Twsited will not reveal his real name and
> it has never been posted to this Ng, if it has then prove me wrong. Mopars
> name was not put out on this ng by him. So don't act like you guys are
> giving out your names you remained anonymous until someone catches up with
> your lies,
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

1907. Re: More Ideas to eliminate CB intruders on 10m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 03:17:35 UTC
From: Landshark
Message-ID: <jRE1a.3261$7O2.837@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 60890
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

<Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
news:20030209215436.180$Vs@newsreader.com...
> "Landshark" <S3Buell@SBCGlobal.Net.> wrote:
> > <Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
> > news:20030209214042.776$vl@newsreader.com...
> > > "Landshark" <S3Buell@SBCGlobal.Net.> wrote:
> > > > <Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:20030209204201.501$QH@newsreader.com...
> > > > > "Kilroy" <kilroy@washere.com> wrote:
> > > > > > <Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
> > > > > > news:20030209105436.291$Xg@newsreader.com...
> > > > > >
> > > > > > > It's an age old argument here. We get harassed by the hams who
> > > > > > > are getting popped,or shed.
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > > What hams are harrasing you here? an which one's are getting
> > > > > > popped??
> > > > > >
> > > > > > > Leland lives in an apartment,and uses a gutter mount for his
> > > > > > > base antenna. He's JOE walkie talkie.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Who cares where he lives I know of apartments that cost more than
> > > > > > your home and land combined 3x over.
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > > A sad sack.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Your a nut sack.
> > > > > >
> > > > > I own apartments in lakewood,boss.
> > > > >
> > > Careful Mopar, he checking the county
> > > tax records again.....................
> > > >
> > > Landshark
> > > >
> > Thanks Shark,dooon't tell him the name of my management > company,
> > please. <g>
> >
> Not a problem guy, only with your
> permission. Hey, I'll be at Fabulous Fords
> at Knotsberry Farm in April. Come on

> > out, we'll have a grand old time.
> >
> > Landshark
> >
> I'll be there! Email me when you're about to leave.

That's in So Cal if you didn't know. I'll be there,
whether the Bronco will be done, not sure. The boss
figures it will take only three to four weeks to put
it back together after the body shop then paint job.

Landshark

--
Any day riding, is better than
being a newsgroupie

73 Baja Stroppe Bronco
98 Buell S3 Thunderbolt
99 Ford F-150 Supercab 4X4 (antenna platform)

1908. Re: More Ideas to eliminate CB intruders on 10m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 04:00:58 UTC
From: Landshark
Message-ID: <_tF1a.1980$ds7.660909095@newssvr13.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 60891
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

<Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
news:20030209222628.421$yl@newsreader.com...
> Oh..there's one in the Buckeye too. I won't be there either. <g>
>
> Basecoat/clearcoat?

I'm going with stock colors, Poppy Red,
Wimbledon White, Satin Black hood, Metallic
Blue top.
Got the front fenders off, gutted the interior
so everything can get painted.

Landshark

--
Any day riding, is better than
being a newsgroupie

73 Baja Stroppe Bronco
98 Buell S3 Thunderbolt
99 Ford F-150 Supercab 4X4 (antenna platform)

1909. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 04:29:18 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030209232918.25651.00000269@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 60892

>Subject: Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/9/03 2:09 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030209150932.03943.00000370@mb-fj.aol.com>

>Those newsgroupies are terribly easy to catch, but they
> taste bad. Ptui.

Gee, Lennie...I figered you for a swallower, not a spitter.

1910. Re: n8wwm king of clowns busted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 04:30:20 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <fwmdnfaYpv1At9qjXTWcoA@comcast.com>
Source record: 60893
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

<Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
news:20030209163648.968$rr@newsreader.com...
> "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net> wrote:
> > <Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
> > news:20030209004047.928$lZ@newsreader.com...
> > > Heh..you should see the shit he was sending me.
> >
> > I haven't. If you want to sent me a sample to read that's fine
Mopar.
> > Just make sure its marked clearly in the subject line what it is
so it
> > doesn't automatically get canned.
> >
> > > If I ever meet him,I'm
> > > busting his lip. Fuck the handshake.
> >
> > He's been at several Hamfests in Ohio where I've seen him. There's
> > another one coming up just outside of Toledo, in Maumee to be
exact,
> > on March 16, 2003. Go take a chance and meet him then. It'll be
the
> > first time somebody had the nerve to meet him face to face from
the CB
> > side of the fence. Then you'll have something to brag about.
> >
> How can I brag about him? C'mon, you've seen him.

Yeah, but I haven't seen you.

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

Saw this on a Tee-shirt:

"I am a
bomb
technician
if you see me
running
try to keep up "

1911. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 04:54:07 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030209235407.25651.00000270@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 60894

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 2/9/03 8:54 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030209095443.08956.00000513@mb-mf.aol.com>

>The way the tests are given, one does not have to know the material to pass
>it

For once, something we can agree on, if for different reasons.

>Also, the general class incorrectly indicates more technical competence, when
>all it really does is proved one passed a Morse code test.

Then you go and blow it. The General class license is three parts. Your
assertion that "all it really does is proved one passed a Morse code test" is
FALSE.

One must first pass the Technician AND General Class writtens, and then
must pass the Morse Code test.

Ergo the code only accounts for 33 1/3 percent of the context of the test.

>HAM radio is a cult.

You are an idiot. Fair trade.

>Others have an AMATEUR radio licence. Those that believe
>in the traditions of Ham also believe in rigidity in activities to fit those
>traditions. The often use absurd rationalizations to justify their views.

I "believe" in the traditions of "Ham" radio, and am anything but "rigid"
about how one must be active in Ham Radio.

>One example is when my club showed that they homebrewed. They posed for a
>photograph (several months before I joined), got listed in QST. Then after
>the
>cameras were gone they went onto their normal activities, as they weren't
>interested in homebrewing. I asked people if they wanted to do any
>homebrewing
>projects and no one wanted to do any. So, the photograph pictured something
>that was not really there and gave a false impression.

No, Vipul, what it demostrated was that you ARE wrong about your assertion
of "rigidity". They spent some time doing one thing, then moved on to another.
That YOU only wanted to talk about nothing BUT homebrewing is evidence of YOUR
"rigidity".

How's it feel to be poster boy for your own rants, Vipul?

>More recently, my local club thought about getting loaner HTs for new Hams.
>In
>the newsletter, they said the main purpose was to promote Ham radio and "the
>advancement of the radio art". I can see HTs promoting HAM radio, but I did
>not
>see these actions or any others related to "the advancement of the radio
>art".

"Advancement of the radio art" is MORE than homebrewing or doing what Vipul wants to do. It's about public service activities...It's about Emergency Communications...It's about that "fostering good will" thing in 47CFR97.1.

>This was so absurdly incorrect, I wanted to point this out to someone in the
>club, but I though it wouldn't be worth it.

You have a real problem with NOT talking to the people you have to be face-to-face with, but somehow think that people in this NG give a rat's-kazoo about your local politics, Vipul.

I think you need to see an orthopedist about that weak spine of yours, Vipul.

>Also at least one other person told
>me he did not see the point, but there was no discussion on the matter, as
>this
>is a HAM club. I'm going to "let" my membership expire.

What club is it, Vipul? I want to join just so we can vote you out first.

>These phrasings are <the rationalizations> used. They are incorrect, but make
>them look good to those who do not investigate its accuracy.

You MEAN they don't check with you first to see if it meets your approval?

>>Extreme conservatives rigidly enforce "fun" according to their
>> directives and definitions. "Fun" is the absolute correctness
>> of their slavish devotion to tradition, lore, mythos as dictated.
>
>Well put. That's correct.

Vipul, here's a hot flash: The creep you are lauding is a known, documented pathological liar. He cannot tell the truth to save his or anyone else's life.

Lennie, like you, hate's Amateur Radio. He hates it because "Joe Average Citizen" can do things with radios that he wants others to believe takes a college degree to do.

>You cannot simply be a radio amateur. You must follow the Ham traditions to
>be
>a <true> "Ham".

If you believe this, Vipul, it's only you and Lennie who DO believe it.

I don't do Wouff Hong ceremonies, nor do I have a dozen DXCC pins hanging from a ballcap or Shriner's vest...But I AM a "true Ham".

Too bad you can't be one too.

Steve, K4YZ

1912. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 05:03:12 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030210000312.25651.00000271@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 60895

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/9/03 11:52 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030209125205.03273.00000428@mb-mb.aol.com>
>
>In article <3E45845A.E50FD9D@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>writes:

>>You have not yet made any attempt to actually become a radio amateur.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. Das Oberst is guessing, only guessing.

I'd say he's guessing pretty accurately...otherwise you are again lying
about your skill and prowess in the world of the tron...since if you had "made
any attempt", you'd be licensed. Since you are not and you insinuate you did
"attempt" it, you obviously failed.

Just as I surmised.

Putz.

Steve

1913. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 05:06:35 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030210000635.25651.00000272@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 60896

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/9/03 11:52 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030209125206.03273.00000429@mb-mb.aol.com>

>>So why do you try to discuss AMATEUR RADIO
>>with LICENSED AMATEUR RADIO OPERATORS,
>>when you don't have an AMATEUR RADIO LICENSE
>>and expect to be accepted as an equal?
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. Plate overload! Breaker tripped! :-)
>
> Please...neutralize that tube final properly before
> key-down, okay? The transmitter you save may be
> your own...

Obfuscation and evasion of the posed question noted.

Again.....

>Who wants to talk like "equals?"

I think that pretty well sums up our assumptions about you, Lennie.

Putz.

Steve

1914. Re: More Ideas to eliminate CB intruders on 10m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 05:10:51 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E47345B.1080903@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 61006
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

sideband wrote:
> An amateur radio operator may not interfere with any signal, regardless
> of whether it's a legal transmission or not. You might want to look
> through part 97 again...
>
> -SSB

Suggest you call the FCC and ask them. They will tell you a
licensed station transmitting on top of an unlicensed station is
not considered interference.

1915. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 05:11:10 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030210001110.25651.00000273@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 60897

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: "KB9TMP" kb9tmp@juno.com
>Date: 2/9/03 5:47 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <v4dq51pb14aj30@corp.supernews.com>
>
>
>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030209125206.03273.00000429@mb-mb.aol.com...

>> Tsk, tsk, tsk. I worked at Rocketdyne division of
>> Rockwell International for a number of years,
>> including some work on the SSMEs (Space Shuttle
>> Main Engines). No problem working with REAL
>> rocket scientists.
>
>
>Good for you! Since I'm not a rocket scientest I am
>not going to discuss it with you, it's not in my area
>of knowlage.

Don't get excited about Lennie's "tour of duty" at Rocketdyne. I bet Lennie's "experience" working on the main shuttle engine was nothing more than pulling the tarp over it as the REAL engineers went home and Lennie tended to his janitorial duties.

Steve, K4YZ

1916. Re: More Ideas to eliminate CB intruders on 10m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 05:13:07 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E4734E3.4070906@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 61007
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Bill, W7TI wrote:

>
> Hypothetical question: If the FCC fined both you and the CB'er, who
> would get the biggest fine?
>
> My money's on you. Supposedly you know the law, supposedly he doesn't.

And any judge will tell you ignorance of the law is no excuse.

>

1917. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 05:16:11 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030210001611.29188.00000287@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 60898

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/9/03 2:09 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030209150931.03943.00000369@mb-fj.aol.com>

>Don't run up your little
> flag on the pole because nobody cares to salute it...

Who says?

YOU..?!?!

HA!

Steve, K4YZ

1918. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 05:24:24 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E4737C5.7A4BD889@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60899

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <1Gk1a.41861$vm2.23772@rwcrnsc54>, "Jackie"
> <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> writes:
>
> >Len is a mystery. He's obviously knowledgeable about some things, so why
> >does he waste so much time criticizing this hobby?
>
> Wrong, Jackie, since I have no amateur radio license (only a
> commercial one) "I cannot possibly know anything about ham
> radio." You've heard the words in hear, shouted at tops of
> little lungs, overdriving their tiny amplifiers.

You actually hear words "in hear"? Really? Shouted words? You need a
rest, Leonard. You don't know any more about amateur radio than someone
does about driving a BMW having known a few BMW owners or from reading
the owner's manual.

> >I place him and Vipul in
> >the same category- I respect them for their knowledge of electronics (which
> >I know little about presently) but disdain their efforts to slam people who
> >are in this hobby.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. Out of 670 thousand or so licensed radio
> amateurs in the USA there are only a handfull of
> newsgroupies who've staked out this territory as "theirs."
> They (and ARRL) "represent" thousands of hams
> nationwide and what they do is what all the others do.
> QED.

Here's a QST for your QED: There are nearly 300,000,000 people in the
U.S.
What percentage of that number have posted over a number of years in an
amateur radio newsgroup? Of that tiny percentage, what percentage feel
that they are called to be uninvited advocates for change in amateur
radio licensing?
Tsk, tsk tsk.

> >I have to wonder why they waste so much time. I mean,
> >there are so many other things they could be doing than griping on an
> >amateur radio policy group.
>
> I have to wonder why those few newsgroupies are on a
> newsgroup "wasting their time" in computer-modem
> communications when they have those fabulous,

> important certificates allowing them to use radio... :-)

I'll make you a deal, Len. You do what you can. I'll do what I want.

> >Griping about policies is one thing; griping
> >about the perceived problems with the entire culture of the hobby is
> >something else.
>
> Gosh and golly, a desire to remove the amateur license
> examination morse code test is "griping about the
> perceived problems of the entire culture of the hobby?!?"

That issue is all but gone from everyone's radar. The remaining 5 wpm test is absurdly easy and even it will be gone in short order. You've already forgotten your issue of the licensing of children. Are we leaving out any other gripes you've aired in recent weeks? Be honest. Google knows.

Dave K8MN

1919. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 05:29:19 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E473909.FEAC8086@earthlink.net>
Source record: 60900

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
> >Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >Date: 2/9/03 11:52 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20030209125205.03273.00000428@mb-mb.aol.com>
> >
> >In article <3E45845A.E50FD9D@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >writes:
>
> >>You have not yet made any attempt to actually become a radio amateur.
> >
> > Tsk, tsk, tsk. Das Oberst is guessing, only guessing.
>
> I'd say he's guessing pretty accurately...otherwise you are again lying
> about your skill and prowess in the world of the tron...since if you had "made
> any attempt", you'd be licensed. Since you are not and you insinuate you did
> "attempt" it, you obviously failed.

He can't keep his own stories straight at this point. Len has told us
in the past that he has never taken an amateur radio exam. If he wasn't
telling the truth--well, it wouldn't be the first time.

Dave K8MN

1920. Re: More Ideas to eliminate CB intruders on 10m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 05:40:46 UTC
From: Sam Adams <Samadams@wash.com>
Message-ID: <8Pydnci0febCptqjXTWcrg@comcast.com>
Source record: 61001
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Landshark" <S3Buell@SBCGlobal.Net.> wrote in message
news:RbE1a.247$KS4.221@newssvr19.news.prodigy.com...
>
> Careful Mopar, he checking the county
> tax records again.....................
>
> Landshark

LOL, real funny landcarp that is your game, I guess you forgot you are the one who checked the county land records from my county and posted then to the net was that in an effort to intimidate me that you know where I live, I guess if you ever decide to show up Ill knows its you. you'll be wearing a dress.

1921. Re: More Ideas to eliminate CB intruders on 10m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 05:44:02 UTC
From: Austin Powers Baby <yeahbaby@minime.com>
Message-ID: <seWdnXQ-ucG-odqjXTWc2Q@comcast.com>
Source record: 61002
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Randy" <rchapman8@houston.rr.REMOVEcom> wrote in message news:QAD1a.40262

> Welcome back, George.

Same to you Randy, I see you could not wait for me to get back to post
since you haven't posted since I had last. I am glad I am your mentor.

1922. Re: n8wwm king of clowns busted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 05:49:48 UTC
From: Austin Powers Baby <yeahbaby@minime.com>
Message-ID: <00SdnRYtiJvgoNqjXTWcqw@comcast.com>
Source record: 61003
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

<Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
news:20030209235128.209$W6@newsreader.com...
> "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net> wrote:
> > <Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
> > news:20030209163648.968$rr@newsreader.com...
> > > "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net> wrote:
> > > > <Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:20030209004047.928$lZ@newsreader.com...
> > > > > Heh..you should see the shit he was sending me.
> > > >
> > > > I haven't. If you want to sent me a sample to read that's fine
> > Mopar.
> > > > > Just make sure its marked clearly in the subject line what it is
> > so it
> > > > > doesn't automatically get canned.
> > > >
> > > > > If I ever meet him,I'm
> > > > > busting his lip. Fuck the handshake.
> > > >
> > > > He's been at several Hamfests in Ohio where I've seen him. There's
> > > > another one coming up just outside of Toledo, in Maumee to be
> > exact,
> > > > on March 16, 2003. Go take a chance and meet him then. It'll be
> > the
> > > > first time somebody had the nerve to meet him face to face from
> > the CB
> > > > side of the fence. Then you'll have something to brag about.
> > > >
> > > How can I brag about him? C'mon, you've seen him.
> >
> > Yeah, but I haven't seen you.
> >
> I'm gonna beat him in the head with you!

Tough guy syndrome

1923. Re: More Ideas to eliminate CB intruders on 10m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 05:50:01 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns931E86F2796Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 61004
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com> wrote in
news:v4dkhpt5f3bpfb@corp.supernews.com:

>
> "Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now> wrote in message
> news:Xns931D81DA4D5B7pookster@216.168.3.50...
>> "BC-610" <Mike@Listen14275and14313.net> wrote in news:b25vof$qn7$0
>> @pita.alt.net:
>>
>> > In my neck of the woods we have an easy cure for CB
>> > ten meter intruders. I have a great old BC-610 which I
>> > rebuilt a few years ago. When we get a local CBer intruding
>> > on ten meters, I lay a steady nonstop 750 watt AM carrier on
>> > top of him wherever he goes, until he gets the idea to get the
>> > hell out of the 10m band!!!!!! Works like a charm every time.
>> >
>> --
>>
>> Hypothetical question: If the FCC fined both you and the CB'er, who
>> would get the biggest fine?
>>
>> My money's on you. Supposedly you know the law, supposedly he doesn't.
>>
>> --
>> Bill, W7TI
>
>
> But calling CQ using CW is not illegal, and will serve the same purpose!
> --
> '73' From KB9TMP
> "The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
> if you can fake that, you've got it made."
> -Groucho Marx
>
>
>

Like the morons who deliberately call CQ in CW on top of DX stations that
are in the phone subband in their own countries, but in the US CW subband.
But that is illegal, though.

1924. Re: n8wwm king of clowns busted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 06:01:06 UTC
From: Austin Powers Baby <yeahbaby@minime.com>
Message-ID: <_y6dnXTqis6_3dqjXTWcrg@comcast.com>
Source record: 61005
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Landshark" <S3Buell@SBCGlobal.Net.> wrote in message
news:s5E1a.242$SF4.135@newssvr19.news.prodigy.com...

>
> LMAO!!! George WA3MOJ, some 550+
> anonymous screen names, would you like
> some cheese with that whine <G>
> As if your comments have any merit
> anymore, with all the garbage you post
> plus your defense of one of the worst
> trolls other than you.
>
> As for you Sideband, duly noted and
> will be respected.
>
> Landshark

I bet your laughing your ass off, your laughing at the stupid post you just made beleive me I am laughing at you too, the hypocrite that you are, listen to what your queer ass is saying how are my screen names anonymous? It is no more anonymous than the name you use, and If I was so anonymous how do you have a total of 550? names. You know the ones you see they say comcast on them and have my ip on them. but if i am so anonymous how do you keep track? Obsession comes to mind a fairy from san fran has fell in love with me and I can't get rid of him. he counts my screen names that is so sweet of you ... Glad I got your name mr. mark beck otherwise i would feel a little uneasy not knowing who the obsessed cross dressing stalker that was watching me and keeping track of my every post.

1925. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 06:45:59 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030210014559.04155.00000221@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 61008

From K4YZ:
>>The way the tests are given, one does not have to know the material to pass
>>it
>
> For once, something we can agree on, if for different reasons.

> One must first pass the Technician AND General Class writtens, and then
>must pass the Morse Code test.

One does not have to understand the written test for the Technician class or the General Class. One must know Morse at 5wpm. Therefore, all the General Class proves is one passed the Morse code test, not higher technical competency.

>>One example is when my club showed that they homebrewed. They posed for a
>>photograph (several months before I joined), got listed in QST. Then after
>>the
>>cameras were gone they went onto their normal activities, as they weren't
>>interested in homebrewing.
>
> No, Vipul, what it demostrated was that you ARE wrong about your
>assertion
>of "rigidity". They spent some time doing one thing, then moved on to
>another.

That's incorrect. If I ask anyone in the photograph still in the club if they want to do a homebrewing project or even if they were the slightest bit interested in a homebrewing project under any situations, every one of them would say they are not interested. The photograph is an inaccurate portrayal of club's activities.

So, they did not "move on".

> "Advancement of the radio art" is MORE than homebrewing or doing what
>Vipul wants to do. It's about public service activities...It's about
>Emergency
>Communications...It's about that "fostering good will" thing in 47CFR97.1.

The phrase "advancement of the radio art" means technical achievement. It does not mean public service, emergency communications, or fostering good will. Fostering good will is a means, but is not in itself "advancement of the radio art".

> You have a real problem with NOT talking to the people you have to be
>face-to-face with

The decision was already made, so what's the point. I told people I am not interested in Morse code. I also said I am not a "Ham" to someone that knows I have an amateur radio license.

>>These phrasings are <the rationalizations> used. They are incorrect, but
>make
>>them look good to those who do not investigate its accuracy.
>
> You MEAN they don't check with you first to see if it meets your
>approval?

No, I mean absurdly false statements or arguments used to support one's viewpoints. One example is that loaner HTs is evidence of "advancement of the radio art". Another example is posing for a homebrew photo and hating homebrewing. Not liking it is fine. But, to not like homebrewing, and then pose for a homebrewing photo, (possibly for publicity reasons), is wrong. Stating such goal of the club so an outsider will be impressed, while disagreing with it in reality. These are examples of rationalizations.

>>You cannot simply be a radio amateur. You must follow the Ham traditions to
>>be
>>a <true> "Ham".
>
> If you believe this, Vipul, it's only you and Lennie who DO believe it.

I've seen this everywhere. Its only Hams that cannot see themselves as others see them. I even knew one lab person was a Ham a while before he even mentioned it just by the way he was stating his interests. At the four closest clubs, from listening to Hams in several states on long trip, and at Hamfests in MA, NH and CT - all show evidence of the common cult of Ham. No one pointed this out to me. I observed this on my own. How would I come to this conclusion, if it did not exist?

1926. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL support it ??)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 06:52:51 UTC
From: Tom Sevart <n2uhcNOSPAM@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <b27i6c$192qn7$1@ID-52518.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 61009
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

"N9NWO" <N9NWO@amsat.org> wrote in message
news:d1b0ff4b.0302091107.76f64d74@posting.google.com...

> Ashcroft is a member of the Assemblies
> of God, as is Pat Robertson and Adm.
> Vern Clark (Navy CNO). The AG church is
> one of the first churches to stand for
> freedom.

That is, unless you're a Catholic, Muslim, Jewish, or atheist.

Tom

1927. Re: More Ideas to eliminate CB intruders on 10m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 07:24:34 UTC
From: Austin Powers Baby <yeahbaby@minime.com>
Message-ID: <r5qdnSSRTvMuztqjXTWcqA@comcast.com>
Source record: 61010
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

<Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
news:20030210010601.922$2e@newsreader.com...
> "Austin Powers Baby" <yeahbaby@minime.com> wrote:
> > "Randy" <rchapman8@houston.rr.REMOVEcom> wrote in message
> > news:QAD1a.40262
> >
> > > Welcome back, George.
> >
> > Same to you Randy, I see you could not wait for me to get back to post
> > since you haven't posted since I had last. I am glad I am your mentor.
> >
> You're a one legged boy,in an ass kicking contest.

Sucks to be you then.

1928. Re: More Ideas to eliminate CB intruders on 10m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 07:47:53 UTC
From: "Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now>
Message-ID: <Xns931DF21687CF6pookster@216.168.3.50>
Source record: 61012
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in news:3E4734E3.4070906@mailcity.moc:

> And any judge will tell you ignorance of the law is no excuse.
>

They may tell you that, but in cases of obscure laws judges are often
lenient in sentencing. Not saying you can get away with something, just
that the consequences are often less.

--
Bill, W7TI

1929. Re: More Ideas to eliminate CB intruders on 10m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 07:52:46 UTC
From: Scott <scott@scotti.sh!t>
Message-ID: <B_-dnfDv0NPYx9qjXTWcog@comcast.com>
Source record: 61013
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

sideband wrote:
>
> vanity call? Not likely.. If he were a Tech, the only options open to
> him are 1x3's and 2x3's... no 1x2's or 2x1... apparently, Scott, you
> don't know a whole heck of alot.
>
> Besides, looking the callsign up on QRZ reveals he's an amateur Extra,
> so even then BC is still full of BS. UC?

I said I'm not a ham. Don't take out your frustrations from others
out on me. You're getting hit on all sides and jabbing at everyone.
A few more sticks and I might jump on you. Chill!

1930. Re: More Ideas to eliminate CB intruders on 10m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 08:43:19 UTC
From: sideband <KRNO8SPAMLR@cac.net>
Message-ID: <3E4758B6.3090505@cac.net>
Source record: 61011
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Ok, JJ, I'll repeat it again...

Ok.. here it is...

ï¿½97.101 General standards.
(d) No amateur operator shall willfully or maliciously interfere
with or cause interference to any radio communication or signal.

Excerpted from:
http://www.arrl.org/FandES/field/regulations/news/part97/b.html
---

This regulation does not state anything about the legality of the
existing signal being interfered with... it says ANY COMMUNICATION OR
SIGNAL..

Hope that clears that up...

-SSB

JJ wrote:
>
>
> sideband wrote:
>
>> An amateur radio operator may not interfere with any signal,
>> regardless of whether it's a legal transmission or not. You might want
>> to look through part 97 again...
>>
>> -SSB
>
>
>
> Suggest you call the FCC and ask them. They will tell you a licensed
> station transmitting on top of an unlicensed station is not considered
> interference.
>

1931. Re: More Ideas to eliminate CB intruders on 10m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 11:01:44 UTC
From: Randy <rchapman8@houston.rr.REMOVEcom>
Message-ID: <sEL1a.10694$yn1.903404@twister.austin.rr.com>
Source record: 61014
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Austin Powers Baby" <yeahbaby@minime.com> wrote in message
news:seWdnXQ-ucG-odqjXTWc2Q@comcast.com...
>
> "Randy" <rchapman8@houston.rr.REMOVEcom> wrote in message news:QAD1a.40262
>
>
> > Welcome back, George.
>
> Same to you Randy, I see you could not wait for me to get back to post
> since you haven't posted since I had last. I am glad I am your mentor.
>
>

Actually George, I've been rather busy chasing drivers for this wretched VIA KT 400 mainboard I bought. Whatever you do, don't ever buy a Gigabyte! Damn 9700 Pro vidcard didn't wanna work right with it. Finally got a chipset driver that works yesterday. But hey, if ya feel like my mentor, more power to ya! <g>

1932. Re: Getting old call sign back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 11:36:33 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030210063633.27873.00000540@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 61015

In article <d22b54c3.0302090855.3f41ee6d@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20030209063605.29016.00000178@mb-fy.aol.com>...
>> In article <Xns931CD1AFBE333pookster@216.168.3.50>, W7TI
><jamspam@upyours.now>
>> writes:
>>
>> >Isn't there still a two year waiting period before a call can be
>> >reassigned? There is a small but non-zero chance the call is within that
>> >period.
>> >
>> The wait depends on who had the call previously. This is done to give
>family
>> members preference towards reissue of a call held by an SK family member.
>
>Something is not right here. My little blonde Tech Plus in
>Indianapolis pondered getting her recently-deceased husband's callsign
>but it was reissued to a complete stranger within 2-3 months after the
>guy's passing. Frigging ghoul.
>
--

ï¿½97.19 Application for a vanity call sign.

(c) Unassigned call signs are available to the vanity call sign system with the following exceptions:

(1) A call sign shown on an expired license grant is not available to the vanity call sign system for 2 years following the expiration of the license.

(2) A call sign shown on a surrendered, revoked, set aside, canceled, or voided license grant is not available to the vanity call sign system for 2 years following the date such action is taken.

(3) Except for an applicant who is the spouse, child, grandchild, stepchild, parent, grandparent, stepparent, brother, sister, stepbrother, stepsister, aunt, uncle, niece, nephew, or in-law, and except for an applicant who is a club station license trustee acting with the written consent of at least one relative, as listed above, of a person now deceased, the call sign shown on the license of person now deceased is not available to the vanity call sign system for 2 years following the person's death, or for 2 years following the expiration of the license grant, whichever is sooner.

--
The two-year wait derives from the license grace period - if a ham lets the license lapse, the call is not lost until the grace period is up.

(3) pretty much says it all, about reassigning an S-K's call. Two year wait unless you're a close relative and can provide documentation.

Perhaps just a clerical mistake at FCC. How long since he passed away?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1933. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 12:34:10 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030210073410.27873.00000541@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 61016

In article <NSX0a.29222$vm2.13214@rwcrnsc54>, "Jackie"
<buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030207160215.10456.00000263@mb-ma.aol.com...
>> There's been a lot of biased remarks categorized as myself "trying
>> to destroy amateur radio for young people" which need to be
>> cleared up for the record. Over four years ago I wrote the
>> following in a Comment on NPRM 98-143 (page 12 of 14) which
>> is in the public record:
>
>It's kinda interesting, the way you bandy around such lofty opinions
>regarding the entrance requirements for a service that you don't partake in.
>
Jackie,

Even more interesting is the way Mr. Anderson behaves when faced with "strong opposition" to his opinions, and expsure of logical and factual mistakes in his posts. Quite illuminating, really, considering his opinions on the maturity of children..

73 de Jim, N2EY

1934. Re: More Ideas to eliminate CB intruders on 10m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 12:42:15 UTC
From: Lloyd <DrLloyd@HerbWillReturn14313.net>
Message-ID: <b286m4$p86$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 61017
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now> wrote in message
> JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in

> > And any judge will tell you ignorance of the law is no excuse.
> >
> They may tell you that, but in cases of obscure laws judges are often
> lenient in sentencing. Not saying you can get away with something, just
> that the consequences are often less.
> --
> Bill, W7TI

Care to share with the group what law school you graduated
from?

Lloyd

1935. Re: n8wwm king of clowns busted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 12:49:23 UTC
From: Dave Hall <nojunk_n3cvj@worldlynx.net>
Message-ID: <3E479FD3.4766@worldlynx.net>
Source record: 61019
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Leland C. Scott wrote:
>
> <Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
> news:20030208131111.061$Pn@newsreader.com...
> > Life is good when you're not a fat blowhard like doug adair,n8wwm.
>
> The whole episode is a non-issue when you dig in to the facts Mopar.
> I've contacted several people directly involved and sorted out the
> facts for myself. Twisted hasn't been completely truthful in his posts
> it seems. Yes there where recordings of N8, however the recordings
> where of him chewing out several other Hams on the repeater for
> routinely causing interference, and his "strongly worded opinions"
> about the lack of action by the control operator(s) to correct the
> problem. Apparently one of the Hams involved in the interference made
> those tape recording in an attempt to cover his behind, and tried to
> get N8 to back off on his complaints, by sending them in to the FCC.
> If N8 is really guilty of anything its trying to clean up an existing
> problem on the Ham band in his local. This is something any really
> concerned Ham would do, a bit of self policing action where we try to
> clean up our own mess first before the FCC has to step in and do it
> for us. As far as I can tell there isn't going to be any action taken
> against N8 by the FCC.

Now if we could only hear those tapes.......

Dave
"Sandbagger"

1936. Re: More Ideas to eliminate CB intruders on 10m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 12:49:44 UTC
From: Lloyd <DrLloyd@HerbWillReturn14313.net>
Message-ID: <b28746qda0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 61018
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now> wrote in message
news:Xns931D81DA4D5B7pookster@216.168.3.50...

> Hypothetical question: If the FCC fined both you and the CB'er, who
> would get the biggest fine?
>
> My money's on you. Supposedly you know the law, supposedly he doesn't.
>
> --
> Bill, W7TI

The FCC does not fine or cite anyone who operates on
Echo Link.

Hypothetical question: Do you think there is a chance some time this
year that you will upgrade to Tech Plus?

Lloyd

1937. Re: n8wwm king of clowns busted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 13:05:56 UTC
From: Dave Hall <nojunk_n3cvj@worldlynx.net>
Message-ID: <3E47A3B4.4661@worldlynx.net>
Source record: 61020
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Landshark wrote:
>
> "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net> wrote in message
> news:A7ecnSCO2Pu6eNijXTWcrg@comcast.com...
> >
> > <Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
> > news:20030208140431.643$8H@newsreader.com...
> > > Yea Lee,I beleive you as much as a would dogie. Why doesn't the fat
> > bastard
> > > speak for himself,instead of posting gay shit all the time?
> > >
> > > Why are you defending such an obvious asshole? Cuz he's a fucking
> > coward?
> >
> > Did you even try to contact him by E-mail Mopar? I suspect most on
> > here wouldn't because they're afraid to reveal their real E-mail
> > address, names etc.
>
> LOL!!!! You are joking? right Leland?
>
> >And you talk about cowards Mopar, well what's your
> > real name - address - etc. Why do you have to hide it?
>
> His name along with mine, Twist, Chris, Jay's etc etc etc
> has been blasted so many times, you must have had selective
> amnesia to miss all those posts.

Funny, I missed most of them, and the ones that I did see, showed
someone blasting a name, but no one confirming it (And in most cases
denying it). I could say that your name is Fred Smith, and if you
neither confrim or deny it, does that make it true? Even if you do deny,
how do I know you're not lying?

It's a fact that many of our more vocal "outlaws" hide behind their
anonymity. I suspect that they're not to proud of what they portray,
outside of this group.

>
> > I've been
> > posting on this news group for a long while now using my real name,
> > callsign, and I haven't had anything serious happen as a result.
>
> Well good for you, probably 90 + % of Cb'ers don't have a
> call sign, most use handles.

But we all have given names. Call signs are optional.

> As for nothing happening to you, Steve's address along with mine,
> twist and probably a dozen others have had them posted here, nothings happened > to them either.

I don't recall anyone posting Twisty's real name. I'm sure he wouldn't admit to it. Although Doug must know him, to be able to send him that jockstrap trophy that gets mentioned from time to time.

>
> >So it
> > appears I have a lot more guts that most of the posters on this group
> > including you. Even Doug posted using his real name and callsign at
> > the beginning. If you call Doug a coward for no longer using his real
> > name and callsign, well he's just taken a page out of your book, i.e.
> > using made up screen nics and posting through anonymous mail servers,
> > like "hotmail.com" just like you do Mopar. You call him a coward then
> > include yourself.
>
> Actually I'll call him a coward for flooding this newsgroup with all sorts of
> porn, foul language, obscene pictures, abusive accusatory troll posts. It's the
> old saying of "what goes around, comes around" He'll get what ever the FCC > thinks he deserve.

Since we were on the topic, what makes you so sure that Doug was responsible for all of the porn flooding etc, that occured on this group? You're recently been found incorrect, when you assumed that Smokey was another of George's nics, so how foolproof are your "sleuthing" abilities? Hopefully, better than Twisty's, but even you have to admit that if someone wants to remain anonymous, they can certainly do so.

Once someone becomes known as the "de-facto" spammer, it's easy for others to jump on the bandwagon, knowing that it will get blamed on Doug, in this case. And the other spammers can enjoy their anonymity. Still others like to "stir the pot" by doing things that will get others in trouble, and perpetuate on-going hostilities. This newsgroup in no different in that respect.

I wouldn't jump to any conclusions until the facts are presented.

Dave
"Sandbagger"

1938. Re: New Field Day Entry Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 13:41:22 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0302100541.49b809e3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61021

"Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now> wrote in message
news:<Xns931D8151D8BF0pookster@216.168.3.50>...
> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in news:3E46AE95.8070102
> @adelphia.net:
>
> > There are 5 pages of rules, the rest is submission and log forms, and
> > some Q and A. Is that too complicated?
> >
> ----------
>
> Five pages of rules? I think the question is self-answering.
>
> This is a hobby, not a Federal Project.

Exactly my point.

I got to the page which shows the entry summary & submission form and
got a massive dose of the giggles, the whole package is Newington's
incarnation of the long-form 1040. FAQs and all.

I'll be in it and yes it will be a contest and it will be fun despite
Newington. Whether I'll bother filing their bloated 1040 after it's
over is an open question, odds are I won't. But maybe if they passed
out 100 bonus points for trudging thru it . .

w3rv

1939. Re: More Ideas to eliminate CB intruders on 10m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 15:04:10 UTC
From: Austin Powers Baby <yeahbaby@minime.com>
Message-ID: <JSSdnUzIj8r3ItqjXTWcqA@comcast.com>
Source record: 61022
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Scott" <scott@scotti.sh!t> wrote in message
news:B_-dnfDv0NPYx9qjXTWcog@comcast.com...
>
>
> sideband wrote:
> >
> > vanity call? Not likely.. If he were a Tech, the only options open to
> > him are 1x3's and 2x3's... no 1x2's or 2x1... apparently, Scott, you
> > don't know a whole heck of alot.
> >
> > Besides, looking the callsign up on QRZ reveals he's an amateur Extra,
> > so even then BC is still full of BS. UC?
>

> I said I'm not a ham.

Couldn't make the grade?

>Don't take out your frustrations from others out on me.

Your the one who made the smart comment

> A few more sticks and I might jump on you. Chill!

Oh I see you been taking notes from moped

1940. Re: More Ideas to eliminate CB intruders on 10m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 15:06:47 UTC
From: cheesecutter@webhideout.com
Message-ID: <fef386d5.0302100706.57c6f3b7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61023
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Randy" <rchapman8@houston.rr.REMOVEcom> wrote in message
news:<sEL1a.10694$yn1.903404@twister.austin.rr.com>...
> "Austin Powers Baby" <yeahbaby@minime.com> wrote in message
> news:seWdnXQ-ucG-odqjXTWc2Q@comcast.com...
> >
> > "Randy" <rchapman8@houston.rr.REMOVEcom> wrote in message news:QAD1a.40262
> >
> >
> > > Welcome back, George.
> >
> > Same to you Randy, I see you could not wait for me to get back to post
> > since you haven't posted since I had last. I am glad I am your mentor.
> >
> >
>
> Actually George, I've been rather busy chasing drivers for this wretched VIA
> KT 400 mainboard I bought. Whatever you do, don't ever buy a Gigabyte! Damn
> 9700 Pro vidcard didn't wanna work right with it. Finally got a chipset
> driver that works yesterday. But hey, if ya feel like my mentor, more power
> to ya! <g>

yes sir it is a given these days........new board doesn't mean
everything is going to work ok..........no doubt about
it.............that card should work no problem though.....i am
surprised.........

1941. Re: n8wwm king of clowns busted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 15:07:36 UTC
From: Landshark
Message-ID: <YeP1a.55$WK.42@newssvr19.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 61024
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dave Hall" <nojunk_n3cvj@worldlynx.net> wrote in message
news:3E47A3B4.4661@worldlynx.net...
> Landshark wrote:
> >
> > "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net> wrote in message
> > news:A7ecnSCO2Pu6eNijXTWcrg@comcast.com...
> > >
> > > <Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
> > > news:20030208140431.643$8H@newsreader.com...
> > > > Yea Lee,I beleive you as much as a would dogie. Why doesn't the fat
> > > bastard
> > > > speak for himself,instead of posting gay shit all the time?
> > > >
> > > > Why are you defending such an obvious asshole? Cuz he's a fucking
> > > coward?
> > >
> > > Did you even try to contact him by E-mail Mopar? I suspect most on
> > > here wouldn't because they're afraid to reveal their real E-mail
> > > address, names etc.
> >
> > LOL!!!! You are joking? right Leland?
> >
> > >And you talk about cowards Mopar, well what's your
> > > real name - address - etc. Why do you have to hide it?
> >
> > His name along with mine, Twist, Chris, Jay's etc etc etc
> > has been blasted so many times, you must have had selective
> > amnesia to miss all those posts.
>
> Funny, I missed most of them, and the ones that I did see, showed
> someone blasting a name, but no one confirming it (And in most cases
> denying it). I could say that your name is Fred Smith, and if you
> neither confrim or deny it, does that make it true? Even if you do deny,
> how do I know you're not lying?
>
> It's a fact that many of our more vocal "outlaws" hide behind their
> anonymity. I suspect that they're not to proud of what they portray,
> outside of this group.
>
>
> >
> > > I've been
> > > posting on this news group for a long while now using my real name,

> > > callsign, and I haven't had anything serious happen as a result.
> >
> > Well good for you, probably 90 + % of Cb'ers don't have a
> > call sign, most use handles.
>
> But we all have given names. Call signs are optional.
>
>
>
> > As for nothing happening to you, Steve's address along with mine,
> > twist and probably a dozen others have had them posted here, nothings happened > to
them
either.
>
> I don't recall anyone posting Twisty's real name. I'm sure he wouldn't
> admit to it. Although Doug must know him, to be able to send him that
> jockstrap trophy that gets mentioned from time to time.
>
>
> >
> > >So it
> > > appears I have a lot more guts that most of the posters on this group
> > > including you. Even Doug posted using his real name and callsign at
> > > the beginning. If you call Doug a coward for no longer using his real
> > > name and callsign, well he's just taken a page out of your book, i.e.
> > > using made up screen nics and posting through anonymous mail servers,
> > > like "hotmail.com" just like you do Mopar. You call him a coward then
> > > include yourself.
> >
> > Actually I'll call him a coward for flooding this newsgroup with all sorts of
> > porn, foul language, obscene pictures, abusive accusatory troll posts. It's the
> > old saying of "what goes around, comes around" He'll get what ever the FCC > thinks he
deserve.
>
> Since we were on the topic, what makes you so sure that Doug was
> responsible for all of the porn flooding etc, that occured on this
> group? You're recently been found incorrect, when you assumed that
> Smokey was another of George's nics, so how foolproof are your
> "sleuthing" abilities? Hopefully, better than Twisty's, but even you
> have to admit that if someone wants to remain anonymous, they can
> certainly do so.
>
> Once someone becomes known as the "de-facto" spammer, it's easy for
> others to jump on the bandwagon, knowing that it will get blamed on
> Doug, in this case. And the other spammers can enjoy their anonymity.
> Still others like to "stir the pot" by doing things that will get others
> in trouble, and perpetuate on-going hostilities. This newsgroup in no
> different in that respect.
>
> I wouldn't jump to any conclusions until the facts are presented.

>
> Dave
> "Sandbagger"

Well Dave, if you haven't noticed this is
a cb newsgroup, hence the cb handles being
used. As for names being posted here, it's all
in the "archives" as some like to say, go see
for yourself.
If Smokey's George so be it, if he's not
so be it, but the fact remains Doug was flooding
this group with crap for months, again it's in the
"archives" go see it for yourself. He's even admitted
more than once, but some people have selective
amnesia.

Landshark

--
Any day riding, is better than
being a newsgroupie

73 Baja Stroppe Bronco
98 Buell S3 Thunderbolt
99 Ford F-150 Supercab 4X4 (antenna platform)

1942. Re: n8wwm king of clowns busted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 15:49:25 UTC
From: Dave Hall <nojunk_n3cvj@worldlynx.net>
Message-ID: <3E47CA05.278B@worldlynx.net>
Source record: 61025
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Landshark wrote:

> Well Dave, if you haven't noticed this is
> a cb newsgroup, hence the cb handles being
> used.

A few have made mention to that. However, this newsgroup is not any different from any other USENET newsgroup, in that a person's credibility is automatically suspect when one hides behind an anonymous name.

I find it quite amusing, in an ironic sort of way, when someone using an anonymous "handle", has the cajones, to lambast someone else, who isn't so "secretive", about their credibility. Generally speaking, those who have more to lose, generally behave themselves more so than someone who, due to their anonymity, can make a total ass of themselves and then re-invent themselves as another anonymous nic. Where's the accountability there?

> As for names being posted here, it's all
> in the "archives" as some like to say, go see
> for yourself.

I have neither the time nor the incination

> If Smokey's George so be it, if he's not
> so be it,

But you were originally convinced that he was, that was where you jumped the gun, and possibly tarnished an innocent person's rep, by associating him with someone else, when you were working on nothing more than a hunch. That's what I mean when I say to wait for the facts before making the connection.

> but the fact remains Doug was flooding
> this group with crap for months, again it's in the
> "archives" go see it for yourself. He's even admitted
> more than once, but some people have selective
> amnesia.

I'm not denying that. All I'm saying is that it's likely that he was not the only one playing, and he may not have been the worst offender.

Dave
"Sandbagger"

1943. Re: New Field Day Entry Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 15:49:44 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3E47CA18.7060001@psu.edu>
Source record: 61027

Brian Kelly wrote:
> "Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now> wrote in message
news:<Xns931D8151D8BF0pookster@216.168.3.50>...
>
>>Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in news:3E46AE95.8070102
>>@adelphia.net:
>>
>>
>>>There are 5 pages of rules, the rest is submission and log forms, and
>>>some Q and A. Is that too complicated?
>>>
>>
>>_____
>>
>>Five pages of rules? I think the question is self-answering.
>>
>>This is a hobby, not a Federal Project.
>
>
> Exactly my point.
>
> I got to the page which shows the entry summary & submission form and
> got a massive dose of the giggles, the whole package is Newington's
> incarnation of the long-form 1040. FAQs and all.
>
> I'll be in it and yes it will be a contest and it will be fun despite
> Newington. Whether I'll bother filing their bloated 1040 after it's
> over is an open question, odds are I won't. But maybe if they passed
> out 100 bonus points for trudging thru it . .

Oops, I have to correct myself. There are *3* pages of actual rules.
Page one is a cover sheet. Page 2 is a rah, rah piece. The actual rules
don't start until page

Maybe I come from the wrong side of the tracks, but 3 pages of rules
doesn't seem so bad, especially in light of the different types of
stations that might participate in FD. In the other party I'm involved
in, the PAQSO, we work hard at keeping the rules to a single page, but
the print gets small, and there are constant queries to clarify this or
expand upon that.

But that is small beans compared to FD.

Here is a challenge. come up with a one page set of rules for FD that
addresses everything. Just for grins, go ahead and ignore the EC and

GOTA sections. Make the rules explicit enough that there is no questioning them. Encompass all the different modes in use during field day.

Up to it? Obviously you could say any mode, any qso, 1 point. Nothing else. But that wouldn't be much of a contest, would it. A lot of people wouldn't care for that. IMO, a home station operating off the mains is the same thing as a EC station. So should either of those participate (FWIW, I am quite happy with both participating) Others don't like the idea, like Larry. So they want clarification. That's why there are rules. Some people want extra points to encourage Morse code use. If we encourage that one mode, then others want their favorite mode encouraged too. On and on.

- Mike KB3EIA -

glad there is something else here to discuss besides Morse and the old master fisherman

1944. Re: More Ideas to eliminate CB intruders on 10m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 15:51:01 UTC
From: Austin Powers Baby <yeahbaby@minime.com>
Message-ID: <X6ycndXwJKb7V9qjXTWc3A@comcast.com>
Source record: 61026
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Randy" <rchapman8@houston.rr.REMOVEcom> wrote in message news:sEL1a.10694
> Actually George, I've been rather busy chasing drivers for this wretched
VIA
> KT 400 mainboard I bought. Whatever you do, don't ever buy a Gigabyte!
Damn
> 9700 Pro vidcard didn't wanna work right with it. Finally got a chipset
> driver that works yesterday. But hey, if ya feel like my mentor, more
power
> to ya! <g>

No, Don't tell me that about the gigabyte I use that board now although it is about 1- 2 years old now,I was going to buy another gigabyte board this week for 79.95. Did the board come with a cd of those drivers???? try that easy tune out you can get your proccesor smokin, oh btw, don't ever plug another hard drive in while the computer is on, the processor and power supply don't like it, they both are history... lol

1945. Re: n8wwm king of clowns busted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 15:54:18 UTC
From: Austin Powers Baby <yeahbaby@minime.com>
Message-ID: <r6-cnQw55oG2VtqjXTWcpA@comcast.com>
Source record: 61028
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Landshark" <S3Buell@SBCGlobal.Net.> wrote in message
news:YeP1a.55$WK.42@newssvr19.news.prodigy.com...

> If Smokey's George so be it, if he's not
> so be it, but the fact remains Doug was flooding
> this group with crap for months, again it's in the
> "archives" go see it for yourself. He's even admitted
> more than once, but some people have selective
> amnesia.
>
> Landshark

Oh so it is ok for you to make a accusation of course with no proof as usual, other than your obsession that everyone who is against you or twithed is me LOL it is rather comical, so just in case if it is me you got me pegged and if it is not me oh well to bad it is ok for you to lie and make false accustaions. LOL hypocrite, joke, queer.

1946. More Disappointment for Vipul, KB1HMW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 15:56:08 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030210105608.11757.00000560@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 61029

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 2/10/03 12:45 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030210014559.04155.00000221@mb-bh.aol.com>

>> One must first pass the Technician AND General Class writtens, and then
>>must pass the Morse Code test.
>
>One does not have to understand the written test for the Technician class or
>the General Class. One must know Morse at 5wpm. Therefore, all the General
>Class proves is one passed the Morse code test, not higher technical
>competency.

So YOUR assumption is that NO ONE knows the material for the tests, Vipul?

This means we can safely assume YOU don't know anything either since YOU
are a product of the VE examining process.

>>No, Vipul, what it demonstrated was that you ARE wrong about your
>>assertion
>>of "rigidity". They spent some time doing one thing, then moved on to
>>another.
>
>That's incorrect. If I ask anyone in the photograph still in the club if they
>want to do a homebrewing project or even if they were the slightest bit
>interested in a homebrewing project under any situations, every one of them
>would say they are not interested. The photograph is an inaccurate portrayal
>of
>club's activities

Having not been there, I cannot say for certain, of course, but I am
willing to bet that the complete context was they were not interested in
homebrewing projects WITH YOU.

I've never met you in person and I'll be danged if I'd want to spend
anytime with you either based upon your whining, poorly presented rants in
here. I can only guess what you are like in person!

>So, they did not "move on".

They did not "move on" with YOU......

>The phrase "advancement of the radio art" means technical achievement.

Oh...?!?! You draw this conclusion based upon WHAT definition from the FCC
or other credible source? Webster's? Funk and Wagnall's? Encyclopedia
Brittanica? Vipul's Volumes of Voiciferous Vile Ventings?

If they meant NOTHING but advancement of "technical achievement" why
didn't they simply SAY that?

The ANSWER to that, Vipul, is that the "radio art" is MORE than
experimentation INSIDE the box...It's how to USE the box too.

>It does
>not mean public service, emergency communications, or fostering good will.
>Fostering good will is a means, but is not in itself "advancement of the
>radio
>art".

>> You have a real problem with NOT talking to the people you have to be
>>face-to-face with
>
>The decision was already made, so what's the point. I told people I am not
>interested in Morse code. I also said I am not a "Ham" to someone that knows
>I
>have an amateur radio license.

But VIPUL! Just last week you said you WERE a "Ham". What's the truth?

>>You MEAN they don't check with you first to see if it meets your
>>approval?
>
>No, I mean absurdly false statements or arguments used to support one's
>viewpoints.

You mean like your really absurd statement above about the definition of
what the "radio art" is?

>One example is that loaner HTs is evidence of "advancement of the
>radio art".

Your opinion only.

>Another example is posing for a homebrew photo and hating
>homebrewing.

You mean like your posting in an Amateur Radio newsgroup but hating
Amateur radio, Vipul?

You mean like asserting that you "support" Amateur Radio and then that
very week posting a very demeaning item in a CB radio newsgroup, Vipul?

And you have not provided any evidence that those guys "hated"
homebrewing...Only your opinion that they disliked it, which is more likely
they didn't want to be with you.

> Not liking it is fine. But, to not like homebrewing, and then pose
>for a homebrewing photo, (possibly for publicity reasons), is wrong.

You mean like politicians who pose with babies but never changed a diaper?

>Stating
>such goal of the club so an outsider will be impressed, while disagreing with

>it in reality. These are examples of rationalizations.

SInce you don't name the club, provide any references for us to see, or third parties to verify any of your assertions by, all we have is your sour-grapes whining...Which sound a lot like Lennie's sour-grapes whining about what HE doesn't get in Amateur Radio.

>>If you believe this, Vipul, it's only you and Lennie who DO believe it.
>
>I've seen this everywhere.

How come no one ELSE sees this, Vipul?

>Its only Hams that cannot see themselves as others see them.

But WAIT, Vipul...YOU are a "licensed Ham" too! How is it that YOU seem to have this clarity of vision that no one else seems to have...?!?! You are smarter or more gifted than other licensees...?!?!

>At the four closest clubs,
>from listening to Hams in several states on long trip, and at Hamfests in MA,
>NH and CT - all show evidence of the common cult of Ham.

Gee, Vipul...people oranized into clubs for common goals with common interests...Gee...THAT'S strange....NOT!

>No one pointed this
>out to me. I observed this on my own. How would I come to this conclusion, if
>it did not exist?

You have not observed ANYTHING yet, Vipul, that isn't common human nature. That you dislike it, find it offensive or otherwise inconsistent with your own goals or desires is just your tough luck.

All of these people are organized into clubs for a common interest...Amateur Radio. Some like to homebrew stuff, some like to chase awards, others like to do public service and emergency communications. If Amateur Radio offers nothing else to ALL licensees, it is the opportunity to do what you want with a radio with very few rules or constraints.

The average Amateur licensee is NOT a degreed engineer. They are common, everyday people, each of whom has their own reasons for becoming licensed. Many are licensed for no other reason than the social opportunities it provides. For some it's just a means to an end, often in emergency communications or a alternative to cellphones. And some are involved because they like experimenting with radios.

That they may or may not be involved for the same reasons as you are, as I said above, your tough luck. If Amateur Radio is not what you thought it would be or is not living up to YOUR expectations, MOVE ON!

I can tell you now with an unwavering certainty that Amateur Radio as a whole is NOT going to change for YOU! Better to move on now than to continue to subject yourself to disappointment and rejection.

Steve, K4YZ

1947. Re: Getting old call sign back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 16:27:40 UTC
From: DaveH <ddhartwick@NO_SPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <379EE1E556D8BE53.B3C0BB5A79465E85.0384BD6916ED2804@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 61030

Thanks to all for the help. I just went ahead and applied for my old call as a vanity call using the online system.

Looks like it should work, hope so, but if not, it will not be the greatest tragedy to come down the pike.

WA3URR really is a miserable call, but you guys understand--it's part of a hams identity, especially going back almost 30 years.

Oh yes, it's been expired for 10+ years.
Dave
KA3STE

>I've done some searching, but can't find an answer to this question.
>
>I was issued WA3URR in 1974, but stupidly let my license expire.
>
>After re-testing back up to Extra class, I received KA3STE--OK but it
>isn't me!
>
>Will the FCC re-issue original call signs? I did a search and WA3URR
>is not currently issued.
>
>DaveH

1948. Re: More Ideas to eliminate CB intruders on 10m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 16:43:45 UTC
From: "Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now>
Message-ID: <Xns931E58CC43B52pookster@216.168.3.50>
Source record: 61031
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Lloyd" <DrLloyd@HerbWillReturn14313.net> wrote in news:b286m4$p86$0
@pita.alt.net:

> Care to share with the group what law school you graduated
> from?
>

I believe the word "knocks" was in the title.

--
Bill, W7TI

1949. Re: More Ideas to eliminate CB intruders on 10m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 16:45:04 UTC
From: "Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now>
Message-ID: <Xns931E5905769E7pookster@216.168.3.50>
Source record: 61032
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Lloyd" <DrLloyd@HerbWillReturn14313.net> wrote in news:b28746qda0
@pita.alt.net:

> Hypothetical question: Do you think there is a chance some time this
> year that you will upgrade to Tech Plus?
>

Not a chance. Do you think there is a chance some time this year you will
come to understand the FCC's licensing structure?

--
Bill, W7TI

1950. Re: Getting old call sign back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 16:47:01 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0302100847.5865be30@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61033

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message news:<20030210063633.27873.00000540@mb-mj.aol.com>...
> (3) pretty much says it all, about reassigning an S-K's call. Two year wait
> unless you're a close relative and can provide documentation.
>
> Perhaps just a clerical mistake at FCC. How long since he passed away?

He passed away maybe three years ago and his callsign was reissued
within months after his passing. His XYL did not inform the FCC of his
passing.

"Clerical mistake" . . right . . same kinda "clerical accident" which
got Joe Hertzberg K3JH decades before anybody else had vanity
callsigns. Look up W3DW in QRZ.

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

1951. Re: More Ideas to eliminate CB intruders on 10m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 16:51:10 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v4fm3tc8d8qq99@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 61034
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
"Alun Palmer" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns931E86F2796Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> "KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com> wrote in
> news:v4dkhpt5f3bpfb@corp.supernews.com:
>
> >
> > "Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now> wrote in message
> > news:Xns931D81DA4D5B7pookster@216.168.3.50...
> >> "BC-610" <Mike@Listen14275and14313.net> wrote in news:b25vof$qn7$0
> >> @pita.alt.net:
> >>
> >> > In my neck of the woods we have an easy cure for CB
> >> > ten meter intruders. I have a great old BC-610 which I
> >> > rebuilt a few years ago. When we get a local CBer intruding
> >> > on ten meters, I lay a steady nonstop 750 watt AM carrier on
> >> > top of him wherever he goes, until he gets the idea to get the
> >> > hell out of the 10m band!!!!!! Works like a charm every time.
> >> >
> >> ____________________________________________________________
> >>
> >> Hypothetical question: If the FCC fined both you and the CB'er, who
> >> would get the biggest fine?
> >>
> >> My money's on you. Supposedly you know the law, supposedly he doesn't.
> >>
> >> --
> >> Bill, W7TI
> >
> >
> > But calling CQ using CW is not illegal, and will serve the same purpose!
> > --
> > '73' From KB9TMP
> > "The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
> > if you can fake that, you've got it made."
> > -Groucho Marx
> >
> >
> >
>
> Like the morons who deliberately call CQ in CW on top of DX stations that
> are in the phone subband in their own countries,
```

That would be illegal due to the fact that the other stations are doing what they are licensed to do where their licensed to do it! Plus bad amateur practice as well.

>but in the US CW subband.
> But that is illegal, though.

But if a CBer is using 10m "ILLEGALLY" then if you call CQ on top of him your doing "NOTHING" wrong, you have to be legal to qualify as a "signal" or "communication" otherwise your just "noise" legally! When the FCC busts someone for being out of band they never say that the person was communicating out of band just "transmitting" out of band.

I seem to remember a posting somewhere here that the person emailed Riley and ask him this question about transmitting on top of "illegal" intrusions into the 10m band and his answer was to go ahead that as long as the other person was "illegal" they weren't considered as communications to be interfered with.
--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx

1952. Re: More Ideas to eliminate CB intruders on 10m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 17:16:26 UTC
From: Tom Sevart <n2uhcNOSPAM@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <b28mnj$19tb7r$1@ID-52518.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 61035
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:3E47345B.1080903@mailcity.moc...
>
>
> Suggest you call the FCC and ask them. They will tell you a
> licensed station transmitting on top of an unlicensed station is
> not considered interference.
>

That's not the way I learned it. I learned that even if the transmitting
station is operating illegally, you have no right to interfere with it.

Tom

1953. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 17:42:50 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0302100942.6acb58a3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61036

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E4737C5.7A4BD889@earthlink.net>...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > In article <1Gk1a.41861$vm2.23772@rwcrnsc54>, "Jackie"
> > <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> writes:
> >
> > >Len is a mystery.

Not really, once you've sen his behavior here for a while. Try
opposing some of his policy views, like the idea of a mandatory
minimum age requirement for a ham license.

> > >He's obviously knowledgeable about some things, so why
> > >does he waste so much time criticizing this hobby?

His hobby is wasting time. Your time.
> >
> > Wrong, Jackie, since I have no amateur radio license (only a
> > commercial one) "I cannot possibly know anything about ham
> > radio."

Note that the source of that allefed quote is not given.

> > You've heard the words in hear, shouted at tops of
> > little lungs, overdriving their tiny amplifiers.
>
> You actually hear words "in hear"? Really? Shouted words? You need a
> rest, Leonard. You don't know any more about amateur radio than someone
> does about driving a BMW having known a few BMW owners or from reading
> the owner's manual.

Doesn't mean he can't comment or post.
>
> > >I place him and Vipul in
> > >the same category- I respect them for their knowledge of electronics (which
> > >I know little about presently) but disdain their efforts to slam people who
> > >are in this hobby.

It is interesting to note that they do not show any respect for
another's knowledge of electronics (or almost any other knowledge or
accomplishment) if the other person opposes their views on amateur
radio policy.
> >
> > Tsk, tsk, tsk. Out of 670 thousand or so licensed radio
> > amateurs in the USA there are only a handfull of
> > newsgroupies who've staked out this territory as "theirs."

> > They (and ARRL) "represent" thousands of hams
> > nationwide and what they do is what all the others do.
> > QED.

685,000 US amateurs.
>
> Here's a QST for your QED: There are nearly 300,000,000 people in the
> U.S.
> What percentage of that number have posted over a number of years in an
> amateur radio newsgroup? Of that tiny percentage, what percentage feel
> that they are called to be uninvited advocates for change in amateur
> radio licensing?
> Tsk, tsk tsk.

K8MN represents 1/685,000 of US amateur radio.
KC0ODY represents 1/685,000 of US amateur radio.
N2EY represents 1/685,000 of US amateur radio.

Mr. Anderson represents 0/685,000 of US amatuer radio.
>
> > >I have to wonder why they waste so much time.

Their hobby is wasting time. Your time.

> > >I mean,
> > >there are so many other things they could be doing than griping on an
> > >amateur radio policy group.
> >
> > I have to wonder why those few newsgroupies are on a
> > newsgroup "wasting their time" in computer-modem
> > communications when they have those fabulous,
> > important certificates allowing them to use radio... :-)
>
> I'll make you a deal, Len. You do what you can. I'll do what I want.

Mr. Anderson repeatedly voiced strong opposition to the idea of hams
discussing ham radio policy on the ham bands. Something about it being
against free speech.

For example:

BEGIN GOOGLE QUOTE

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 14 Nov 2002 20:04:20 GMT

In article <3DD34A7F.D6655058@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
<k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <20021112203942.13494.00000474@mb-mj.aol.com>,

n2ey@aol.com
(N2EY)
>> writes:
>>
>> >In article <3DD19270.7010807@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net>
>> >writes:
>> >
>> >>Perhaps another ham here can help.
>> >>
>> >Here's a way almost anyone who reads this can participate in an
on-the-air
>> >amateur radio policy discussion on the ham bands:
>> >
>> >1) Set up an effective station for the amateur band and mode to be
used.
>> >2) Obtain the necessary license by passing the required tests.
>> >3) Operate the station in 1) as required by the governmental
agency who
>> >granted the license in 2).
>> >
>> >The fact that someone passes a test to obtain a license does not
in any way
>> >indicate agreement with the test requirements.
>>
>> In fewer words: No one can discuss the subject of GETTING IN
>> amateur radio without ALREADY BEING IN. That's not free speech
>> or free assembly, just exclusivity and limited participation.
>
>You've discussed GETTING IN without ALREADY BEING IN. You've
discussed,
>dismissed and shown rudeness to anyone not sharing your view of
amateur
>radio utopia. That, by God, is free speech. Convincing others to
share
>your views has not been your long suit.

Free speech on an EXISTING INTERNET NEWSGROUP, yes.

Such free speech has been met by some, like yourself, trying to
control content through ill-mannered sarcasm and general
bullying whenever opinions are contrary to your personal views.

>> This newsgroup already exists, is public access, unmoderated.
No
>> time or frequency limit exists for communications, discussion,
or
>> participation.
>
>You'll forgive radio amateurs if they wish to discuss policy on the
>amateur bands, wont' you, Len?

No problem if those policy matters affect ONLY those who are
already licensed.

END GOOGLE QUOTE

Lots more examples in that thread. Note how Mr. Anderson interprets

"1) Set up an effective station for the amateur band and mode to be
used.
2) Obtain the necessary license by passing the required tests.
3) Operate the station in 1) as required by the governmental agency
who
granted the license in 2).

The fact that someone passes a test to obtain a license does not in
any way
indicate agreement with the test requirements."

to mean:

"In fewer words: No one can discuss the subject of GETTING IN
amateur radio without ALREADY BEING IN. That's not free speech
or free assembly, just exclusivity and limited participation."

> > >Griping about policies is one thing; griping
> > >about the perceived problems with the entire culture of the hobby is
> > >something else.
> >
> > Gosh and golly, a desire to remove the amateur license
> > examination morse code test is "griping about the
> > perceived problems of the entire culture of the hobby?!?"

Nope. It's all the other stuff from Mr. Anderson.
>
> That issue is all but gone from everyone's radar. The remaining 5 wpm
> test is absurdly easy and even it will be gone in short order. You've
> already forgotten your issue of the licensing of children. Are we
> leaving out any other gripes you've aired in recent weeks?

Months? Years?

>Be honest.
>Google knows.
>
God bless Google

73 de Jim, N2EY

1954. Re: More Ideas to eliminate CB intruders on 10m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 18:34:23 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E47F0AF.2010307@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 61038
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

sideband wrote:
> Ok, JJ, I'll repeat it again...
>
> Ok.. here it is...
>
> ï¿½97.101 General standards.
> (d) No amateur operator shall willfully or maliciously interfere with
> or cause interference to any radio communication or signal.

Ok, I will repeat it again, I suggest you call the FCC and ask
them. They will tell you a licensed station transmitting on top of
an unlicensed station is not considered interference.

1955. Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 18:45:16 UTC
From: Steve Adell - KF2TI <kf2ti@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <b28s0g$k45$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 61037

http://www.msnbc.com/news/869906.asp

1956. Re: Oh my God! It's a bald fat Forrest Gump!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 21:24:01 UTC
From: Rev Floozie <green4apple@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3e48187b@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 61039
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.scanner

"Tom" <oo@nospam.com> wrote in message
news:erof4vg3c7gtioilk71p17a5r3gcmhr1ds@4ax.com...
> Look at that rertard!
>
> http://members.aol.com/jcunham/

Please.....please...nobody tell the balding pate
chipmunk-cheeked Lloyd-da-toid about this website:

http://www.angelfire.com/ne/AntariiRescue/rabbi_rocky_show.html

If Lloyd sees it, he's liable to go on an INSANE rant across every
kook and conspiracy newsgroup known to man and then check into
the 3.860 Eastern Regioinal Pay-triots Website and blow up his HF
from loading into his 5/8th wave 2 meter vertical mag-mount he's
got pasted atop the rusty 4-drawer filing cabinet outside of his shack's
window that he "rescued" from the local auto-body shop's trashcan....

(come to think of it...DO NOT let any Liberty Netters get ahold of
the website either.....if Vic sees it, he's liable to have "depends
under-garments"
moments right up to next Saturday night.....Oy!!

1957. Re: More Ideas to eliminate CB intruders on 10m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 21:40:22 UTC
From: "Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now>
Message-ID: <Xns931E8B16C8828pookster@216.168.3.50>
Source record: 61040
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in news:3E47F0AF.2010307@mailcity.moc:

>> ?97.101 General standards.
>> (d) No amateur operator shall willfully or maliciously interfere with
>> or cause interference to any radio communication or signal.
>
>
> Ok, I will repeat it again, I suggest you call the FCC and ask
> them. They will tell you a licensed station transmitting on top of
> an unlicensed station is not considered interference.
>
>

Ok, lets say you're an actual judge, sitting in a court of law.
Which of the following would guide you in your decision?

1. Rules and/or laws written and documented in the Code of Federal
Regulations?
-or-
2. What someone at the FCC said on the phone?

Fill in the blank. 1.___ 2.___

Grades will be posted for all to see.

--
Bill, W7TI

1958. Re: Getting old call sign back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-10 22:41:59 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302101441.405cb79a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61041

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0302100847.5865be30@posting.google.com>...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030210063633.27873.00000540@mb-mj.aol.com>...
> > (3) pretty much says it all, about reassigning an S-K's call. Two year wait
> > unless you're a close relative and can provide documentation.
> >
> > Perhaps just a clerical mistake at FCC. How long since he passed away?
>
> He passed away maybe three years ago and his callsign was reissued
> within months after his passing. His XYL did not inform the FCC of his
> passing.
>
> "Clerical mistake" . . right . . same kinda "clerical accident" which
> got Joe Hertzberg K3JH decades before anybody else had vanity
> callsigns. Look up W3DW in QRZ.

If the xyl did not notify, (and if his license didn't expire,) then
how could this happen?

1959. Re: More Ideas to eliminate CB intruders on 10m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 00:01:26 UTC
From: Randy <rchapman8@houston.rr.REMOVEcom>
Message-ID: <q3X1a.43129$yb.3090974@twister.austin.rr.com>
Source record: 61042
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Austin Powers Baby" <yeahbaby@minime.com> wrote in message
news:X6ycndXwJKb7V9qjXTWc3A@comcast.com...
>
> "Randy" <rchapman8@houston.rr.REMOVEcom> wrote in message news:sEL1a.10694
> > Actually George, I've been rather busy chasing drivers for this wretched
> VIA
> > KT 400 mainboard I bought. Whatever you do, don't ever buy a Gigabyte!
> Damn
> > 9700 Pro vidcard didn't wanna work right with it. Finally got a chipset
> > driver that works yesterday. But hey, if ya feel like my mentor, more
> power
> > to ya! <g>
>
>
> No, Don't tell me that about the gigabyte I use that board now although it
> is about 1- 2 years old now,I was going to buy another gigabyte board this
> week for 79.95. Did the board come with a cd of those drivers???? try
that
> easy tune out you can get your proccesor smokin, oh btw, don't ever plug
> another hard drive in while the computer is on, the processor and power
> supply don't like it, they both are history... lol
>
>

The board did come with drivers, but they were old (August), and the Radeon
9700 pro I have didn't like them. After much research, and reading about the
conflicts with the vid card in 3D mode, I found one here:
http://www.viaarena.com/?PageID=2

If you're using a GeForce or other card you probably wont need them, but if
you're using a Radeon, you might want to bookmark the site. Card worked fine
in 2D mode, but anything 3D caused the system to go into infinite loop. Only
way out of that is the reset button. Kind of silly to have a $380 video
card that wont do 3D because of a $110 board. Anyway, it's all good now.

1960. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 00:36:05 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030210193605.04050.00000262@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 61043

From K4YZ:
> So YOUR assumption is that NO ONE knows the material for the tests,
>Vipul?
>
> This means we can safely assume YOU don't know anything either since YOU
>are a product of the VE examining process.

The test doesn't prove one learned the material. This does not mean no one knows the material.

So, I repeat, passing the General test only proves one learned Morse code. It does not prove higher technical competence (a common rationalization) as the license seems to indicate.

> Having not been there, I cannot say for certain, of course, but I am
>willing to bet that the complete context was they were not interested in
>homebrewing projects WITH YOU.

>And you have not provided any evidence that those guys "hated"
>homebrewing

>SInce you don't name the club, provide any references for us to see, or
>third parties to verify any of your assertions by, all we have is your
>sour-grapes whining

This is a good example, because I'm pretty sure about what people in this club are interested in. I could verify my claim, but somehow you would find fault with my methods if the conclusion did not support your beliefs.

>>The phrase "advancement of the radio art" means technical achievement.
>
> Oh...?!?! You draw this conclusion based upon WHAT definition from the
>FCC
>or other credible source?

CFR, TITLE 47--TELECOMMUNICATION, PART 97--AMATEUR RADIO SERVICE, Sec. 97.1 Basis and purpose.

> If they meant NOTHING but advancement of "technical achievement" why
>didn't they simply SAY that?

"Advancement of the radio art" is listed separately which means its different from those other aspects (also listed) that you mention. Radio "art" means technical achievement. Service and international goodwill is listed separately. Notice that trained operators, technicians, electronics experts is also listed separately. Note that electronics expert is not the same as <advancement of the> radio art.

Rationalization also involves changing the definition of words.

> The ANSWER to that, Vipul, is that the "radio art" is MORE than
>experimentation INSIDE the box...It's how to USE the box too.

Possibly, if you could give an example.

> You have a real problem with NOT talking to the people you have to be
>face-to-face with, but somehow think that people in this NG give a
>rat's-kazoo
>about your local politics, Vipul.

I just remembered, I DID mention in the forum (which gets mailed to every club member), well before they made the decision, what would be a better usage rather than the HTs.

> But VIPUL! Just last week you said you WERE a "Ham". What's the truth?

I am not a "Ham". I am a radio amateur. If I said I was a "Ham", I meant that I was a member of a Ham radio club.

>>No, I mean absurdly false statements or arguments used to support one's
>>viewpoints.
> You mean like your really absurd statement above about the definition of
>what the "radio art" is?

No, your definition is absurd.

>>One example is that loaner HTs is evidence of "advancement of the
>>radio art".
> Your opinion only.

The club stated the goal was to get people on Morse before they otherwise would have. Anyway, the definition of "radio art" was given above. Very commonly used this way, so not my opinion only.

>>I've seen this everywhere.
> How come no one ELSE sees this, Vipul?

Many others that have seen it, probably left Ham radio, not stayed around. There are a few that express similar opinions.

Here, Lenover21 states basically the same thing:
" Liberals of The Ham are, well, more liberal. They are only
having their own fun, enjoying a technically challenging
recreational activity involving radio. They are not slavishly
tied by conservative bonds. According to extreme
conservatives these liberals do not have The RIGHT Stuff
to be worthy of The Ham. Why is that? "

>Amateur Radio as a
>whole is NOT going to change for YOU!

I may be able to add to the theoretical, but unrealized potential of the other aspects of amateur radio. A few people I have met were interested in similar activities. If I could find such a club, I would join it. Otherwise, once my

current situation changes, I may be able to start an amateur radio club for those interests.

1961. Re: More Ideas to eliminate CB intruders on 10m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 00:46:46 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3E4847F5.D0EC680A@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 61044
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

KB9TMP wrote:

>
> I seem to remember a posting somewhere here that the person emailed
> Riley and ask him this question about transmitting on top of "illegal"
> intrusions into the 10m band and his answer was to go ahead that as
> long as the other person was "illegal" they weren't considered as
> communications to be interfered with.

That could mean: 1) It's not illegal, or 2) I would not enforce the
rules if you do do it.

1962. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 00:54:49 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030210195449.04050.00000263@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 61045

From article
http://www.msnbc.com/news/869906.asp

" ACCORDING TO THE national membership association for amateur radio, the American Radio Relay League (ARRL), ham radio volunteers are currently assisting federal, state and local officials and relief organizations in Texas in their search for shuttle Columbia debris and the remains of the crew members. "

I did not hear any mention of Ham (or amateur) radio operators, in regard to the Columbia recovery, in the news. Not one. I guess ARRL is the "inside" news organization.

"Ham radio has proven to be the only reliable communications options during the recovery effort,"
...
"The communications systems used by other federal and state organizations cannot penetrate 'The Pine Curtain' as we know it in East Texas," he said. "The dense forests and hilly terrain just swallow up most radio traffic, and even county sheriff and county fire department radio systems have serious blind spots."

Hype.

If you look more closely, this actually supports removing amateur radio privileges (to get rid of those serious "blind spots"). Not good for amateur radio.

"Three of the Columbia astronauts were licensed amateur radio operators."

Irrelevant. In any group, some of them may have amateur radio licenses. Just because they happen to have licenses, does not support the claim. It was part of their work anyway.

"Even astronaut hopeful Lance Bass of 'N Sync is a ham - KG4UYY."

I doubt it. Why does this celebrity not proclaim he is a Ham in public?

1963. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 01:24:40 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3E4850D8.8E6B2378@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 61046

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:

> >Subject: Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >Date: 2/9/03 2:09 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20030209150932.03943.00000370@mb-fj.aol.com>
>
> >Those newsgroupies are terribly easy to catch, but they
> > taste bad. Ptui.
>
> Gee, Lennie...I figered you for a swallower, not a spitter.

Maybe he's looking for trouser trout..... :-)

1964. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 01:32:06 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0302101732.5476da76@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61047

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0302100444.79a001fe@posting.google.com>...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0302091509.5343063f@posting.google.com>...
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0302091119.1ef3bbb0@posting.google.com>...
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E45C722.284A9516@earthlink.net>...
> > >
> > > > I'd call it just another factual comment.
> > > >
> > > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> > > You're always right, Dave. You are God-like.
> > >
> > > Why didn't I see it your way earlier?
> > >
> > > When viewed in those terms, I am completely unworthy.
> > >
> > > I'm just another worthless lower class ham who dared to question your
> > > authority and mastery of the amateur communication art.
> > >
> > > I see the light, now.
> > >
> > > Long Live Heil!!!
> >
> >
> > It's Heil Heil Brainiac . . .
>
> I stand corrected again!
>
> Heil Heil!

Und doan you fuggedit it Herr Brainiac, ve haf been vatching you und
ve haf ways of dealing mit you vipul . .

1965. Re: Oh my God! It's a bald fat Forrest Gump!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 01:35:22 UTC
From: Usenet User <pkeller@mil.edu>
Message-ID: <urY1a.32872$Xr1.7573571@twister.nyroc.rr.com>
Source record: 61048
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.scanner

WOW!

--
=-=-

My icq# is 179085437
"Rev Floozie" <green4apple@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:3e48187b@snipnews.snip.net...
>
> "Tom" <oo@nospam.com> wrote in message
> news:erof4vg3c7gtioilk71p17a5r3gcmhr1ds@4ax.com...
> > Look at that rertard!
> >
> > http://members.aol.com/jcunham/
>
> Please.....please...nobody tell the balding pate
> chipmunk-cheeked Lloyd-da-toid about this website:
>
> http://www.angelfire.com/ne/AntariiRescue/rabbi_rocky_show.html
>
> If Lloyd sees it, he's liable to go on an INSANE rant across every
> kook and conspiracy newsgroup known to man and then check into
> the 3.860 Eastern Regioinal Pay-triots Website and blow up his HF
> from loading into his 5/8th wave 2 meter vertical mag-mount he's
> got pasted atop the rusty 4-drawer filing cabinet outside of his shack's
> window that he "rescued" from the local auto-body shop's trashcan....
>
> (come to think of it...DO NOT let any Liberty Netters get ahold of
> the website either.....if Vic sees it, he's liable to have "depends
> under-garments"
> moments right up to next Saturday night.....Oy!!
>
>
>
>

1966. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 01:57:58 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E4858A8.81685CD9@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61049

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E46BC3D.465156B6@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E45C722.284A9516@earthlink.net>...
> > >
> > > > I'd call it just another factual comment.
> >
> > > You're always right, Dave. You are God-like.
> >
> > You have a unique ability to understand other than what is written.
> > I've never claimed to always be right. I've never claimed to be a god.
> > I'm just a guy who has more experience in and knowledge of amateur radio
> > than you. Others know more than me. That is the way of the world.
> >
> >
> > > Why didn't I see it your way earlier?
> >
> > Beats me.
> >
> > > When viewed in those terms, I am completely unworthy.
> >
> > Have it your way.
> >
> > > I'm just another worthless lower class ham who dared to question your
> > > authority and mastery of the amateur communication art.
> >
> > Your difficulties do not come from license class. You have a chip on
> > your shoulder. I don't know how long it has been there but I've noted
> > its presence since my first encounter with you.
> >
> > > I see the light, now.
> >
> > I'm happy for you. What you see may be a reflection off your monitor.
> >
> > > Long Live Heil!!!
> >
> > Thank you.

>
> Dave, our first encounters were on the air, 10M SSB to be exact (the

> "kiddie band" as some OF's call it).

I hate to burst your bubble but I have no recollection of anything about you on air. Your saying "five nine" to me doesn't give me a lot to work with in forming an opinion of you. I don't call break the ten meter band down into separate modes and I don't call it the "kiddie band".

> Is that when you first noticed
> "the chip?"

Noooooo. That wasn't it.

> Anyway, I always thought God would be gracious, not smug.
>
> I guess that's what happens when you are a God.

No, that's what happens when you are busy reading between the lines instead of attempting comprehension of what is actually written. You're a real help in proving a point. Please refer to the portion above where I state, "I've never claimed to be a god".

Dave K8MN

1967. Re: More Ideas to eliminate CB intruders on 10m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 02:45:33 UTC
From: Scott <scott@scotti.sh!t>
Message-ID: <NGKdnXLkkotM_tWjXTWcow@comcast.com>
Source record: 61050
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Did you know that Windows 3.1/95/98/ME can only access 512 MB?
If you have more then that, remove the excess. Your video card
will suddenly work!!!

Windows NT/2K/XP use a different memory model and can access
more then 512 MB.

I have 768 MB in this 2K box. 1 GB in the 2.4 GHZ XP box I
just built for a friend. Intel 2.4/D845EBG2 motherboard.
Damn it's fast! XP loads in 7 seconds after the beep.

1968. Re: Getting old call sign back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 03:14:34 UTC
From: tad danley <tdanley@nospamatearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E486AEF.ADCAA6F0@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61051

DaveH wrote:

> Thanks to all for the help. I just went ahead and applied for my old
> call as a vanity call using the online system.
>
> Looks like it should work, hope so, but if not, it will not be the
> greatest tragedy to come down the pike.
>
> WA3URR really is a miserable call, but you guys understand--it's part
> of a hams identity, especially going back almost 30 years.
>
> Oh yes, it's been expired for 10+ years.
> Dave
> KA3STE

Good luck and 73, Dave. Let us know when you get your old call back - I think the lead time is about 20 days or so.

--
Tad Danley, K3TD

* Anti-spam return address in use *

1969. Re: Oh my God! It's a bald fat Forrest Gump!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 03:23:34 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <k3rg4v889td8fta28l6s29nupino4da6u9@4ax.com>
Source record: 61052
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.scanner

On Mon, 10 Feb 2003 16:24:01 -0500, "Rev Floozie"
<green4apple@yahoo.com> wrote:

>http://www.angelfire.com/ne/AntariiRescue/rabbi_rocky_show.html
>
>If Lloyd sees it, he's liable to go on an INSANE rant across every
>kook and conspiracy newsgroup known to man and then check into
>the 3.860 Eastern Regioinal Pay-triots Website and blow up his HF
>from loading into his 5/8th wave 2 meter vertical mag-mount he's
>got pasted atop the rusty 4-drawer filing cabinet outside of his shack's
>window that he "rescued" from the local auto-body shop's trashcan....
>
>(come to think of it...DO NOT let any Liberty Netters get ahold of
>the website either.....if Vic sees it, he's liable to have "depends
>under-garments"
>moments right up to next Saturday night.....Oy!!

I've read sci fi novels that were more convincing than this website.

1970. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 04:32:20 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030210233220.10901.00000556@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 61053

In article <v4blajbpids962@corp.supernews.com>, "KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com>
writes:

>
>If I remember my movie correctly was it something like "pay no attention
>to the man behind the curtain" If so I agree 100% !!!

Oh My! A second reference to "The Wizard of Oz" in the same
thread!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1971. Re: ID???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 04:32:20 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030210233220.10901.00000555@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 61054

In article <b258mt$5e7$0@pita.alt.net>, "YoYo" <Repeat@Anon.com> writes:

>Should I ID now or wait? If I give my call as per FCC rules, is that enough
>or should I ID and say, "W7xxx for ID"?
>Only the no-coders know for sure.

When I'm having a QSO on 2-meters, and I hear someone ID and say "For ID," I occasionally say, "This is K3LT, and if anyone I'm communicating with doesn't know why I said that, they'd better give up their license!"

73 de Larry, K3LT

1972. Re: More Ideas to eliminate CB intruders on 10m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 04:45:44 UTC
From: Randy <rchapman8@houston.rr.REMOVEcom>
Message-ID: <Yd%1a.44198$yb.3278579@twister.austin.rr.com>
Source record: 61055
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Scott" <scott@scotti.sh!t> wrote in message
news:NGKdnXLkkotM_tWjXTWcow@comcast.com...
> Did you know that Windows 3.1/95/98/ME can only access 512 MB?
> If you have more then that, remove the excess. Your video card
> will suddenly work!!!
>
> Windows NT/2K/XP use a different memory model and can access
> more then 512 MB.
>
> I have 768 MB in this 2K box. 1 GB in the 2.4 GHZ XP box I
> just built for a friend. Intel 2.4/D845EBG2 motherboard.
> Damn it's fast! XP loads in 7 seconds after the beep.

Both of my networked machines have 1 gig apiece. Both are now AMD after being an Intel fan for years and supporting them with both mouth and pocketbook.
Just retired the Intel 1.7 gig p4 in favor of an AMD XP2000 and XP2400 for my machines. Intel had SDRam and the two AMD's are using ddr ram, one at 266 and the other at 400. Both post significantly higher on all benchmarks than the intel. It also had a gig of ram, but clocked at 100, so it was a bit handicapped. I guess I went for more "bang for the buck" than outright performance. To get the same performance from Intel, the ram would have cost more than the PC.

1973. Re: More Ideas to eliminate CB intruders on 10m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 04:51:11 UTC
From: Scott <scott@scotti.sh!t>
Message-ID: <fsacnYIX75bcHNWjXTWcpw@comcast.com>
Source record: 61056
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Randy wrote:
>
> "Scott" <scott@scotti.sh!t> wrote in message
> news:NGKdnXLkkotM_tWjXTWcow@comcast.com...
> > Did you know that Windows 3.1/95/98/ME can only access 512 MB?
> > If you have more then that, remove the excess. Your video card
> > will suddenly work!!!
> >
> > Windows NT/2K/XP use a different memory model and can access
> > more then 512 MB.
> >
> > I have 768 MB in this 2K box. 1 GB in the 2.4 GHZ XP box I
> > just built for a friend. Intel 2.4/D845EBG2 motherboard.
> > Damn it's fast! XP loads in 7 seconds after the beep.
>
> Both of my networked machines have 1 gig apiece. Both are now AMD after
> being an Intel fan for years and supporting them with both mouth and
> pocketbook.
> Just retired the Intel 1.7 gig p4 in favor of an AMD XP2000 and XP2400 for
> my machines. Intel had SDRam and the two AMD's are using ddr ram, one at 266
> and the other at 400. Both post significantly higher on all benchmarks than
> the intel. It also had a gig of ram, but clocked at 100, so it was a bit
> handicapped. I guess I went for more "bang for the buck" than outright
> performance. To get the same performance from Intel, the ram would have cost
> more than the PC.

512 MB DDR's cost about $100 a piece. You went to the wrong place.
Circuit City sells the board I mentioned for $140. It can be had
from a distributor for $90. I can undersell CC and still make $.

I won't post uP prices publicly. They change faster then RAM or gas.

1974. Re: More Ideas to eliminate CB intruders on 10m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 05:00:40 UTC
From: AB2HR <ab2hr@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <kd4h4vgmcl9tg1ujhcnq1lk1u2tmgs6bji@4ax.com>
Source record: 61057

On Mon, 10 Feb 2003 19:46:46 -0500, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote:

>KB9TMP wrote:
>
>>
>> I seem to remember a posting somewhere here that the person emailed
>> Riley and ask him this question about transmitting on top of "illegal"
>> intrusions into the 10m band and his answer was to go ahead that as
>> long as the other person was "illegal" they weren't considered as
>> communications to be interfered with.
>
>That could mean: 1) It's not illegal, or 2) I would not enforce the
>rules if you do do it.

Riley's position is that it is not possible to interfere with an
illegal signal.
Raymond Sirois AB2HR
SysOp: The Lost Chord BBS
607-733-5745
telnet://thelostchord.dns2go.com:6000

1975. Re: More Ideas to eliminate CB intruders on 10m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 05:04:02 UTC
From: AB2HR <ab2hr@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <9g4h4vobk47irv2pam9sj8a97feu16veia@4ax.com>
Source record: 61058

On Mon, 10 Feb 2003 21:40:22 -0000, "Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now>
wrote:

>JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in news:3E47F0AF.2010307@mailcity.moc:
>
>>> ï¿½97.101 General standards.
>>> (d) No amateur operator shall willfully or maliciously interfere with
>>> or cause interference to any radio communication or signal.
>>
>>
>> Ok, I will repeat it again, I suggest you call the FCC and ask
>> them. They will tell you a licensed station transmitting on top of
>> an unlicensed station is not considered interference.
>>
>>
>____
>
>Ok, lets say you're an actual judge, sitting in a court of law.
>Which of the following would guide you in your decision?
>
>1. Rules and/or laws written and documented in the Code of Federal
>Regulations?
>-or-
>2. What someone at the FCC said on the phone?
>
>Fill in the blank. 1.___ 2.___
>
>Grades will be posted for all to see.

So what're ya saying, Bill? If we hear a bunch of roger beeps and
"10-4 Good Buddy" going on in AM on the lower 300 of 10, we should
just stand aside and let them use our frequency allocation for their
illegal operations?

Raymond Sirois AB2HR
SysOp: The Lost Chord BBS
607-733-5745
telnet://thelostchord.dns2go.com:6000

1976. Re: More Ideas to eliminate CB intruders on 10m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 05:27:41 UTC
From: "Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now>
Message-ID: <Xns931EDA5194161pookster@216.168.3.50>
Source record: 61059

AB2HR <ab2hr@arrl.net> wrote in news:9g4h4vobk47irv2pam9sj8a97feu16veia@4ax.com:

> So what're ya saying, Bill? If we hear a bunch of roger beeps and
> "10-4 Good Buddy" going on in AM on the lower 300 of 10, we should
> just stand aside and let them use our frequency allocation for their
> illegal operations?
>
>

No, I think you should hunt them down and kill them. Do it in a particularly gruesome way that makes the 11 o'clock news and that should scare all future miscreants off. At your trial, Riley will testify in your favor and you will be acquitted.

Or you could just jam the living s*** out of them like you're itching to. Jamming usually makes the recipient realize he's made a terrible mistake and QRT, right?

And if you believe that last part, I have a bridge, etc, etc.

IOW pal, the cure for this problem ain't that simple.

--
Bill, W7TI

1977. Re: Getting old call sign back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 05:28:59 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.ha48o40.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 61060

On 10 Feb 2003 08:47:01 -0800, Brian Kelly wrote:

>"Clerical mistake" . . right . . same kinda "clerical accident" which
>got Joe Hertzberg K3JH decades before anybody else had vanity
>callsigns. Look up W3DW in QRZ.

Look up Richard Zeigler in the FBI's records - Dick lost his job at Gettysburg and was sentenced in Federal court for selling call signs in the mid-70s. That's when the "sequential call sign" ssystem was imposed, 20 years ot so before the present system "vanity" call signs were instututed as a source of revenue.

Remember, though, that there was a "pre-vanity-call" program in the 60s and 70s of issuing a 1x2 to Amateur Extra Class license holders who were licensed for 25 years or more. At first it was the next 1x2 in line. Then they started a "choose your own call" from a self-supplied list of calls. That's how I got my former 1x2 (N6SP) in 1977 which I traded in for my original 1X3 call when the "vanity" program opened 20 years or so later.

The one person who could have explained the circumstances about reissuing the deceased's call in question was Darlene Reeder, who took Dick's place in Gettysburg. She retired last month after 40 years with the FCC. so I guess that we just live with it.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1978. Re: More Ideas to eliminate CB intruders on 10m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 05:35:30 UTC
From: Randy <rchapman8@houston.rr.REMOVEcom>
Message-ID: <CY%1a.27122$%U2.2120407@twister.austin.rr.com>
Source record: 61061
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Scott" <scott@scotti.sh!t> wrote in message
news:fsacnYIX75bcHNWjXTWcpw@comcast.com...
>
>
> Randy wrote:
> >
> > "Scott" <scott@scotti.sh!t> wrote in message
> > news:NGKdnXLkkotM_tWjXTWcow@comcast.com...
> > > Did you know that Windows 3.1/95/98/ME can only access 512 MB?
> > > If you have more then that, remove the excess. Your video card
> > > will suddenly work!!!
> > >
> > > Windows NT/2K/XP use a different memory model and can access
> > > more then 512 MB.
> > >
> > > I have 768 MB in this 2K box. 1 GB in the 2.4 GHZ XP box I
> > > just built for a friend. Intel 2.4/D845EBG2 motherboard.
> > > Damn it's fast! XP loads in 7 seconds after the beep.
> >
> > Both of my networked machines have 1 gig apiece. Both are now AMD after
> > being an Intel fan for years and supporting them with both mouth and
> > pocketbook.
> > Just retired the Intel 1.7 gig p4 in favor of an AMD XP2000 and XP2400
for
> > my machines. Intel had SDRam and the two AMD's are using ddr ram, one at
266
> > and the other at 400. Both post significantly higher on all benchmarks
than
> > the intel. It also had a gig of ram, but clocked at 100, so it was a bit
> > handicapped. I guess I went for more "bang for the buck" than outright
> > performance. To get the same performance from Intel, the ram would have
cost
> > more than the PC.
>
>
> 512 MB DDR's cost about $100 a piece. You went to the wrong place.
> Circuit City sells the board I mentioned for $140. It can be had
> from a distributor for $90. I can undersell CC and still make $.
>
> I won't post uP prices publicly. They change faster then RAM or gas.

That is what I paid for the ram for both machines, due to time diff.

1979. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 05:44:06 UTC
From: Lloyd <Lloyd@LloydandHerbareNrOne.com>
Message-ID: <b2a2i1$c53$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 61062

The ARRL continues to spew fiction about "glorious and
important" valuable ham radio operations in selected
emergencies. The league has been living in a dream world
since the 1960s incentive licensing flap. Their only purpose now
is to preserve and protect their own worthless jobs.

Been to any hamfests recently? They are a target rich
environment for psychology students studying abnormal
psychology and mental health issues.

Lloyd

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030210195449.04050.00000263@mb-bh.aol.com...
> From article
> http://www.msnbc.com/news/869906.asp
>
> " ACCORDING TO THE national membership association for amateur radio, the
> American Radio Relay League (ARRL), ham radio volunteers are currently
> assisting federal, state and local officials and relief organizations in
Texas
> in their search for shuttle Columbia debris and the remains of the crew
> members. "
>
> I did not hear any mention of Ham (or amateur) radio operators, in regard
to
> the Columbia recovery, in the news. Not one. I guess ARRL is the "inside"
news
> organization.
>
> "Ham radio has proven to be the only reliable communications options
during the
> recovery effort,"
> ...
> "The communications systems used by other federal and state organizations
> cannot penetrate 'The Pine Curtain' as we know it in East Texas," he said.
"The
> dense forests and hilly terrain just swallow up most radio traffic, and
even
> county sheriff and county fire department radio systems have serious blind
> spots."
>
> Hype.
>
> If you look more closely, this actually supports removing amateur radio

> privileges (to get rid of those serious "blind spots"). Not good for
amateur
> radio.
>
> "Three of the Columbia astronauts were licensed amateur radio operators."
>
> Irrelevant. In any group, some of them may have amateur radio licenses.
Just
> because they happen to have licenses, does not support the claim. It was
part
> of their work anyway.
>
> ---
-
> "Even astronaut hopeful Lance Bass of 'N Sync is a ham - KG4UYY."
>
> I doubt it. Why does this celebrity not proclaim he is a Ham in public?
>
>
>
>
>

1980. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 05:46:08 UTC
From: "Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now>
Message-ID: <Xns931EDD725AABCpookster@216.168.3.50>
Source record: 61063

"Lloyd" <Lloyd@LloydandHerbareNrOne.com> wrote in news:b2a2i1$c53$0
@pita.alt.net:

> The ARRL continues to spew fiction about "glorious and
> important" valuable ham radio operations in selected
> emergencies. The league has been living in a dream world
> since the 1960s incentive licensing flap. Their only purpose now
> is to preserve and protect their own worthless jobs.
>
> Been to any hamfests recently? They are a target rich
> environment for psychology students studying abnormal
> psychology and mental health issues.
>
> Lloyd
>

I hate it when someone criticizes the hobby I love and is exactly on
target. Damn.

--
Bill, W7TI

1981. Re: More Ideas to eliminate CB intruders on 10m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 05:57:37 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E4890D0.8080903@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 61066
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Tom Sevart wrote:
> "JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> news:3E47F0AF.2010307@mailcity.moc...
>
>>
>>Ok, I will repeat it again, I suggest you call the FCC and ask
>>them. They will tell you a licensed station transmitting on top of
>>an unlicensed station is not considered interference.
>>
>
>
> I doubt it. Just because you might think that a station on X frequency may
> be unlicensed doesn't mean that the station isn't licensed. That
> foriegn-speaking person on the CW subband just might be a licensed ham in a
> country that has voice priviliges there. Or, there are a lot of frequencies
> where amateur use is shared with other services where amateurs have a
> secondary use of the frequency.

It is obvious to any moron when you hear English transmissions,
especially below 28.3, on AM, that never ID and use all the cb
lingo, including the vulgarities, that they are not licensed hams.
A lot of them are truckers illegally using 10 meters.

> I doubt the FCC would tell you it's OK to try to jam or otherwise interfere
> with another station because you think it's there illegally.

I have had the FCC tell me exactly that it is OK, they have no
concerns about hams interfering with these unlicensed stations on
10 meters. There take is you can't interfere with a station that
has no right to transmit on those frequencies, since they are not
licensed any transmission on top of them by any station licensed
to use the frequencies is not considered interference.

1982. Re: More Ideas to eliminate CB intruders on 10m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 06:17:21 UTC
From: Tom Sevart <n2uhcNOSPAM@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <b2a4fm$19v672$1@ID-52518.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 61064
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:3E47F0AF.2010307@mailcity.moc...
>
>
> Ok, I will repeat it again, I suggest you call the FCC and ask
> them. They will tell you a licensed station transmitting on top of
> an unlicensed station is not considered interference.
>

I doubt it. Just because you might think that a station on X frequency may be unlicensed doesn't mean that the station isn't licensed. That foriegn-speaking person on the CW subband just might be a licensed ham in a country that has voice priviliges there. Or, there are a lot of frequencies where amateur use is shared with other services where amateurs have a secondary use of the frequency.

I doubt the FCC would tell you it's OK to try to jam or otherwise interfere with another station because you think it's there illegally.

Tom

1983. Re: Getting old call sign back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 06:22:41 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3E4896B1.F4C03022@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 61065

DaveH wrote:

> I've done some searching, but can't find an answer to this question.
>
> I was issued WA3URR in 1974, but stupidly let my license expire.
>
> After re-testing back up to Extra class, I received KA3STE--OK but it
> isn't me!
>
> Will the FCC re-issue original call signs? I did a search and WA3URR
> is not currently issued.

They have a vanity callsign program. But there's a fee involved, on the order of $15 per ten years. You can ask for WA3URR, also if you want try for WA3U, WA3R, W3UR, or W3RR, or WU3R. WR3R. You'd then have an "extra" style call that retains some of the "flavor" of your old call.

I was issued WA2ISE back in 1976. I think that they were recycling calls back then, as my father got WB2JIA in 1972.

1984. Re: FCC Fees

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 09:13:34 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b2b29432anc@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 61079

Thanks for the compliment. I started the thread after a discussed ensued recently on that very same topic and I thought it may provide for a decent new thread. Tired of the same old morse debate....

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

(snippage)
> >
> >
>
> I don't think so just because then the FCC would be
> able to "find" enforcement problems that don't matter
> much and make money off of them. Kind of like the
> small town speed trap that generates money for the
> town. OTOH that might just be what's needed to
> clean up the "freeband" & 11 meter problems ;^)
>
> BTW I like your "CW" message!
> --
> '73' From KB9TMP
> "The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
> if you can fake that, you've got it made."
> -Groucho Marx
>
>
>

1985. Re: Getting old call sign back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 09:17:20 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b2b29542anc@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 61083

Larry... there is a link on the QRZ site where you/they could find out if it is available. I am offline right now as I respond to this so I can't check, but they list either callsigns totally available and another page lists callsigns getting close to getting over the 2 year waiting period. If I remember when I get home and online, I will check and post a link here.... :)

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030208225508.08747.00000534@mb-cg.aol.com...
> In article
<57C7FA5930616060.09C035F7088B4388.B256AC75093257C8@lp.airnews.net>,
> DaveH <ddhartwick@NO_SPAMearthlink.net> writes:
>
> >Larry,
> >I've had a good search through VanityHQ and can't find where the
> >availability of WA3URR is addressed.
>
> Dave:
>
> I simply plugged "WA3URR" in to the call sign search window at qrz.com,
> and it came back as not being found in the database. Since the database
> comes from the FCC, and is updated regularly, I just naturally ass-u-&-me
> that the call is available at this time. Most Vanity call sign sites
usually
> don't provide listings of 2x3 calls available, therefore the
> process-of-elimination
> method is the usual way of telling whether or not a specific call is
available.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

1986. Re: ID???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 09:25:15 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b2b29552anc@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 61081

Just ID when making the initial contact with others, as they need to know who is calling them unless you know them, and every ten minutes and the end of the communication.

Examples:

W7xxx CALLING W8yyy
or
W7xxx FOR W8yyy
or
W8yyy FROM W7xxx
or simply
W8yyy, W8yyy W7xxx

At the ten minute time, just state your callsign. FOR ID is not necessary to state, but some do, some don't.

At the end of the conversation or calling a person, adding clear is not necessary but more of a semantical choice by some. Just stating your callsign covers it otherwise.

Have fun,
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

"YoYo" <Repeat@Anon.com> wrote in message news:b258mt$5e7$0@pita.alt.net...
> Should I ID now or wait? If I give my call as per FCC rules, is that enough
> or should I ID and say, "W7xxx for ID"?
> Only the no-coders know for sure.
>
>

1987. Re: OT - was Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 10:00:42 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b2b29662anc@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 61082

Regarding the age thingy.... as long as they are literate enough to read and understand enough of the material to pass the tests, I guess any age is cool. If the person is under say, 10 years old, and is sucessful at passing, and has at least a basic understanding, they ought to be applauded, as they are the exception to most of the youth out there.

As far as those between 10-18 years old..... If they, with all of the competition for their time, become interested, get involved, study and successfully pass the tests, they should be applauded as well. With sports and many other (good and bad) things out there to take as much of their schedule, it seems to me that any kid getting involved in ham radio is not going to the "problematic" kids of today, but more like the educationally gifted (nerds and other introverts), not the rap music loving/drug doing/other criminal acts type that seem to be the representative people in the eyes of today's old farts.

If a kid (whatever the definition of a kid) wants to get into ham radio, dammit, we should encourage them!!
And cultivate them into the hams that we want them to be! Then if we mold them the way we want to see ham radio going (insert favorite issue here) then we have truly created a positive future for the hobby.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

1988. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 10:05:13 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b2b29872anc@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 61085

So Mike..... based on the below statement, would you say that he is a
"Master Baiter?"

Sorry.... ya left that one WIDE OPEN! :)

Ryan KC8PMX

> I think his interest is as a master fisherman, trolling, trolling,
> trolling. Otherwise intelligent members of the group are happy to
> oblige. I think he has just found a place where the fishin's easy and
> the fish always rise to the bait.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>
>

1989. Re: Montana and Florida

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 10:11:03 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b2b29982anc@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 61086

Feel free to ship or divert any snowfalls to Michigan, especially the middle
and lower parts of the lower peninsula! :)

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0302070613.5df3d591@posting.google.com...
> "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<b1tt103285n@enews2.newsguy.com>...
> > Jeeesh.... wish we had that much snow.... we may be lucky if we had 8
> > separate 1" snowfalls here in Mid-Michigan!!!!!
>
> We got about 5 inches of new snow overnight. Went for a pre-dawn run
> (about 2-1/2 miles) in the stuff about 5 AM. Wonderful time.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

1990. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 10:29:48 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b2b29b92anc@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 61087

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:b1si2bkot1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
> news:b1rahd7q05@enews3.newsguy.com...
> > I do not support any measure of registration for ham gear in the manner
> > similar to the way guns are registered but I do support any legislation
> > supporting the sale of transmitting equipment to those that hold the
> > appropriate licensure for that equipment. (I said transmitting, not
> > recieving equipment)
>
> So you would not want me to sell my current rig unless I check the
> license of the person buying it?

In an ideal world, yes. Real world dictates most likely not.....

>
> > IMHO, I think places like Radio Shack should have to ask for your
license
> > before you are allowed to purchase transmitting equipment. There
> definitely
> > needs to be done with the sale of amateur equipment to non-licensed
> persons.
> > (reference the problem with 10 meters for starters.)
>
> So when I was a teenager, I shouldn't have been allowed to purchase the
> transmitter that I saved up for while studying for my license?

My guess is that when you were a kid, the CB issue was not existant or less
of a problem as it is today. That is merely a guess as to your age, as you
may be only a couple of years older than me or may have 30-40 on me, or
anywhere inbetween. Heard of using lay-a-way programs? Perfect way to save
up for a piece of equipment while waiting. What good is the transmitter if
you can't use it yet due to the lack of license? Now a reciever would serve
more purpose in that waiting time.

>
> > If this is not the answer, what is? What allows us to normally
purchase
> > stuff we have a right to, by licensure, but keeps the transmitting
> equipment
> > out of the hands of unlicensed persons??
>
> You don't need a license to buy a car?

Well.... ya got me there..... sort of. Let me know when you can transmit on
the ham bands with that car (less QRM created by it)

>
> > A better way I would like to see
> > this thread go.... Maybe there might actually be some positive
> suggestions.
>
> The whole concept of requiring a license to purchase, and/or
> registration of transmitting equipment is just a beaurocratic
> impossibility (IMHO)...for no other reason than the fact that
> there must be hundreds of thousands of rigs out there
> already that can be and are bought/sold through many
> non-commercial venues (classifieds, ebay, flea markets, etc.)

Again Bill... then what is the answer of keeping the people who have not
earned a license for the appropriate bands or services, off the air?
Referencing the ten meter problem for example.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

1991. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 11:05:49 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b2b29c02anc@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 61088

Agreed, the "use 'em or lose 'em" philosophy. It is actually kinda crappy
that people treat 10 and 6 (for example) as only good when there is a band
opening. I have personally heard or conversed with up to a 75 mile distance
(on 6) before when there WASNT a band opening.

> The real answer would be to fill the spectrum with 'use' to
> the point the illegals COULDN'T use it. Look at 75/80
> meters, even if you do have a license it's hard to find a
> free spot to use. If the lower portion of 10 meters was
> being used that way the "freebanders" would just about
> disappear from there.

Then make the FCC do some
> more enforcement in the 26.0 - 26.9 MHz and 27.5 -
> 28.0 MHz area to slow down all the "freeband" crap!

That is definitely a dream there! :) Maybe if they had more funding to do
so, that could happen???
>
> The only way I would approve of the radio registration
> at point of sale would be if ALL amateur radio equipment
> was excluded and just business radio buyers be tracked.
> That "might" slow down the number of business frequencies
> being used by non-licensed users, but I wouldn't hold my
> breath on that one!

Track all of them I say (or none at all being the only two options) both
business, public safety, ham etc. When I stated about the retailers like
Radio Shack (for example) merely showing the ham license would suffice, as
far as them recording any of what is on the face of the license is a
different arguement.

Who knows what the solution is. We have a problem in the radio spectrum, we
know it, and aren't willing to do a damned thing except complain about
it..... Guess I am living in "idealistic dream world" if expected any
positive change.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

1992. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 11:10:21 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b2b29c12anc@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 61080

Shoot... I have a HP laser printer that someone threw out and it was only a small part that needed to be replaced!!!! Now I have a nice laser printer!! About 1/12 the cost of a toner cartridge!!!!

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

> I refer to it as "Radio Recycling". Quite amazing what people throw
> out, and what they hang on to.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

1993. Re: The coders embarrass themselves on 14.275 MHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 11:15:37 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b2b29e22anc@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 61084
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

<major snippage>
>
> I myself don't use "destinated" or "KB9TMP for ID" but I do use
> the QSY and some other "Q" signals. It just seems shorter to say
> "KB9TMP QSY to 146.58" than it does to say "KB9TMP switching
> frequencies to 146.58". I also do a lot of "public safety" type radio
> comms and the use of "10" codes are a large part of that, just like
> "Q" codes are a part of the ARS.
>

For the most part neither do I use those as listed in the first sentence. I am also in the public safety family and sometimes, especially if you are tired, accidentally mixing up the two. This just happened the other day while on the way back from a fire, and I cleared my rig and almost said my ham callsign, but bit my tongue before I got anything more than the K in my callsign out and quickly said instead "1130 clear."
Whhhhhooooopppssss!!! :)

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

1994. Re: More Ideas to eliminate CB intruders on 10m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 12:25:33 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030211072533.12173.00000505@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 61067

In article <9g4h4vobk47irv2pam9sj8a97feu16veia@4ax.com>, AB2HR <ab2hr@arrl.net>
writes:

>On Mon, 10 Feb 2003 21:40:22 -0000, "Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now>
>wrote:
>
>>JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in news:3E47F0AF.2010307@mailcity.moc:
>>
>>>> ï¿½97.101 General standards.
>>>> (d) No amateur operator shall willfully or maliciously interfere with
>>>> or cause interference to any radio communication or signal.
>>>
>>>
>>> Ok, I will repeat it again, I suggest you call the FCC and ask
>>> them. They will tell you a licensed station transmitting on top of
>>> an unlicensed station is not considered interference.
>>>
>>>
>>>>_____
>>
>>Ok, lets say you're an actual judge, sitting in a court of law.
>>Which of the following would guide you in your decision?
>>
>>1. Rules and/or laws written and documented in the Code of Federal
>>Regulations?
>>-or-
>>2. What someone at the FCC said on the phone?
>>
>>Fill in the blank. 1.___ 2.___
>>
>>Grades will be posted for all to see.

Let's consider that question a bit.

How is a licensed ham going to wind up in court for allegedly jamming an
illegal signal? Is a freebander going to actually get a day in court to argue
that even though they were operating an illegal transmitter on an unauthorized
frequency in a method that violated several FCC rules, the freebander was
harmed by interference?

It's my understanding that 28.0-29.7 is worldwide exclusive amateur, so the
question of other services does not apply as it would on, say, 30 or 40 meters.
>
>So what're ya saying, Bill? If we hear a bunch of roger beeps and
>"10-4 Good Buddy" going on in AM on the lower 300 of 10, we should

>just stand aside and let them use our frequency allocation for their
>illegal operations?
>
Record & report to FCC. They're complaint-driven.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1995. Re: ID???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 12:47:52 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302110447.5cd340f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61068

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030210233220.10901.00000555@mb-dh.aol.com>...
> In article <b258mt$5e7$0@pita.alt.net>, "YoYo" <Repeat@Anon.com> writes:
>
> >Should I ID now or wait? If I give my call as per FCC rules, is that enough
> >or should I ID and say, "W7xxx for ID"?
> >Only the no-coders know for sure.
>
> When I'm having a QSO on 2-meters, and I hear someone ID and say "For ID," I
> occasionally say, "This is K3LT, and if anyone I'm communicating with doesn't
> know why I said that, they'd better give up their license!"
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Fer sher.

1996. Re: Getting old call sign back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 13:21:00 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0302110521.643b1010@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61069

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0302100847.5865be30@posting.google.com>...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030210063633.27873.00000540@mb-mj.aol.com>...
> > > (3) pretty much says it all, about reassigning an S-K's call. Two year wait
> > > unless you're a close relative and can provide documentation.
> > >
> > > Perhaps just a clerical mistake at FCC. How long since he passed away?
> >
> > He passed away maybe three years ago and his callsign was reissued
> > within months after his passing. His XYL did not inform the FCC of his
> > passing.
> >
> > "Clerical mistake" . . right . . same kinda "clerical accident" which
> > got Joe Hertzberg K3JH decades before anybody else had vanity
> > callsigns. Look up W3DW in QRZ.

I did - and there's more odd stuff going on there.

QRZ and ARRL databases both agree on issue date of June 4, 1999, which agrees with an SK of about three years ago. But the expiration date is in 2006, which doesn't make any sense because a vanity callsign issue automatically causes a 10 year renewal. (FCC does it that way so the fee isn't pro-rated. Vanity callsign issue is the one way to get a renewal outside of the 90 day window. Moving and upgrading don't do it anymore).

So the vanity callsign must have been issued back in 1996?

Seems to me that what's needed here is a paper or CD-ROM Callbook to check up on who held what call when.

Besides Phil's account of the Ziegler callsign-selling case, there have been FCC errors in assigning ham calls. I know of at least one documented case where FCC issued the same call to two different hams. These two hams, at first unaware of each other, actually had a QSO and sent each other QSLs. (musta been a bit tense!) FCC rectified the problem.

Whether something's rotten in Gettysburg or whether it's an honest mistake, the reissue contradicts FCC's own rules. Could it be...they made a mistake, even though we are constantly reminded that FCC is "the expert agency charged with regulating all of civilian radio"? And if FCC made one mistake....could there be others??

The mind reels.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1997. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 14:04:18 UTC
From: Janet <janet11@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <agvh4v8ag320rpf57j3os102nalon2uk5j@4ax.com>
Source record: 61072

On Tue, 11 Feb 2003 00:44:06 -0500, "Lloyd" <Lloyd@LloydandHerbareNrOne.com>
wrote:

> The ARRL continues to spew fiction about "glorious and
>important" valuable ham radio operations in selected
>emergencies. The league has been living in a dream world
>since the 1960s incentive licensing flap.

Obviously you weren't working in east texas during the last week. I was. Along with many other ham volunteers.

And of course the news wasn't picking this up. We're a support function, not the 'front lines'. And that's how it should be. There weren't big articles about what the Salvation Army or Red Cross were doing there. There weren't big articles about the highway patrol. But the National Guard search team I was was with also included a highway patrolman.

"glorious", no. But important? Yes. We were wanted and useful. Can't beat that! Even when teams had cell phones, what happened?

If the search organizers needed to contact all the search teams, net control could put one call out via ham radio and all hams would then confirm they received it individually. For 20 teams, this took about 5-10 mins max. But when contacting teams via cell phone, let's see. Most cell systems didn't work in San Augustine. And those that did were picky about where they worked. Walk a few feet and they were silent. And the person with a cell phone tended to put it in a pocket or pack and not notice when it rang. 4 hours later, many of those search teams without a ham still hadn't received the change of search protocols.

No, "ham radio" isn't the critical thing here. It was just that our "job" there was communications. We paid attention to it. We listened. And when there was something important to pass on, we did it.

In this case, there's nothing the national/local news would even bother to pick up. So it's nice that the ARRL DOES try to get some publicity for things that the hams do that help the public in time of need.

It's funny. One of the guys on my search team told me they thought that ham radio was only for 'old guys' and wasn't worth much in this modern world. He told me he couldn't believe how wrong he was (*grin*).

Janet
WB9ZPH

1998. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 14:04:51 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030211090451.23989.00000284@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 61070

>Subject: Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 2/10/03 6:54 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030210195449.04050.00000263@mb-bh.aol.com>

Once again, Vipul the Imputzable tries to "support" Amateur Radio with another dazzling display of ignorance and stupidity.

>I did not hear any mention of Ham (or amateur) radio operators, in regard to
>the Columbia recovery, in the news. Not one. I guess ARRL is the "inside"
>news
>organization.

HEY BLOCKHEAD! "MSNBC" >>IS<< the news! It's an affiliate of MSN and NBC networks.

>"The communications systems used by other federal and state organizations
>cannot penetrate 'The Pine Curtain' as we know it in East Texas," he said.
>"The
>dense forests and hilly terrain just swallow up most radio traffic, and even
>county sheriff and county fire department radio systems have serious blind
>spots."
>
>Hype.

">>HYPE<<"...?!?! What complete and utter ignorance brings you to THIS conclusion...?!?! when were YOU in east Texas and made an assessment of the terrain from which to draw this conclusion?

>If you look more closely, this actually supports removing amateur radio
>privileges (to get rid of those serious "blind spots"). Not good for amateur
>radio.

And I bet if we look real closely we can find a trace of >>HUMAN<< DNA in your genetics, Vipul, but I really don't care to strain THAT hard.

Again, from WHAT passage in that report do you come to the conclusion that this article even REMOTELY suggests that Amateurs have privileges removed...?!?!

>"Three of the Columbia astronauts were licensed amateur radio operators."
>
>Irrelevant.

Now I've seen it all. Only the most ignorant of the ignorant would consider Amateur Radio operators on the Shuttle "irrelevent" in a newsgroup about Amateur Radio in a thread about Amateur Radio operators that were killed

on a shuttle.

>"Even astronaut hopeful Lance Bass of 'N Sync is a ham - KG4UYY."
>
>I doubt it. Why does this celebrity not proclaim he is a Ham in public?

You "doubt" it..?!!? What...QRZ and Buckmaster won't work in MA..?

Vipul, your posts have gone from "dubiously uninformed" to downright stupid. It's no wonder that you can't find anyone in the NE Corridor to "play" Ham Radio with...You're an idiot ! ! ! !

Steve

1999. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 14:11:33 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030211091133.23989.00000285@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 61071

>Subject: Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery
>From: "Bill, W7TI" jamspam@upyours.now
>Date: 2/10/03 11:46 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <Xns931EDD725AABCpookster@216.168.3.50>
>
>"Lloyd" <Lloyd@LloydandHerbareNrOne.com> wrote in news:b2a2i1$c53$0
>@pita.alt.net:
>
>> The ARRL continues to spew fiction about "glorious and
>> important" valuable ham radio operations in selected
>> emergencies. The league has been living in a dream world
>> since the 1960s incentive licensing flap. Their only purpose now
>> is to preserve and protect their own worthless jobs.
>>
>> Been to any hamfests recently? They are a target rich
>> environment for psychology students studying abnormal
>> psychology and mental health issues.
>>
>> Lloyd
>>
>____
>
>I hate it when someone criticizes the hobby I love and is exactly on
>target. Damn.

"On target"...?!?!

Oh...Wait a minute...Bill is from California.

Never mind. That explains it all.

Steve

2000. Re: More Ideas to eliminate CB intruders on 10m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 14:20:08 UTC
From: Scott <scott@scotti.sh!t>
Message-ID: <knedndiPUZkEm9SjXTWcqg@comcast.com>
Source record: 61073
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

JJ wrote:

> I have had the FCC tell me exactly that it is OK, they have no
> concerns about hams interfering with these unlicensed stations on
> 10 meters. _Their_ take is you can't interfere with a station that
> has no right to transmit on those frequencies, since they are not
> licensed any transmission on top of them by any station licensed
> to use the frequencies is not considered interference...

...as long as that use is legal and by the book.

2001. Re: N4FZ on 14.313 this afternoon

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 14:36:09 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <tT72a.1863$rE3.1198@nwrddc01.gnilink.net>
Source record: 61074

"Ed Norton" <haaaynorton@aol.comnojunk> wrote in message
news:20030209163717.11231.00000544@mb-cl.aol.com...
> I heard that "Festering Zit" N4FZ on .313 this afternoon, then the qrm'ers
> started in with the music.....john da blabtist was complaining.....That
> sanctimonious piece of shit didn't mind it when those jamming tapes he made for
> the Stumpjumpers were being used in that manner. What a two faced piece of
> shit!
>
> Ed Norton

But Ed, tell us how you really feel. :-)

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

2002. Re: More Ideas to eliminate CB intruders on 10m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 14:48:55 UTC
From: Tom Sevart <n2uhcNOSPAM@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <b2b2et$1ag49s$1@ID-52518.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 61075
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:3E4890D0.8080903@mailcity.moc...

> I have had the FCC tell me exactly that it is OK, they have no
> concerns about hams interfering with these unlicensed stations on
> 10 meters. There take is you can't interfere with a station that
> has no right to transmit on those frequencies, since they are not
> licensed any transmission on top of them by any station licensed
> to use the frequencies is not considered interference.

Which official did you speak with?

Tom

2003. Re: Getting old call sign back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 14:49:13 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0302110649.713eb8f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61076

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.ha48o40.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> On 10 Feb 2003 08:47:01 -0800, Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> >"Clerical mistake" . . right . . same kinda "clerical accident" which
> >got Joe Hertzberg K3JH decades before anybody else had vanity
> >callsigns. Look up W3DW in QRZ.
>
> Look up Richard Zeigler in the FBI's records - Dick lost his job at
> Gettysburg and was sentenced in Federal court for selling call signs
> in the mid-70s. That's when the "sequential call sign" ssystem was
> imposed, 20 years ot so before the present system "vanity" call
> signs were instututed as a source of revenue.
> Remember, though, that there was a "pre-vanity-call" program in the
> 60s and 70s of issuing a 1x2 to Amateur Extra Class license holders
> who were licensed for 25 years or more.

I don't know when Joe Hertzberg was first licensed or what his
callsign was then but he was probably licensed in the '30s based on
his having led a bunch of antenna R&D at M.I.T. during WW2. When I
first met him in the late '50s he already had K3JH which is obviously
a vanity callsign issued well before any published vanity callsign
programs appeared. Joe just happened to be the VP who ran the huge RCA
gummint contracting empire from Camden NJ and was one of Sarnoff's
close-in buddies. I suspect his callsign was the result of engaging a
bit "suction" in the right places. No big deal, nobody dies but I
think it illustrates a point or two, "things" do happen which are "off
the books".

> At first it was the next
> 1x2 in line. Then they started a "choose your own call" from a
> self-supplied list of calls. That's how I got my former 1x2 (N6SP)
> in 1977 which I traded in for my original 1X3 call when the "vanity"
> program opened 20 years or so later.

Comb thru the callbook, submit yer list and wait for the mailman to
drop the new license on ya to find out if ya got yer first choice. I
got my second choice.

> The one person who could have explained the circumstances about
> reissuing the deceased's call in question was Darlene Reeder, who
> took Dick's place in Gettysburg. She retired last month after 40
> years with the FCC. so I guess that we just live with it.

God bless her . . 40 . . whew . . Yes I think we can live with it.

>
> ---
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

w3rv

2004. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 14:51:41 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v4i3fqf30t9095@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 61077

I wonder if Groucho Marx could see into the future?
He seems to be describing Vipul in his quote below.

"He may look like an idiot
and talk like an idiot
but don't let that fool you.
He really is an idiot."
-Groucho Marx
--
'73' From KB9TMP
"Quote me as saying I was misquoted."
-Groucho Marx

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030210193605.04050.00000262@mb-bh.aol.com...
> From K4YZ:
> > So YOUR assumption is that NO ONE knows the material for the tests,
> >Vipul?
> >
> > This means we can safely assume YOU don't know anything either since
YOU
> >are a product of the VE examining process.
>
> The test doesn't prove one learned the material. This does not mean no one
> knows the material.
>
> So, I repeat, passing the General test only proves one learned Morse code.
It
> does not prove higher technical competence (a common rationalization) as
the
> license seems to indicate.
>
> > Having not been there, I cannot say for certain, of course, but I am
> >willing to bet that the complete context was they were not interested in
> >homebrewing projects WITH YOU.
>
> >And you have not provided any evidence that those guys "hated"
> >homebrewing
>
> >SInce you don't name the club, provide any references for us to see, or
> >third parties to verify any of your assertions by, all we have is your
> >sour-grapes whining
>
> This is a good example, because I'm pretty sure about what people in this
club

> are interested in. I could verify my claim, but somehow you would find
fault
> with my methods if the conclusion did not support your beliefs.
>
> >>The phrase "advancement of the radio art" means technical achievement.
> >
> > Oh...?!?! You draw this conclusion based upon WHAT definition from
the
> >FCC
> >or other credible source?
>
> CFR, TITLE 47--TELECOMMUNICATION, PART 97--AMATEUR RADIO SERVICE, Sec.
97.1
> Basis and purpose.
>
> > If they meant NOTHING but advancement of "technical achievement" why
> >didn't they simply SAY that?
>
> "Advancement of the radio art" is listed separately which means its
different
> from those other aspects (also listed) that you mention. Radio "art" means
> technical achievement. Service and international goodwill is listed
separately.
> Notice that trained operators, technicians, electronics experts is also
listed
> separately. Note that electronics expert is not the same as <advancement
of
> the> radio art.
>
> Rationalization also involves changing the definition of words.
>
> > The ANSWER to that, Vipul, is that the "radio art" is MORE than
> >experimentation INSIDE the box...It's how to USE the box too.
>
> Possibly, if you could give an example.
>
> > You have a real problem with NOT talking to the people you have to be
> >face-to-face with, but somehow think that people in this NG give a
> >rat's-kazoo
> >about your local politics, Vipul.
>
> I just remembered, I DID mention in the forum (which gets mailed to every
club
> member), well before they made the decision, what would be a better usage
> rather than the HTs.
>
> > But VIPUL! Just last week you said you WERE a "Ham". What's the
truth?
>
> I am not a "Ham". I am a radio amateur. If I said I was a "Ham", I meant

that
> I was a member of a Ham radio club.
>
> >>No, I mean absurdly false statements or arguments used to support one's
> >>viewpoints.
> > You mean like your really absurd statement above about the
definition of
> >what the "radio art" is?
>
> No, your definition is absurd.
>
> >>One example is that loaner HTs is evidence of "advancement of the
> >>radio art".
> > Your opinion only.
>
> The club stated the goal was to get people on Morse before they otherwise
would
> have. Anyway, the definition of "radio art" was given above. Very commonly
used
> this way, so not my opinion only.
>
> >>I've seen this everywhere.
> > How come no one ELSE sees this, Vipul?
>
> Many others that have seen it, probably left Ham radio, not stayed around.
> There are a few that express similar opinions.
>
> Here, Lenover21 states basically the same thing:
> " Liberals of The Ham are, well, more liberal. They are only
> having their own fun, enjoying a technically challenging
> recreational activity involving radio. They are not slavishly
> tied by conservative bonds. According to extreme
> conservatives these liberals do not have The RIGHT Stuff
> to be worthy of The Ham. Why is that? "
>
> >Amateur Radio as a
> >whole is NOT going to change for YOU!
>
> I may be able to add to the theoretical, but unrealized potential of the
other
> aspects of amateur radio. A few people I have met were interested in
similar
> activities. If I could find such a club, I would join it. Otherwise, once
my
> current situation changes, I may be able to start an amateur radio club
for
> those interests.
>

2005. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 14:59:25 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030211095925.14896.00000202@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 61078

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 2/10/03 6:36 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030210193605.04050.00000262@mb-bh.aol.com>

>>This means we can safely assume YOU don't know anything either since
>YOU
>>are a product of the VE examining process.
>
>The test doesn't prove one learned the material. This does not mean no one
>knows the material.
>
>So, I repeat, passing the General test only proves one learned Morse code. It
>does not prove higher technical competence (a common rationalization) as the
>license seems to indicate.

And >>I<< repeat...Since YOU are a product of the present examining system, we can safely assume that YOU don't know the material...Just memorized the test. Which further leads me to believe that all those Hams in MA, CT, etc that don't want to play homebrewing with you probably figured out you are just trying to ride thier coattails.

Also, the code tests are also pre-prepared, and as such, can be played over and over again until one "gets" a few of the characters, enough to know which test is being used and therefore know which questions to answer. Only in a case where a person fully completes the five minutes of copy is it certain that they really "know" the code.

>This is a good example, because I'm pretty sure about what people in this
>club
>are interested in. I could verify my claim, but somehow you would find fault
>with my methods if the conclusion did not support your beliefs.

You have no idea how I would react if you were to provide names, dates, times of these club meetings and I subsequently attened one and had a chance to see for myself. I can only assume you don't want to reveal the names of these clubs for fear we will get an even more accurate picture of what Vipul Shah really is...Or worse yet, we provide some of your quotes to the members of these clubs so they can see how YOU talk about THEM!

>>Oh...?!?! You draw this conclusion based upon WHAT definition from the
>>FCC
>>or other credible source?
>
>CFR, TITLE 47--TELECOMMUNICATION, PART 97--AMATEUR RADIO SERVICE, Sec. 97.1
>Basis and purpose.

Been there...done that...in no way, shape or form does that paragraph state
that "the radio art" is solely "technical achievement".

>"Advancement of the radio art" is listed separately which means its different
>from those other aspects (also listed) that you mention. Radio "art" means
>technical achievement. Service and international goodwill is listed
>separately.
>Notice that trained operators, technicians, electronics experts is also
>listed
>separately. Note that electronics expert is not the same as <advancement of
>the> radio art.
>
>Rationalization also involves changing the definition of words.

Yes, Vipul, you ARE "rationalizing" here. You are trying to change the
meaning of words to fit YOUR agenda, when YOUR "definition" comes no where near
anything the FCC says in 47CFR97.1.

Really childish attempt, Vipul. Try again later when no one is
looking.....

>> The ANSWER to that, Vipul, is that the "radio art" is MORE than
>>experimentation INSIDE the box...It's how to USE the box too.
>
>Possibly, if you could give an example.

No "possibly" to it.

>> But VIPUL! Just last week you said you WERE a "Ham". What's the truth?
>
>I am not a "Ham". I am a radio amateur. If I said I was a "Ham", I meant
>that
>I was a member of a Ham radio club.

Uh uh uhhhhhhhh! You said you were a "ham". No changing of the meaning of
words here, Vipul! Your rules! Did you mean it, or not?

>>>No, I mean absurdly false statements or arguments used to support one's
>>>viewpoints.
>> You mean like your really absurd statement above about the definition
>of
>>what the "radio art" is?
>
>No, your definition is absurd.

Oh? You mean almost ninety years of Amateur Radio has been absurd? All
of the achivevements of Amateur Radio before Vipul Shah got a license were
absurd?

>The club stated the goal was to get people on Morse before they otherwise
>would
>have. Anyway, the definition of "radio art" was given above. Very commonly
>used
>this way, so not my opinion only.

Yes, YOUR opinion only, Vipul. I have been an ACTIVE Amateur Radio licensee, probably before you were born, and I ahve NEVER heard of ANY "definintion" of "radio art" to be ONLY "technical achievement".

>>>I've seen this everywhere.
>> How come no one ELSE sees this, Vipul?
>
>Many others that have seen it, probably left Ham radio, not stayed around.
>There are a few that express similar opinions.

Oh...You mean like Lennie the Liar? An alleged electronics engineer who can't keep his stories straight or pass an exam that gradeschoolers pass? Or maybe you mean like Brian, who doesn't know the difference between "permission to operate" and "acceptable for credit". Or we can go REALLY bizzare, and assume you mean Mark Morgan, KB9RQZ...The gay pagan Army Chemical Corps colonel who was drafted...a pretty good trick since he would have been eight years old when the draft was last used in the United States.

So far, you make absolutely assinine assertions that are completely unfounded and unsupported by corroborating evidence or testimony.

>Here, Lenover21 states basically the same thing:...(SNIP)

You really HAVEN'T been paying ATTENTION, have you, Vipul?

Leonard H Anderson, "Lenover21", is a documented pathological liar. He has made hundreds of statements and assertions that have been found to be untruthful. He is NOT an Amateur Radio licensee, does NOT participate in ANY organized Amateur Radio activity, and continues to make blatantly false statements and assertions in THIS forum which he refuses to validate.

Is THAT the best you can do for corroborating support for YOUR stuff, Vipul?

When one quotes a KNOWN pathological liar as his source reference, do you know what that does to his OWN credibility, Vipul?

Better wake up and smell the coffee, Vipul.

>I may be able to add to the theoretical, but unrealized potential of the
>other
>aspects of amateur radio

I doubt it. So far you've "dissed" almost every aspect of it and offered nothing in return for your "criticism".

If experimentation is your sole interest, Vipul, just send your Amateur ticket back to Gettysburg, then apply for "experimental" licenses as the need arises...that way no one will mistake you for "one of those hams...".

Steve, K4YZ

2006. Re: More Ideas to eliminate CB intruders on 10m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 15:15:29 UTC
From: cheesecutter@webhideout.com
Message-ID: <fef386d5.0302110715.4c21ac1d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61089
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message news:<3E4890D0.8080903@mailcity.moc>...
> Tom Sevart wrote:
> > "JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> > news:3E47F0AF.2010307@mailcity.moc...
> >
> >>
> >>Ok, I will repeat it again, I suggest you call the FCC and ask
> >>them. They will tell you a licensed station transmitting on top of
> >>an unlicensed station is not considered interference.
> >>
> >
> >
> > I doubt it. Just because you might think that a station on X frequency may
> > be unlicensed doesn't mean that the station isn't licensed. That
> > foriegn-speaking person on the CW subband just might be a licensed ham in a
> > country that has voice priviliges there. Or, there are a lot of frequencies
> > where amateur use is shared with other services where amateurs have a
> > secondary use of the frequency.
>
> It is obvious to any moron when you hear English transmissions,
> especially below 28.3, on AM, that never ID and use all the cb
> lingo, including the vulgarities, that they are not licensed hams.
> A lot of them are truckers illegally using 10 meters.
>
>
> > I doubt the FCC would tell you it's OK to try to jam or otherwise interfere
> > with another station because you think it's there illegally.
>
> I have had the FCC tell me exactly that it is OK, they have no
> concerns about hams interfering with these unlicensed stations on
> 10 meters. There take is you can't interfere with a station that
> has no right to transmit on those frequencies, since they are not
> licensed any transmission on top of them by any station licensed
> to use the frequencies is not considered interference.

hey pinhead........thanks for your contribution...........so hammies
do cause malicious interference.......well i'll be dipped....ain't
that a kick in the pants.??? well since this is cross posted to
policy for some reason.....i would like to say this to the policy
crew....hey guys would you all please come get your terminal
technician class hamsters, put a dunce cap on each of them, make them
stand in the corner for a long time and if they move hit them over the
head with a rolled up newspaper......this bad seed of yours has been

fucking up this newsgroup for about three years now, and it would be appreciated if you guys who claim to police your own do some police work and get these chumps off of here.....thanks.....thanks a lot.....

2007. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 15:26:50 UTC
From: "Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now>
Message-ID: <Xns931F4BC31E415pookster@216.168.3.50>
Source record: 61090

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in
news:20030211091133.23989.00000285@mb-fz.aol.com:

> Oh...Wait a minute...Bill is from California.
>
> Never mind. That explains it all.
>

I *did* go to Iowa once. :-)

--
Bill, W7TI

2008. Re: More Ideas to eliminate CB intruders on 10m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 15:30:36 UTC
From: "Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now>
Message-ID: <Xns931F4C66A6B75pookster@216.168.3.50>
Source record: 61091

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in news:20030211072533.12173.00000505@mb-mr.aol.com:

> Record & report to FCC. They're complaint-driven.
>

That was my point, exactly.

--
Bill, W7TI

2009. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 15:58:51 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030211105851.00111.00001612@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 61092

In article <20030209150931.03943.00000369@mb-fj.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>
>>Lennie -- you're the Wicked Witch of the West -- and the Scarecrow
>>just tossed a bucket of water on you!
>
> In your dreams coachman...this ain't the NFL.
>
> Larrie, you are a bus driver after being summa cum laude
> in personnel management and ex-USAF desk ace who
> shot down officers (according to your own words).

Lennie:

I only "shot down" the officers who needed "shooting down." I had a lot of very close and satisfactory working relationships with officers and Senior NCO's who recognized and appreciated my talents, abilities, and willingness to give my best effort to accomplish the mission. The only ones I had problems with were the ones who were uncomfortable with the fact that I was working rings around them, and making THEM look bad in the process!

> You've
> never done any military or commercial or government radio
> communications on any continuous basis, have no
> expertise in radio except having a lot of certificates and
> fantasizing a lot of hypothetical emergencies. You DO
> have a computer-modem and some experience in that,
> are usually a good typist.
>
> Beyond those narrow boundaries all you have is fantasy
> about radio. You've never been IN any big leagues in
> anything other than the military. Don't run up your little
> flag on the pole because nobody cares to salute it...

I don't "fantasize" about radio whatsoever, Lennie! However, I DO have over two decades of varied experience as an Amateur Radio Operator, and am thus qualified to render my judgments and opinions on topics related to that field. You, OTOH, are definitely NOT! So, why don't you get your ticket, spend a few years on the air, and then come back and try again! You may find some of us a bit more interested in what you have to say!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2010. Re: More Ideas to eliminate CB intruders on 10m

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 16:22:06 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E49232E.90105@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 61095
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

chesseclutter wrote:
> JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message news:<3E4890D0.8080903@mailcity.moc>...
>
>>Tom Sevart wrote:
>>
>>>"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
>>>news:3E47F0AF.2010307@mailcity.moc...
>>>
>>>
>>>>Ok, I will repeat it again, I suggest you call the FCC and ask
>>>>them. They will tell you a licensed station transmitting on top of
>>>>an unlicensed station is not considered interference.
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>I doubt it. Just because you might think that a station on X frequency may
>>>be unlicensed doesn't mean that the station isn't licensed. That
>>>foriegn-speaking person on the CW subband just might be a licensed ham in a
>>>country that has voice priviliges there. Or, there are a lot of frequencies
>>>where amateur use is shared with other services where amateurs have a
>>>secondary use of the frequency.
>>
>>It is obvious to any moron when you hear English transmissions,
>>especially below 28.3, on AM, that never ID and use all the cb
>>lingo, including the vulgarities, that they are not licensed hams.
>>A lot of them are truckers illegally using 10 meters.
>>
>>
>>
>>>I doubt the FCC would tell you it's OK to try to jam or otherwise interfere
>>>with another station because you think it's there illegally.
>>
>>I have had the FCC tell me exactly that it is OK, they have no
>>concerns about hams interfering with these unlicensed stations on
>>10 meters. There take is you can't interfere with a station that
>>has no right to transmit on those frequencies, since they are not
>>licensed any transmission on top of them by any station licensed
>>to use the frequencies is not considered interference.
>
>
>
> hey pinhead........thanks for your contribution...........so hammies
> do cause malicious interference.......well i'll be dipped....ain't

> that a kick in the pants.???

Hey pinhead....a licensed ham transmitting over some clueless cber
like you operating illegally on 10 meters isn't malicious
interference, it isn't even considered interference.

2011. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 16:33:34 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v4i9ernuv0bo06@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 61093

Ryan
The school I work for threw away in the dumpster several PC's.
I salvaged as many as possible and even got several working
again (some already were) I have now donated 3 to our local
ham radio club. http://www.qsl.net/kb9ohy/ One is going to be
used to revive our club's packet station and 2 are going to be
used for logging during Field Day. I've got another one on the
floor of my shack right now looking for a use for it, I'm thinking
SSTV or PSK-31. And I have sold several whole PC's and
even more boxes and parts, just from their disposal of
some "junk".

It always pays to look inside the dumpster when you're
making a drop-off ;^)
--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:b2b29c12anc@enews2.newsguy.com...
> Shoot... I have a HP laser printer that someone threw out and it was only
a
> small part that needed to be replaced!!!! Now I have a nice laser
printer!!
> About 1/12 the cost of a toner cartridge!!!!
>
>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF/MFR
> REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
> --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
> .. --. .... - . .-. ...
>
>
>
> > I refer to it as "Radio Recycling". Quite amazing what people throw
> > out, and what they hang on to.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

>

2012. Re: ID???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 16:51:20 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BA6E9437.E4D6%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 61094

"YoYo" wrote:

> Should I ID now or wait? If I give my call
> as per FCC rules, is that enough or should
> I ID and say, "W7xxx for ID"? Only the
> no-coders know for sure.

That isn't the real question, YoYo. The question raised by some elsewhere (including you, I believe) is whether it is UNACCEPTABLE to add the words "for ID" after the callsign. No, the words "for ID" are not required by FCC rules (and nobody has said they are), but it still remains for you to show it is unacceptable. After all, that is your real premise, isn't it?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2013. Re: New Field Day Entry Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 17:34:48 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0302110934.8e477f8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61096

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3E47CA18.7060001@psu.edu>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:
> > "Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now> wrote in message
news:<Xns931D8151D8BF0pookster@216.168.3.50>...
> >
> >>Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in news:3E46AE95.8070102
> >>@adelphia.net:

> >>>There are 5 pages of rules, the rest is submission and log forms, and
> >>>some Q and A. Is that too complicated?

> >>
> >>Five pages of rules? I think the question is self-answering.

Not too complicated, considering all the ground to be covered. The
rules themselves only take up 3 pages.
> >>
> >>This is a hobby, not a Federal Project.

Tell the hams combing Texas for shuttle parts that "it's a hobby"....

> > Exactly my point.
> >
> > I got to the page which shows the entry summary & submission form and
> > got a massive dose of the giggles, the whole package is Newington's
> > incarnation of the long-form 1040. FAQs and all.

Gotta remember that the 28 page packet is meant to be self-contained.
Log sheets, summary sheets, W1AW schedules and freqs, typical
message-to-the-SCM formats, handouts for the general public,
explanations of basic stuff for the clueless, etc.
> >
> > I'll be in it and yes it will be a contest and it will be fun despite
> > Newington. Whether I'll bother filing their bloated 1040 after it's
> > over is an open question, odds are I won't.

Summary sheet is one page. Entry class, how many contacts per
band/mode, bonuses, signature. Ya don't even hafta send in a complete
log, just a dupe sheet.

> > But maybe if they passed
> > out 100 bonus points for trudging thru it . .
>
>
> Oops, I have to correct myself. There are *3* pages of actual rules.
> Page one is a cover sheet. Page 2 is a rah, rah piece. The actual rules

> don't start until page
>
> Maybe I come from the wrong side of the tracks, but 3 pages of rules
> doesn't seem so bad, especially in light of the different types of
> stations that might participate in FD. In the other party I'm involved
> in, the PAQSO, we work hard at keeping the rules to a single page, but
> the print gets small, and there are constant queries to clarify this or
> expand upon that.

Whole point of FD is "something for everybody" which means lotsa
rules. Can't get away from it. The new Class F will hopefully do two
things:

1) Get more EOCs on-the-air during FD, which is better than having
them gather dust

2) Generate publicity both in the media and among govt. types.

Are either of those a bad thing?
>
> But that is small beans compared to FD.
>
> Here is a challenge. come up with a one page set of rules for FD that
> addresses everything. Just for grins, go ahead and ignore the EC and
> GOTA sections. Make the rules explicit enough that there is no
> questioning them. Encompass all the different modes in use during field day.

On one page? Easy, just use a little tiny font.
>
> Up to it? Obviously you could say any mode, any qso, 1 point. Nothing
> else. But that wouldn't be much of a contest, would it.

Nope. One of the whole points of all those rules is to give lots of
alternative ways to make points so nobody is left out.

I remember when the rules were much simpler. Four entry classes: ABCD.
1 point, any qso any mode. Multiplier for emergency power, small bonus
for message handling, that's it.

Result was that most FD operations consisted of gas engine generators
powering SSB transceivers, some antennas and not much else in the way
of radio stuff. A beginner might get a shot at a rig around 3AM on a
dead band. Satellites? GOTA station? Publicity, natural power, new
modes? Ferget it, no points, not worth the effort.

Having all the catgeories and such is meant to widen the scope of FD.
Not a bad thing.

There's also the perennial problem of folks not understanding the
rules, no matter how clearly they are written.

> A lot of people
> wouldn't care for that. IMO, a home station operating off the mains is
> the same thing as a EC station. So should either of those participate

> (FWIW, I am quite happy with both participating)

Of course! But not against set-up-in-the-field stations. Thus the new
class.

> Others don't like the
> idea, like Larry. So they want clarification. That's why there are
> rules. Some people want extra points to encourage Morse code use.

Phone QSO's are one point, digital/CW two points. Works for me.

> If we
> encourage that one mode, then others want their favorite mode encouraged
> too. On and on.
>
Not a bad thing. The more the merrier. Are we too dumb to understand
three pages of rules? I don't think so.
>
> glad there is something else here to discuss besides Morse and the old
> master fisherman

Heck yes. This morning I was out on the run while the rosy-fingered
dawn was coming up behind the Roxborough antenna farm as I rounder the
turn by the elementary school. Black ice, stiff wind and 28 degrees,
so I'm planning FD and how to get a few more points than last year.
Just inherited a clean but old lapper, might be just the thing for
logging. All there except it needs a battery. Also gotta get practice
with the slingshot/spinning reel antenna launcher setup. FD 2003 will
be #36 for me.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2014. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 17:43:53 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0302110943.37927a89@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61097

vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030210195449.04050.00000263@mb-bh.aol.com>...
> From article
> http://www.msnbc.com/news/869906.asp
>
> " ACCORDING TO THE national membership association for amateur radio, the
> American Radio Relay League (ARRL), ham radio volunteers are currently
> assisting federal, state and local officials and relief organizations in Texas
> in their search for shuttle Columbia debris and the remains of the crew
> members. "
>
> I did not hear any mention of Ham (or amateur) radio operators, in regard to
> the Columbia recovery, in the news. Not one.

Isn't MNSNBC "the news"?

> I guess ARRL is the "inside" news organization.

Is it a bad thing if ARRL can get positive publicity for ham radio?
>
> "Ham radio has proven to be the only reliable communications options during
> the
> recovery effort,"
> ...
> "The communications systems used by other federal and state organizations
> cannot penetrate 'The Pine Curtain' as we know it in East Texas," he said. "The
> dense forests and hilly terrain just swallow up most radio traffic, and even
> county sheriff and county fire department radio systems have serious blind
> spots."
>
> Hype.

Nope - fact.
>
> If you look more closely, this actually supports removing amateur radio
> privileges (to get rid of those serious "blind spots"). Not good for amateur
> radio.

How will removing amateur radio privileges remove the blind spots?
Giving police and fire companies more frequencies won't improve the
coverage.
>
> "Three of the Columbia astronauts were licensed amateur radio operators."
>
> Irrelevant.

Why?

> In any group, some of them may have amateur radio licenses. Just
> because they happen to have licenses, does not support the claim. It was part
> of their work anyway.

Is it a bad thing for astronauts to be hams and have direct contact
with the public via ham radio?
>
> ---
> "Even astronaut hopeful Lance Bass of 'N Sync is a ham - KG4UYY."
>
> I doubt it.

No, it's true. Also Joe Walsh, Patty Loveless, Walter Cronkite, and
many others.

> Why does this celebrity not proclaim he is a Ham in public?

How would you have him do that? Pull out an HT at a concert?

Sorry to bust your bubble, Vipul, but not all hams fit your narrow,
stereotypical view of us.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2015. Re: ID???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 18:57:19 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.ha5iul2.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 61098

On 11 Feb 2003 04:32:20 GMT, Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>When I'm having a QSO on 2-meters, and I hear someone ID and say "For
>ID," I occasionally say, "This is K3LT, and if anyone I'm
>communicating with doesn't know why I said that, they'd better give up
>their license!"

Whereas on the repeater that I usually frequent, when one of the
gab-fest regulars acting as the "timekeeper" says "K7xxx for ID",
that's the trigger for all of us to do an ID, good for another ten
minutes of swapping tall tales.....

Contrary to accusations, there's no "rigid culture" in ham radio....

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2016. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 19:45:17 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0302111145.2cabd27e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61099

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<b2b29c12anc@enews2.newsguy.com>...
> Shoot... I have a HP laser printer that someone threw out and it was only a
> small part that needed to be replaced!!!! Now I have a nice laser printer!!
> About 1/12 the cost of a toner cartridge!!!!

> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF/MFR
> --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
> .. --. .... - . .-. ...

Four years ago, a nearby office got a new computer system. A little
dumpster-diving produced the following:

Seven - 14 inch color VGA monitors, all in working order, with cables
Six - 386 computers in AT-style cases with 200 watt power supplies,
3-1/2" floppy drives, 2 meg of memory, video and network cards,
complete with cables, all in working order.
One - 386 computer in AT-style cases with 235 watt power supply,
3-1/2" floppy drive, 8 meg of memory, video and network cards, 256
meg hard drive, complete with cables, all in working order.

One IBM 4019 laser printer with half-full toner cartridge and all
documentation and cables (!) in working order.

Of course the motherboards, HD and old 30 pin SIMM memory were not of
much use, but the rest of the stuff has been put to all sorts of uses.
Only one of the monitors has failed. The power supplies have turned
out to be not only reliable but very RF-quiet.

Old Yankee proverb: "Use it up, wear it out, make it do, or do
without".

73 de Jim, N2EY

2017. A Question on the US Vanity Callsign Program

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 19:52:23 UTC
From: jim@qrowireless.com
Message-ID: <982cab6d.0302111152.7c238626@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61100

All,

Question on the US Vanity Callsign program.

The current Status of my application is 2 - meaning "Pending Level 2".
Anyone know what this means?

I submitted the application on Jan 29, and I see payment was confirmed on
Jan 30 (used CC online). The applications has spent most of its life in
"Pending Level 2" status. Just curious if anyone has insight as to what
Pending Level 2 is.

Thanks & 73,

Jim

2018. Re: A Question on the US Vanity Callsign Program

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 20:56:12 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.52.0302112036470.201@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 61101

On Tue, 11 Feb 2003, Jim wrote:
>Question on the US Vanity Callsign program.
>
>The current Status of my application is 2 - meaning "Pending Level 2".
>Anyone know what this means?
>
>I submitted the application on Jan 29, and I see payment was confirmed on
>Jan 30 (used CC online). The applications has spent most of its life in
>"Pending Level 2" status. Just curious if anyone has insight as to what
>Pending Level 2 is.

Crude answer: It means shut up and wait.

Nice answer: It means that your application has been received but they haven't run a vanity call processing session since it was received. They don't run these daily.

2019. Re: Getting old call sign back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 22:41:48 UTC
From: Ray Fitz <isphouston@houstoncableisp.net>
Message-ID: <b2bu6f$pa0$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 61102

Zeigler did not sell ALL the call signs he issued. Many call
signs he gave away just for the asking. Lets just say I have first
hand knowledge that he gave many call signs absolutely free of
charge. And you know what? Who really gives a shit anyway?
There are far more important things in the world to worry about!

73,

Ray
Houston TX

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.ha48o40.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On 10 Feb 2003 08:47:01 -0800, Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> >"Clerical mistake" . . right . . same kinda "clerical accident" which
> >got Joe Hertzberg K3JH decades before anybody else had vanity
> >callsigns. Look up W3DW in QRZ.
>
> Look up Richard Zeigler in the FBI's records - Dick lost his job at
> Gettysburg and was sentenced in Federal court for selling call signs
> in the mid-70s. That's when the "sequential call sign" ssystem was
> imposed, 20 years ot so before the present system "vanity" call
> signs were instututed as a source of revenue.
>
> Remember, though, that there was a "pre-vanity-call" program in the
> 60s and 70s of issuing a 1x2 to Amateur Extra Class license holders
> who were licensed for 25 years or more. At first it was the next
> 1x2 in line. Then they started a "choose your own call" from a
> self-supplied list of calls. That's how I got my former 1x2 (N6SP)
> in 1977 which I traded in for my original 1X3 call when the "vanity"
> program opened 20 years or so later.
>
> The one person who could have explained the circumstances about
> reissuing the deceased's call in question was Darlene Reeder, who
> took Dick's place in Gettysburg. She retired last month after 40
> years with the FCC. so I guess that we just live with it.
>
> ---
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>
>

2020. Re: New Field Day Entry Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 23:10:09 UTC
From: "Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now>
Message-ID: <Xns931F9A503AC89pookster@216.168.3.50>
Source record: 61103

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in news:c2356669.0302110934.8e477f8
@posting.google.com:

>> >>Five pages of rules? I think the question is self-answering.
>
> Not too complicated, considering all the ground to be covered. The
> rules themselves only take up 3 pages.
>

Five pages of rules that take up only three pages?

Is this like stuffing ten pounds of you-know-what into a five pound sack?
Or stuffing five sacks into ten pounds? Or ten fives into a sack? Or
sacking out for ten?

My little brain can no longer compute. Thanks, ARRL.

--
Bill, W7TI

2021. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 23:11:31 UTC
From: "Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now>
Message-ID: <Xns931F9A8BAE72pookster@216.168.3.50>
Source record: 61104

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in news:c2356669.0302110943.37927a89
@posting.google.com:

> Is it a bad thing if ARRL can get positive publicity for ham radio?
>

Only when it makes us look self-congratulatory, which it *often* does.

--
Bill, W7TI

2022. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 23:13:57 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302111513.7425cfe0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61105

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030211105851.00111.00001612@mb-mv.aol.com>...
> In article <20030209150931.03943.00000369@mb-fj.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> (Len Over 21) writes:
>
> >
> >>Lennie -- you're the Wicked Witch of the West -- and the Scarecrow
> >>just tossed a bucket of water on you!
> >
> > In your dreams coachman...this ain't the NFL.
> >
> > Larrie, you are a bus driver after being summa cum laude
> > in personnel management and ex-USAF desk ace who
> > shot down officers (according to your own words).
>
> Lennie:
>
> I only "shot down" the officers who needed "shooting down." I had a lot
> of very close and satisfactory working relationships with officers and Senior
> NCO's who recognized and appreciated my talents, abilities, and willingness
> to give my best effort to accomplish the mission. The only ones I had
> problems with were the ones who were uncomfortable with the fact that I
> was working rings around them, and making THEM look bad in the process!
>
> > You've
> > never done any military or commercial or government radio
> > communications on any continuous basis, have no
> > expertise in radio except having a lot of certificates and
> > fantasizing a lot of hypothetical emergencies. You DO
> > have a computer-modem and some experience in that,
> > are usually a good typist.
> >
> > Beyond those narrow boundaries all you have is fantasy
> > about radio. You've never been IN any big leagues in
> > anything other than the military. Don't run up your little
> > flag on the pole because nobody cares to salute it...
>
> I don't "fantasize" about radio whatsoever, Lennie! However, I DO have
> over two decades of varied experience as an Amateur Radio Operator,
> and am thus qualified to render my judgments and opinions on topics
> related to that field. You, OTOH, are definitely NOT! So, why don't you
> get your ticket, spend a few years on the air, and then come back and
> try again! You may find some of us a bit more interested in what you
> have to say!

>
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Larry, ahem. What Len said.

"Broken leg on mountainside, screaming wife" fantasy. Refuses
assistance from no-coder with shack-on-belt.

73,
Brian

2023. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 23:15:21 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302111515.1d2c5c12@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61106

```
"Jackie" <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> wrote in message
news:<iYz1a.52359$be.39252@rwcrnsc53>...
> "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030209160051.16280.00001787@mb-
>
> > What?!? "Just a hobby?!?" How can that be?
> >
> > Several other newsgroupies have shouted "it's a SERVICE!"
>
> Some people are into it for the hobby and others for the services, yet
> others are in it for both.
>
> J.

Some just want the license plate.
```

2024. Re: ID???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 23:34:38 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v4j24bkusqmt19@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 61107

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.ha5iul2.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On 11 Feb 2003 04:32:20 GMT, Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> >When I'm having a QSO on 2-meters, and I hear someone ID and say "For
> >ID," I occasionally say, "This is K3LT, and if anyone I'm
> >communicating with doesn't know why I said that, they'd better give up
> >their license!"
>
> Whereas on the repeater that I usually frequent, when one of the
> gab-fest regulars acting as the "timekeeper" says "K7xxx for ID",
> that's the trigger for all of us to do an ID, good for another ten
> minutes of swapping tall tales.....
>
> Contrary to accusations, there's no "rigid culture" in ham radio....
>
> ---
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>

Now Phil we can't be showing people a bad example here.
That isn't a gab-fest it's a (said with a radio announcers voice)
"round table discussion"! For me it's just chewin' the fat
with the guys, we also jump off the repeater and send some
SSTV for kicks. We have even tried PSK 31 on FM, works
real good to! ;^) We also ID with voice keyers, computer
programs, and "CW" sometimes, just to be different.
--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx

2025. Re: New Field Day Entry Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 23:36:57 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v4j28nasmelv70@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 61108

"Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now> wrote in message
news:Xns931F9A503AC89pookster@216.168.3.50...
> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in news:c2356669.0302110934.8e477f8
> @posting.google.com:
>
> >> >>Five pages of rules? I think the question is self-answering.
> > >
> > > Not too complicated, considering all the ground to be covered. The
> > > rules themselves only take up 3 pages.
> > >
> > ----------
>
> Five pages of rules that take up only three pages?
>
> Is this like stuffing ten pounds of you-know-what into a five pound sack?
> Or stuffing five sacks into ten pounds? Or ten fives into a sack? Or
> sacking out for ten?
>
> My little brain can no longer compute. Thanks, ARRL.
>
> --
> Bill, W7TI

Naw it's that new compressed file format their using
for written documents. I think it's called a dip file ;^)
--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx

2026. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-11 23:42:36 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v4j2ja944lhs45@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 61109

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0302111515.1d2c5c12@posting.google.com...
> "Jackie" <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> wrote in message
news:<iYz1a.52359$be.39252@rwcrnsc53>...
> > "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20030209160051.16280.00001787@mb-
> >
> > > What?!? "Just a hobby?!?" How can that be?
> > >
> > > Several other newsgroupies have shouted "it's a SERVICE!"
> >
> > Some people are into it for the hobby and others for the services, yet
> > others are in it for both.
> >
> > J.
>
> Some just want the license plate.

And what's wrong with that. In Indiana the custom
plates go for $35 more than the regular ones, OTOH
the Amateur Radio plates are just $7.50 more.
(It was $5 more but our Governor spent all our
money and now he's raising taxes to cover his
drunken sailor spending) :(
--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx

2027. Re: Montana and Florida

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-12 01:05:41 UTC
From: Jackie <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com>
Message-ID: <E5h2a.78905$vm2.45308@rwcrnsc54>
Source record: 61110

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:b2b29982anc@enews2.newsguy.com...
> Feel free to ship or divert any snowfalls to Michigan, especially the
middle
> and lower parts of the lower peninsula! :)

Would you like some of the blizzard that the western half of Minnesota had earlier today? It even shut down some schools. It's yours simply for being on a direct path to our east. :-)

Jackie KC0ODY

2028. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-12 01:07:27 UTC
From: Jackie <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com>
Message-ID: <j7h2a.77742$be.56936@rwcrnsc53>
Source record: 61111

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0302111515.1d2c5c12@posting.google.com...

> Some just want the license plate.

Could be. AR radio plates are only $10 here- compared to, say... what is it
now... $75 for regular, non-vanity plates?

Jackie

2029. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-12 01:36:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030211203627.14527.00000262@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 61112

In article <Xns931F9A8BAE72pookster@216.168.3.50>, "Bill, W7TI"
<jamspam@upyours.now> writes:

>N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in news:c2356669.0302110943.37927a89
>@posting.google.com:
>
>> Is it a bad thing if ARRL can get positive publicity for ham radio?
>>
>____
>
>Only when it makes us look self-congratulatory, which it *often* does.
>
Then how do we get the word out? Let's face it, the average nonham thinks the
police and other govt. agencies have communications equipment for every
possible contingency. "Everybody has a cell phone" is another frequently heard
comment. The idea that amateur volunteers play a key role is a tough sell to
the media and the public, even though it's true.

How should it be done, Bill?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2030. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-12 02:08:26 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030211210826.28727.00000216@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 61113

From N2EY:
>The idea that amateur volunteers play a key role is a tough sell to
>the media and the public, even though it's true.
>
>How should it be done, Bill?

How about a special on PBS? This could definately fit in to their current programs. They have done "documentary" specials on "sandwiches" and other topics. After watching the "flea market" program, a special on Ham radio showing Hamfests would fit right in.

2031. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-12 02:23:37 UTC
From: "Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now>
Message-ID: <Xns931FBB1D73298pookster@216.168.3.50>
Source record: 61114

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in news:20030211203627.14527.00000262@mb-cc.aol.com:

> How should it be done, Bill?
>

Not by us.

I'm so tired of people/groups/organizations banging their own drum. If their work is really good and desirable, others will realize it and beat the drum for them.

You younger folks who grew up in the age of Muhammad Ali may not realize it, but modesty in your accomplishments used to be considered a virtue worthy of respect. Nobody *ever* bragged on themself. If you were good, others would do it for you and it meant something. Nowdays it's so pervasive us old guys just tune it out. Wish the younger ones would too.

--
Bill, W7TI

2032. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-12 03:04:32 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030211220432.28727.00000217@mb-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 61116

From K4YZ:
> And >>I<< repeat...Since YOU are a product of the present examining system,
>we can safely assume that YOU don't know the material

You can assume that, but it would be incorrect.

>Which further leads me to believe that all those Hams in MA, CT, etc
>that don't want to play homebrewing with you probably figured out you are
>just
>trying to ride thier coattails

There are no coattails to ride, whatever that is. More likely, its a lack of interest in homebrewing. One can see that at a Hamfest, which represents what Hams are interested in, what topics are presented.

Remember when "Ham Radio" became QST? It is representative of the change in today's Ham radio.

>>> The ANSWER to that, Vipul, is that the "radio art" is MORE than
>>>experimentation INSIDE the box...It's how to USE the box too.
>>
>>Possibly, if you could give an example.
>
> No "possibly" to it.

So, no example.

> Been there...done that...in no way, shape or form does that paragraph
>state
>that "the radio art" is solely "technical achievement".

>>>Oh...?!?! You draw this conclusion based upon WHAT definition from the
>>>FCC
>>>or other credible source?

>I have been an ACTIVE Amateur Radio
>licensee, probably before you were born, and I ahve NEVER heard of ANY
>"definintion" of "radio art" to be ONLY "technical achievement".

From the ARRL's "FCC rule book":

Advancement of the radio art, [97.1(b)]
"For more than 85 years, hams have carried on a tradition of learning by doing, and since the beginning have remained at the forefront of technology. Through experimentation and building, hams have pioneered advances such as single-sideband transmission, and are currently engaged in state-of-the-art designs in digital radio and spread-spectrum techniques. Amateurs were among the first to bounce signals off the moon to extend signal range. Amateurs

design and build satellites, experimental balloons and rockets at a fraction of the cost of their commercial counterparts. Ham's practical experience has lead to technical refinements and cost reductions beneficial to the commercial radio industry."

The club uses the phrase "advancement of the radio art" and does not do anything near what is mentioned in the above paragraph. Not only do they not do these activities, they are uninterested in those activities. Yet, they can use that phrase to make them look good - that's rationalization.

2033. Re: Montana and Florida

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-12 03:23:12 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <A6j2a.4181$4y4.2078087@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 61115

"Jackie" <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> wrote in message
news:E5h2a.78905$vm2.45308@rwcrnsc54...
>
> "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
> news:b2b29982anc@enews2.newsguy.com...
> > Feel free to ship or divert any snowfalls to Michigan, especially the
> middle
> > and lower parts of the lower peninsula! :)
>
> Would you like some of the blizzard that the western half of Minnesota had
> earlier today? It even shut down some schools. It's yours simply for being
> on a direct path to our east. :-)
>
> Jackie KC0ODY

And here I thought you were a nice girl. :)

Dee Flint, N8UZE

2034. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-12 03:29:50 UTC
From: Jackie <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com>
Message-ID: <Ocj2a.79839$HN5.299679@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 61117

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030211220432.28727.00000217@mb-fr.aol.com...

> The club uses the phrase "advancement of the radio art" and does not do
> anything near what is mentioned in the above paragraph. Not only do they
not do
> these activities, they are uninterested in those activities. Yet, they can
use
> that phrase to make them look good - that's rationalization.

Then I'd say that it's time to find-- or perhaps even establish-- a local club that does those things. Seems like you are looking for something more specialized in that regard, and if there is no such club in your area, maybe you would be the best person to start one, by virtue of your background in homebrew and electronics. Get the word out and I'll bet you'll find some instant members, particularly if you live in a larger city or metro area.

Jackie

2035. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-12 04:20:09 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E49CB7D.3050201@adelphia.net>
Source record: 61118

KC8PMX wrote:

> So Mike..... based on the below statement, would you say that he is a
> "Master Baiter?"
>
> Sorry.... ya left that one WIDE OPEN! :)
>
>
> Ryan KC8PMX

Heh, heh! I've been doing that a lot lately. Sometimes I feel like the world's straight man! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

2036. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-12 04:23:58 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E49CC62.7070004@adelphia.net>
Source record: 61119

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> In article <v4blajbpids962@corp.supernews.com>, "KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com>
> writes:
>
>
>>If I remember my movie correctly was it something like "pay no attention
>>to the man behind the curtain" If so I agree 100% !!!
>>
>
> Oh My! A second reference to "The Wizard of Oz" in the same
> thread!

Liars and tyrants and boors, Oh My! Weird how that one fits this group sometimes ;^)

later! - Mike KB3EIA -

2037. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-12 04:34:22 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E49CECC.D832E273@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61120

Vshah101 wrote:

> Remember when "Ham Radio" became QST? It is representative of the change in
> today's Ham radio.

No, I don't remember that. Why don't you fill us in on how that came
about.

Dave K8MN

2038. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-12 04:44:19 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E49D16C.97096E03@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61121

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E4858A8.81685CD9@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave, our first encounters were on the air, 10M SSB to be exact (the
> > > "kiddie band" as some OF's call it).
> >
> > I hate to burst your bubble but I have no recollection of anything about
> > you on air. Your saying "five nine" to me doesn't give me a lot to work
> > with in forming an opinion of you.
>
> Dave, I hate to burst your bubble, but you weren't "59."

Doesn't burst my bubble, Brian. My pileup QSO with you did not involve
a conversation and you didn't make an impression of any kind. You
didn't provide your views on anything and I didn't give you my views on
anything. All of my opinions of you have been formed here over a number
of years.

> > > Anyway, I always thought God would be gracious, not smug.
> > >
> > > I guess that's what happens when you are a God.
> >
> > No, that's what happens when you are busy reading between the lines
> > instead of attempting comprehension of what is actually written. You're
> > a real help in proving a point. Please refer to the portion above where
> > I state, "I've never claimed to be a god".
>
> But you don't deny it, either.

I haven't denied being fabulously wealthy either. Is it your opinion
that anyone is anything he hasn't denied being? That tangental logic
you are using needs a bit of polishing.

Dave K8MN

2039. Re: New Field Day Entry Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-12 04:51:21 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E49D2CD.3030501@adelphia.net>
Source record: 61122

N2EY wrote:

> Whole point of FD is "something for everybody" which means lotsa
> rules. Can't get away from it. The new Class F will hopefully do two
> things:
>
> 1) Get more EOCs on-the-air during FD, which is better than having
> them gather dust
>
> 2) Generate publicity both in the media and among govt. types.
>
> Are either of those a bad thing?

Heck no! I like the idea. It not only might entice some more participation, but a big bonus is that the EOC station will be looked at, checked out, and made working. There was a station not so far away, not an EOC, but pressed into operation which had several of it's antennas down one day that it needed them up and working. Thank heavens some hams got a quick dipole up and running for it. But getting the EOc station up for field day means it will be checked out at least once a year. That means it will probably be up and running when it might be needed badly.

>> But that is small beans compared to FD.
>>
>> Here is a challenge. come up with a one page set of rules for FD that
>>addresses everything. Just for grins, go ahead and ignore the EC and
>>GOTA sections. Make the rules explicit enough that there is no
>>questioning them. Encompass all the different modes in use during field day.
>>
>
> On one page? Easy, just use a little tiny font.

Heh, heh. I'll grab the bifocals.

> There's also the perennial problem of folks not understanding the
> rules, no matter how clearly they are written.

I think the QnA pages go a long way towards fixing that. But you can't cover every possible situation

>>glad there is something else here to discuss besides Morse and the old
>>master fisherman
>>
>
> Heck yes. This morning I was out on the run while the rosy-fingered

> dawn was coming up behind the Roxborough antenna farm as I rounder the
> turn by the elementary school. Black ice, stiff wind and 28 degrees,
> so I'm planning FD and how to get a few more points than last year.
> Just inherited a clean but old lapper, might be just the thing for
> logging. All there except it needs a battery. Also gotta get practice
> with the slingshot/spinning reel antenna launcher setup. FD 2003 will
> be #36 for me.

Wow, This will only be my third. I've been thinking about the GOTA station, which I control op. I'll probably make a poster up explaining the parts of a QSO. I've seen that newbies are more willing to work if they can understand the structure of a contest QSO. I'm also going to check to see if there is any restriction on running PSK31 on a GOTA station. Lots of the kids will feel right at home with that. Top it off with the club getting a new radio for GOTA, and I'm juiced. Top that off with running the 80 meter station on the overnight shift, and that's just about as much fun as I've ever had.

Then I go home and sleep about 14 hours after teardown. 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

2040. Re: New Field Day Entry Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-12 04:52:54 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E49D32A.7010104@adelphia.net>
Source record: 61123

Bill, W7TI wrote:

> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in news:c2356669.0302110934.8e477f8
> @posting.google.com:
>
>
>>>>>Five pages of rules? I think the question is self-answering.
>>>>>
>>Not too complicated, considering all the ground to be covered. The
>>rules themselves only take up 3 pages.
>>
>>
> ____
>
> Five pages of rules that take up only three pages?
>
> Is this like stuffing ten pounds of you-know-what into a five pound sack?
> Or stuffing five sacks into ten pounds? Or ten fives into a sack? Or
> sacking out for ten?

Page one is hte document cover, page two is a feel good piece, and the
actual rules start on Page three.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2041. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-12 05:11:32 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E49D788.9040202@adelphia.net>
Source record: 61124

Vshah101 wrote:

> From article
> http://www.msnbc.com/news/869906.asp
>
> " ACCORDING TO THE national membership association for amateur radio, the
> American Radio Relay League (ARRL), ham radio volunteers are currently
> assisting federal, state and local officials and relief organizations in Texas
> in their search for shuttle Columbia debris and the remains of the crew
> members. "
>
> I did not hear any mention of Ham (or amateur) radio operators, in regard to
> the Columbia recovery, in the news. Not one. I guess ARRL is the "inside" news
> organization.

I did.

> "Ham radio has proven to be the only reliable communications options during the
> recovery effort,"
> ...
> "The communications systems used by other federal and state organizations
> cannot penetrate 'The Pine Curtain' as we know it in East Texas," he said. "The
> dense forests and hilly terrain just swallow up most radio traffic, and even
> county sheriff and county fire department radio systems have serious blind
> spots."
>
> Hype.

I guess you don't know about HF versus VHF/UHF Propogation.

> If you look more closely, this actually supports removing amateur radio
> privileges (to get rid of those serious "blind spots"). Not good for amateur
> radio.
>
> "Three of the Columbia astronauts were licensed amateur radio operators."

> Irrelevant. In any group, some of them may have amateur radio licenses. Just
> because they happen to have licenses, does not support the claim. It was part
> of their work anyway.

We lost three hams. I'm sorry you find that irrelevant. I do not. In my
area, we feel the loss when one of our own dies. I can't even imagine
you said that

> "Even astronaut hopeful Lance Bass of 'N Sync is a ham - KG4UYY."
>
> I doubt it. Why does this celebrity not proclaim he is a Ham in public?

He has a license. look it up.

Now I gotta say it..... SHEESH. Your insensitivity on this issue makes me want to PUKE. You take a national tragedy like this and try to twist it to further your dislike of Ham radio operators and the ARS. Do you have no shame?

I would suggest you take a minute or day to think about what you have said here. You owe the entire group an apology. If you don't like hams so be it. But I doubt that the fattest smelliest social misfit ham you see at a hamfest (that you so detest) has the decency to care about these people.

Shame on you.

2042. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-12 06:17:35 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030212011735.29328.00000304@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 61125

>Subject: Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery
>From: "Bill, W7TI" jamspam@upyours.now
>Date: 2/11/03 5:11 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <Xns931F9A8BAE72pookster@216.168.3.50>

>Only when it makes us look self-congratulatory, which it *often* does.

"Self-congratulatory"...?!?!

Interesting term, since the advertising business, which is essentially the profession of self-congratulating, is a multi-billion dollar industry.

So we're supposed to just sit around and HOPE that someone promotes our activities and programs? Maybe the professional broadcasters, with whom we compete for spectrum allocations, will do this for us...?!?!?

73

Steve, K4YZ

2043. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-12 06:29:44 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030212012944.29328.00000305@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 61126

>Subject: Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery
>From: "Bill, W7TI" jamspam@upyours.now
>Date: 2/11/03 8:23 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <Xns931FBB1D73298pookster@216.168.3.50>

>> How should it be done, Bill?

>Not by us.
>
>I'm so tired of people/groups/organizations banging their own drum. If
>their work is really good and desirable, others will realize it and beat
>the drum for them.

Uh huh...sure. I belong to an aviation organization that is really poor about getting their own word out, yet are one of the most proactive rescue and aviation advocates in the United States..

As a real recent and "in your face" "fer instance", which agancy was the only civil agency allowed to fly in the immdeiate post attack phase of 9/11?

What agency flies 85% of all USAF assigned air search and rescue missions in the United States (and has maintained that threshold for over 40 years of it's 60 years of existence?)

What agency has the largest civil fleet of aircraft in the United States?

What civil aviation organizaton has the highest saftey record in the United States?

Now, unless you happen to be a member of Civil Air Patrol or are just a trivia-geek, (or took the BIG hint from my lead-in above!), you probably DIDN'T know it was Civil Air Patrol.

I agree with your suggestions that once-upon-atime it was not necessary for one to self-promote, however that was in a much simpler day and before the onslaught of media exposure, Bill.

If you want your "story" out there, you're gonna have to do it. Some do it better than others, but oh well.....

73

Steve, K4YZ

2044. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-12 06:35:58 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030212013558.29328.00000306@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 61127

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 2/11/03 9:04 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030211220432.28727.00000217@mb-fr.aol.com>

>From K4YZ:

>> And >>I<< repeat...Since YOU are a product of the present examining system,
>>we can safely assume that YOU don't know the material
>
>You can assume that, but it would be incorrect.

Prove it.

>Remember when "Ham Radio" became QST? It is representative of the change in
>today's Ham radio.

HUH...?!?!?

Are you using dope, Vipul?

>The club uses the phrase "advancement of the radio art" and does not do
>anything near what is mentioned in the above paragraph. Not only do they not
>do
>these activities, they are uninterested in those activities. Yet, they can
>use
>that phrase to make them look good - that's rationalization.

And if the club recruits ONE person into Amateur Radio with thier program
that subsequently becomes involved in the promotion of "the radio art" (whcih
does not EXCLUSIVELY involve "technical achievement"), then they will have
succeeded.

That's NOT "rationalization".

Try again, Shadowman.

Steve, K4YZ

2045. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-12 06:40:01 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030212014001.29328.00000307@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 61128

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: "Jackie" buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com
>Date: 2/11/03 9:29 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <Ocj2a.79839$HN5.299679@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net>

>Then I'd say that it's time to find-- or perhaps even establish-- a local
>club that does those things. Seems like you are looking for something more
>specialized in that regard, and if there is no such club in your area, maybe
>you would be the best person to start one, by virtue of your background in
>homebrew and electronics. Get the word out and I'll bet you'll find some
>instant members, particularly if you live in a larger city or metro area.

Vipul's alrady been suggested that, but he's only looking for a ready-made organization into which he can make a grand entrance, Jackie...When suggested HE start such a club, he made some vague reference to having "tried that once", and only had one or two people showed up.

Now it's his "other obligations" that prevent him from doing it, but obviously not from WHINING about the lack of one in THIS forum.

That's what happens when people let thier kids play with the computer at night.

73

Steve, K4YZ

2046. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-12 08:34:05 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0302120034.c1e139c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61129

"Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now> wrote in message
news:<Xns931F9A8BAE72pookster@216.168.3.50>...
> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in news:c2356669.0302110943.37927a89
> @posting.google.com:
>
> > Is it a bad thing if ARRL can get positive publicity for ham radio?
> >
> ----------
>
> Only when it makes us look self-congratulatory, which it *often* does.

That in itself is not all bad but would the hams in Texas who are
actually doing their thing do it if there was no ARRL?? I think so.

w3rv

2047. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-12 08:36:14 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0302120036.22c11b8b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61130

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0302110446.1ed9f7f8@posting.google.com>...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0302101732.5476da76@posting.google.com>...
>
> > Und doan you fuggedit it Herr Brainiac, ve haf been vatching you und
> > ve haf ways of dealing mit you vipul . .
>
> Hey, I understood that. Too much Hogan's Heroes in my youth (and not
> enough F-Troop).

More like "Car 59 Where Are You?" in your case.

w3rv

2048. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-12 11:11:51 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b2djkq28fe@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 61135

"KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com> wrote in message
news:v4i9ernuv0bo06@corp.supernews.com...
> Ryan
> The school I work for threw away in the dumpster several PC's.
> I salvaged as many as possible and even got several working
> again (some already were) I have now donated 3 to our local
> ham radio club. http://www.qsl.net/kb9ohy/ One is going to be
> used to revive our club's packet station and 2 are going to be
> used for logging during Field Day. I've got another one on the
> floor of my shack right now looking for a use for it, I'm thinking
> SSTV or PSK-31. And I have sold several whole PC's and
> even more boxes and parts, just from their disposal of
> some "junk".

That's great! I am always accepting donations of older PC's 133Mhz and up, as I get them working, (or consolidate 2-3 into one good one) and donate them to the Family Community Center close to where I live, and they give them out to the needy. They are more than adequate for basic internet exploring and email, as well as using similar programs such as used in Microsoft Office etc. So far I have donated over 20 PC's in the past 3 years or so, through people donating them to me!

Any of the 100Mhz or less make good packet or logging stations or similar for me.

>
> It always pays to look inside the dumpster when you're
> making a drop-off ;^)

Hell... nothing wrong with that! I have "no shame" picking something up something from the curb, or dumpster! I have picked up a 55 gallon fish tank where the glass was cracked and I repaired the crack by sealing it and it still is in otherwise great shape. Crack was towards the bottom on a side pane of glass and barely noticeable if covered up right. I am still using the VCR I found once. All it required was a new belt and is still working like a charm! It is amazing what people throw out.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

2049. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-12 11:13:13 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b2djks38fe@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 61134

Damn Jim.... Never been THAT lucky!

Ryan KC8PMX

> Four years ago, a nearby office got a new computer system. A little
> dumpster-diving produced the following:
>
> Seven - 14 inch color VGA monitors, all in working order, with cables
> Six - 386 computers in AT-style cases with 200 watt power supplies,
> 3-1/2" floppy drives, 2 meg of memory, video and network cards,
> complete with cables, all in working order.
> One - 386 computer in AT-style cases with 235 watt power supply,
> 3-1/2" floppy drive, 8 meg of memory, video and network cards, 256
> meg hard drive, complete with cables, all in working order.
>
> One IBM 4019 laser printer with half-full toner cartridge and all
> documentation and cables (!) in working order.
>
> Of course the motherboards, HD and old 30 pin SIMM memory were not of
> much use, but the rest of the stuff has been put to all sorts of uses.
> Only one of the monitors has failed. The power supplies have turned
> out to be not only reliable but very RF-quiet.
>
> Old Yankee proverb: "Use it up, wear it out, make it do, or do
> without".
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

2050. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-12 11:36:26 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030212063626.12173.00000517@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 61131

In article <d22b54c3.0302120034.c1e139c@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>"Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now> wrote in message
>news:<Xns931F9A8BAE72pookster@216.168.3.50>...
>> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in news:c2356669.0302110943.37927a89
>> @posting.google.com:
>>
>> > Is it a bad thing if ARRL can get positive publicity for ham radio?
>> >
>> ____
>>
>> Only when it makes us look self-congratulatory, which it *often* does.
>
>That in itself is not all bad but would the hams in Texas who are
>actually doing their thing do it if there was no ARRL??

If amateur radio hadn't been legislated out of existence, yes. Which probably would have happened years ago without ARRL or an equivalent group banging the drum on both a national and international level.

> I think so.

Reading the blurb, note that ARRL does not say it's an ARRL thing, but a ham radio thing. All Newington is doing is getting the word out.

Would MSNBC have carried the story about what the hams in Texas are actually doing if there was no ARRL?? I don't think so.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2051. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-12 11:36:26 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030212063626.12173.00000516@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 61132

In article <Xns931FBB1D73298pookster@216.168.3.50>, "Bill, W7TI"
<jamspam@upyours.now> writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in news:20030211203627.14527.00000262@mb-
>cc.aol.com:
>
>> How should it be done, Bill?
>>
>____
>
>Not by us.

Then it won;t get done.
>
>I'm so tired of people/groups/organizations banging their own drum. If
>their work is really good and desirable, others will realize it and beat
>the drum for them.

I wish it were so. But the fact is that the squeaky wheel gets the grease in our society. Most nonhams I meet have no idea that amateur radio even exists, despite the fact that there are 685,000 of us in the USA alone. Those who do know often confuse amateurs with cbers and freebanders.

Do you think the MSNBC piece would have happened without somebody pushing it? Who is going to push it, if not some organized amateur radio group like ARRL?
>
>You younger folks who grew up in the age of Muhammad Ali may not realize
>it, but modesty in your accomplishments used to be considered a virtue
>worthy of respect.

I hear what you are saying, but there's a big difference between bragging and telling the story so the credit goes where it is due.

> Nobody *ever* bragged on themself.

"It ain't braggin' if ya really done it" - Babe Ruth

Heck, just look at the history of radio. Marconi, Sarnoff, DeForest and others were tireless self-promoters, often to the point of distorting the facts. Many books will tell you that all-electronic TV made its debut at the 1939 NYC World's Fair, and that it was "invented" by RCA - even though Philo T. Farnsworth was the actual inventor, and gave a public demonstration five years earlier (1934) in Philadelphia, at the Franklin Institute.

>If you were good,
>others would do it for you and it meant something.

Wish it was like that today, but it's not.

>Nowdays it's so
>pervasive us old guys just tune it out. Wish the younger ones would too.

I'm 48. Been a ham 35 years. Publicity has always been a problem - as in not enough.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2052. Re: A Question on the US Vanity Callsign Program

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-12 13:01:46 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302120501.41b36f75@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61133

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:<Pine.LNX.4.52.0302112036470.201@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>...
> On Tue, 11 Feb 2003, Jim wrote:
> >Question on the US Vanity Callsign program.
> >
> >The current Status of my application is 2 - meaning "Pending Level 2".
> >Anyone know what this means?
> >
> >I submitted the application on Jan 29, and I see payment was confirmed on
> >Jan 30 (used CC online). The applications has spent most of its life in
> >"Pending Level 2" status. Just curious if anyone has insight as to what
> >Pending Level 2 is.
>
> Crude answer: It means shut up and wait.
>
> Nice answer: It means that your application has been received but they haven't
> run a vanity call processing session since it was received. They don't run
> these daily.

Relax. Remember the good old days w/o vanity call signs and 21/2
month wait on real license issuances.

2053. Re: New Field Day Entry Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-12 15:10:50 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0302120710.6d30e862@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61136

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0302110934.8e477f8@posting.google.com>...
> Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3E47CA18.7060001@psu.edu>...
> > Brian Kelly wrote:
> > > "Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now> wrote in message
news:<Xns931D8151D8BF0pookster@216.168.3.50>...
> > >
> > >>Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in news:3E46AE95.8070102
> > >>@adelphia.net:
>
> > >>>There are 5 pages of rules, the rest is submission and log forms, and
> > >>>some Q and A. Is that too complicated?
> ____
> > >>
> > >>Five pages of rules? I think the question is self-answering.

Heh!

>
> Not too complicated, considering all the ground to be covered. The
> rules themselves only take up 3 pages.
> > >>
> > >>This is a hobby, not a Federal Project.
>
> Tell the hams combing Texas for shuttle parts that "it's a hobby"....

What the hell does collecting Shuttle parts have to do with Field Day
rules? Izzit Field Day in Texas??

> Gotta remember that the 28 page packet is meant to be self-contained.

So are the Bible and the tax codes, the similarities between those and
the FD "rules" package is striking.

> Log sheets, summary sheets, W1AW schedules and freqs, typical
> message-to-the-SCM formats,

When was the last time an NTS formatted "message" to an SCM proved of
any value whatsoever during an emergency in which ham radio was
involved? Ditto the pointless "Message from w1aw" thingey. Because
that's the way Hiram Percy imagined how ham emergency traffic should
be done? Pffft. Dump it, It's bullshit which has notting to do with
notting. There goes at least one page.

Hiram Percy did die ya know . .

> handouts for the general public,
> explanations of basic stuff for the clueless, etc.

Bible, tax codes . .

> Whole point of FD is "something for everybody"

That's exactly what's WRONG with FD for many participants like myself
and you too, see following.

> which means lotsa
> rules. Can't get away from it. The new Class F will hopefully do two
> things:
>
> 1) Get more EOCs on-the-air during FD, which is better than having
> them gather dust
>
> 2) Generate publicity both in the media and among govt. types.
>
> Are either of those a bad thing?

But are you gonna take DELCOM into the ham bands during this year's
FD?

> >
> > But that is small beans compared to FD.
> >
> > Here is a challenge. come up with a one page set of rules for FD that
> > addresses everything. Just for grins, go ahead and ignore the EC and
> > GOTA sections. Make the rules explicit enough that there is no
> > questioning them. Encompass all the different modes in use during field day.
>
> On one page? Easy, just use a little tiny font.

Smack!

> Result was that most FD operations consisted of gas engine generators
> powering SSB transceivers, some antennas and not much else in the way
> of radio stuff. A beginner might get a shot at a rig around 3AM on a
> dead band. Satellites? GOTA station? Publicity, natural power, new
> modes? Ferget it, no points, not worth the effort.

Who are you kidding?? How are you gonna run in FD this year? Are you
gonna work a satellite? Are you gonna set up a GOAT station? Of course
not. You're gonna toss up some antennas and churn score. Just like it
"used to be." And I'm gonna do the same drill for exactly the same
reasons.

>
> Having all the catgeories and such is meant to widen the scope of FD.
> Not a bad thing.

Much of it is, as a minimum, a goofy thing at best. Generates gross
confusion, lotta pointless pushups, wasted manpower, general BS, yadda
yadda . . which is why we both opted away from the annual k3mn "radio

picnic". Preaching in one direction and going in the other direction
is bad form.

>
> There's also the perennial problem of folks not understanding the
> rules, no matter how clearly they are written.

Bible, tax codes again.

> > A lot of people
> > wouldn't care for that. IMO, a home station operating off the mains is
> > the same thing as a EC station. So should either of those participate
> > (FWIW, I am quite happy with both participating)
>
> Of course! But not against set-up-in-the-field stations. Thus the new
> class.

I can see the k3mn squad moving the operation from Clayton Park to the
courthouse front lawn so that they can compete in the F class. This
one is almst as good an idea as the Diamond Club.

There is a solution. We need two field events per year. One would be
FD the way it exists. I could care less, don't bore me with it, let
'em go work GOATs, do some radio and pass out PR sheets or whatever
other ARRL flag-waving exercises they get off on. Except call it the
annual ARRL National Radio Picnic and drop the "emergency comms"
nonsense because in truth FD as it exists today has about as much
relevance to emergency comms as the ARRL cw dx contest has.

The new one would be taking Sweepstakes into the bushes. Same rules as
SS except that it would have to be done in the field per FD and both
phone and CW would be used on an equal points basis on the same
weekend. One page.

Lemmee guess which event you'd jump all over . .

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

2054. Re: New Field Day Entry Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-12 15:22:22 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <9E3DD1E06A1B3513.4293E68FF30350E7.9A11E9D85041B534@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 61137

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0302120710.6d30e862@posting.google.com...
> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0302110934.8e477f8@posting.google.com>...
> > Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:<3E47CA18.7060001@psu.edu>...
> > > Brian Kelly wrote:
> > > > "Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now> wrote in message
news:<Xns931D8151D8BF0pookster@216.168.3.50>...
> > > >
> > > >>Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in news:3E46AE95.8070102
> > > >>@adelphia.net:
> > >
> > > >>This is a hobby, not a Federal Project.
> > >
> > Tell the hams combing Texas for shuttle parts that "it's a hobby"....
>
>
> What the hell does collecting Shuttle parts have to do with Field Day
> rules? Izzit Field Day in Texas??
>

In my opinion and without scientific data: for the majority part, amateur radio is a hobby for most amateur radio operators. However, we all, nearly all of us anyway, realize that the privilege of being able to use the frequencies comes with the responsibility to "pay back" our community(ies) with some form of public *service*. I think that is the most succinct way of putting it. I regard ham radio as nothing but a hobby. However, I have--from time to time--gladly "put in" my time back to my community(ies) for the privilege of being a ham radio operator. Hobby is 98%, Service is 2%. Rough estimates, of course.

When I considered amateur radio licensing, I didn't say to myself "Wow, I think I will find an activity that I can do for free in *service* to my community! One where I can spend all kinds of money and hours on my own, without reimbursement." What I did say to myself was, "Wow, ham radio! Sounds like lots of fun! I think I'll go for it!" And, if most are truthful--we just are not prone to doing something without reward: the reward for the *tiny* bit most of us spend in service, is the fun we have with what we consider little more than a hobby. I actually daresay that most who would zealously use "service" as a defense for amateur radio are the Larry Roll definitions of nothing but wannabes.

The hams combing Texas for shuttle parts--I also daresay--would probably agree with my opinion. Maybe not.

Kim W5TIT

2055. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-12 15:45:22 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0302120745.65e351eb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61138

Janet,

I can only add two words to your excellent post:

Thank you

73 de Jim, N2EY

Janet <janet11@attbi.com> wrote in message
news:<agvh4v8ag320rpf57j3os102nalon2uk5j@4ax.com>...
> On Tue, 11 Feb 2003 00:44:06 -0500, "Lloyd" <Lloyd@LloydandHerbareNrOne.com>
> wrote:
>
> > The ARRL continues to spew fiction about "glorious and
> >important" valuable ham radio operations in selected
> >emergencies. The league has been living in a dream world
> >since the 1960s incentive licensing flap.
>
> Obviously you weren't working in east texas during the last week. I was. Along
> with many other ham volunteers.
>
> And of course the news wasn't picking this up. We're a support function, not
> the 'front lines'. And that's how it should be. There weren't big articles
> about what the Salvation Army or Red Cross were doing there. There weren't big
> articles about the highway patrol. But the National Guard search team I was
> was with also included a highway patrolman.
>
> "glorious", no. But important? Yes. We were wanted and useful. Can't beat
> that! Even when teams had cell phones, what happened?
>
> If the search organizers needed to contact all the search teams, net control
> could put one call out via ham radio and all hams would then confirm they
> received it individually. For 20 teams, this took about 5-10 mins max. But
> when contacting teams via cell phone, let's see. Most cell systems didn't work
> in San Augustine. And those that did were picky about where they worked. Walk
> a few feet and they were silent. And the person with a cell phone tended to put
> it in a pocket or pack and not notice when it rang. 4 hours later, many of
> those search teams without a ham still hadn't received the change of search
> protocols.
>
> No, "ham radio" isn't the critical thing here. It was just that our "job" there
> was communications. We paid attention to it. We listened. And when there was
> something important to pass on, we did it.
>
> In this case, there's nothing the national/local news would even bother to pick

> up. So it's nice that the ARRL DOES try to get some publicity for things that
> the hams do that help the public in time of need.
>
> It's funny. One of the guys on my search team told me they thought that ham
> radio was only for 'old guys' and wasn't worth much in this modern world. He
> told me he couldn't believe how wrong he was (*grin*).
>
> Janet
> WB9ZPH

2056. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-12 16:42:44 UTC
From: "Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now>
Message-ID: <Xns9320589F257CEpookster@216.168.3.50>
Source record: 61139

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in
news:20030212011735.29328.00000304@mb-fy.aol.com:

> "Self-congratulatory"...?!?!
>
> Interesting term, since the advertising business, which is
> essentially the
> profession of self-congratulating, is a multi-billion dollar industry.

Are you holding the advertising industry up as a role model?
If so, plonk me now.

> So we're supposed to just sit around and HOPE that someone
> promotes our
> activities and programs? Maybe the professional broadcasters, with
> whom we compete for spectrum allocations, will do this for us...?!?!?

Yes you are and yes they will. Do a good job, be useful, smile, and the
word will get around. One word from another person is worth a hundred of
your own.

--
Bill, W7TI

2057. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-12 16:44:10 UTC
From: "Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now>
Message-ID: <Xns932058DD24F00pookster@216.168.3.50>
Source record: 61140

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in
news:20030212012944.29328.00000305@mb-fy.aol.com:

> I agree with your suggestions that once-upon-atime it was not
> necessary
> for one to self-promote, however that was in a much simpler day and
> before the onslaught of media exposure, Bill.
>
> If you want your "story" out there, you're gonna have to do it.
> Some do
> it better than others, but oh well.......
>

I agree with everything you said Steve, I just lament it.

--
Bill, W7TI

2058. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-12 16:46:40 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0302120846.196b159d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61141

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message news:<20030212063626.12173.00000517@mb-mr.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0302120034.c1e139c@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >"Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now> wrote in message
> >news:<Xns931F9A8BAE72pookster@216.168.3.50>...
> >> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in news:c2356669.0302110943.37927a89
> >> @posting.google.com:
> >>
> >> > Is it a bad thing if ARRL can get positive publicity for ham radio?
> >> >
> >> ____
> >>
> >> Only when it makes us look self-congratulatory, which it *often* does.
> >
> >That in itself is not all bad but would the hams in Texas who are
> >actually doing their thing do it if there was no ARRL??
>
> If amateur radio hadn't been legislated out of existence, yes. Which probably
> would have happened years ago without ARRL or an equivalent group banging the
> drum on both a national and international level.

Ya picked the wrong example.

There were only two points in history when the existence of ham radio
was threatened. The first came in 1910 when a Senator Drew wrote a
bill prohibiting amateur experimentation. The Junior Wireless Club
squashed that and Hiram Percy was nowhere on the horizon.

The second was in 1919 when the Alexander bill would have eliminated
ham radio. The ARRL got into it but the league was only one of a
number of players who helped kill that proposal. Those included Hugo
Gernsback who has been credited by many with actually turning the tide
vs. the puffery about Hiram and the ARRL's role in certain League
publications. Drum:Beating:Twist history. Marconi and Fleming also
went to bat for ham radio. How much clout do ya 'spose those two icons
had in Congress vs. Hiram Percy??

How much column space did QST give Gernsback, Fleming and Marconi (vs.
Hiram Percy) for their efforts?

There was never an international movement to eliminate ham radio.

>
> > I think so.
>

> Reading the blurb, note that ARRL does not say it's an ARRL thing, but a ham
> radio thing. All Newington is doing is getting the word out.
>
> Would MSNBC have carried the story about what the hams in Texas are actually
> doing if there was no ARRL?? I don't think so.

I haven't seen anything yet about what the Civil Air Patrol or the Boy
Scouts are doing in Texas either but you can bet yer bippy both are up
to their eyeballs in it. Ham news is for hams, nobody else cares.

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

2059. Re: New Field Day Entry Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-12 16:46:59 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3E4A7A83.9080200@psu.edu>
Source record: 61143

Brian Kelly wrote:
> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0302110934.8e477f8@posting.google.com>...
>
>>Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3E47CA18.7060001@psu.edu>...
>>
>>>Brian Kelly wrote:
>>>
>>>>"Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now> wrote in message
news:<Xns931D8151D8BF0pookster@216.168.3.50>...
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in news:3E46AE95.8070102
>>>>>@adelphia.net:
>>>>
>>
>>
>>>>>>There are 5 pages of rules, the rest is submission and log forms, and
>>>>>>some Q and A. Is that too complicated?
>>>>>
>> ----------
>>
>>>>>Five pages of rules? I think the question is self-answering.
>>>>
>
> Heh!
>
>
>
>>Not too complicated, considering all the ground to be covered. The
>>rules themselves only take up 3 pages.
>>
>>>>>This is a hobby, not a Federal Project.
>>>>
>>Tell the hams combing Texas for shuttle parts that "it's a hobby"....
>
>
>
> What the hell does collecting Shuttle parts have to do with Field Day
> rules? Izzit Field Day in Texas??

Emergency op's knowing how to pass traffic. FD is glitzy training for
that sort of thing. It's really a clever way of getting a lot of people
to train for this sort of thing at their own expense.

>>Gotta remember that the 28 page packet is meant to be self-contained.
>
>
> So are the Bible and the tax codes, the similarities between those and
> the FD "rules" package is striking.

I can understand the tax code. YMMV.

>>Log sheets, summary sheets, W1AW schedules and freqs, typical
>>message-to-the-SCM formats,
>
>
> When was the last time an NTS formatted "message" to an SCM proved of
> any value whatsoever during an emergency in which ham radio was
> involved? Ditto the pointless "Message from w1aw" thingey. Because
> that's the way Hiram Percy imagined how ham emergency traffic should
> be done? Pffft. Dump it, It's bullshit which has notting to do with
> notting. There goes at least one page.

Do you know exactly the form of comms for any emergency? If the wheels fall off ya gotta work with what you have. Kinda like I think hams should have basic proficiency in CW so they can use that if need be, and exposure to as many forms of comms as possible.

>>handouts for the general public,
>>explanations of basic stuff for the clueless, etc.
>
>
> Bible, tax codes . .

I guess you started as a fully experienced ham, eh? Maybe someone will see the handout and become interested. Maybe

>
>
>>Whole point of FD is "something for everybody"
>
>
> That's exactly what's WRONG with FD for many participants like myself
> and you too, see following.

But Brian, it's for you too! If you want to stay home and QSO, you're free to do that. If the scoring is too difficult, you don't have to turn in a dupe sheet. A person can participate in FD just firing up their station at home and at least give out the exchange. Sounds like a no-muss, no fuss Field day if that's what you want. No one is forcing you to run a station for the newbies, no one is forcing you to copy a W1AW bulletin. etc.

>
>>Result was that most FD operations consisted of gas engine generators
>>powering SSB transceivers, some antennas and not much else in the way
>>of radio stuff. A beginner might get a shot at a rig around 3AM on a
>>dead band. Satellites? GOTA station? Publicity, natural power, new

>>modes? Ferget it, no points, not worth the effort.
>
>
> Who are you kidding?? How are you gonna run in FD this year? Are you
> gonna work a satellite? Are you gonna set up a GOAT station? Of course
> not. You're gonna toss up some antennas and churn score. Just like it
> "used to be." And I'm gonna do the same drill for exactly the same
> reasons.

We might work a satellite, We will definitely have a GOTA station,
We'll have a person copying W1AW, we'll have an elected official there,
we'll have the local newspaper there. We'll have the local Television
stations there. We want to, and will. If you don't want to, don't.

>
>>Having all the catgeories and such is meant to widen the scope of FD.
>>Not a bad thing.
>
>
> Much of it is, as a minimum, a goofy thing at best. Generates gross
> confusion, lotta pointless pushups, wasted manpower, general BS, yadda
> yadda . . which is why we both opted away from the annual k3mn "radio
> picnic". Preaching in one direction and going in the other direction
> is bad form.
>
>>There's also the perennial problem of folks not understanding the
>>rules, no matter how clearly they are written.
>
> Bible, tax codes again.

I've been involved in rule writing for over 10 years now. Some
observations:

1. You cannot write a rule that someone cannot misunderstand.

2. Those who misunderstand the rules invariably blame the rule
writers.

3. Those who have problems with the rules cannot do any better. I
always ask the complainant to come up with something better. they have
either gone away mumbling something about "I'm not going to do your job
for you", or come up with something that won't work at all. See rule 1
of the observations.

I think it is symptomatic of some of the problems in society today that
people who cannot understand the rules seem to blame those who do for
their lack of understanding.

The challenge to write better rules still stands. Make us some rules to
run field day by. Jim's joke about the small font notwithstanding, I'd
love to see the ideas.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2060. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-12 16:49:00 UTC
From: "Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now>
Message-ID: <Xns932059AEE8708pookster@216.168.3.50>
Source record: 61142

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
news:d22b54c3.0302120034.c1e139c@posting.google.com:

> That in itself is not all bad but would the hams in Texas who are
> actually doing their thing do it if there was no ARRL?? I think so.
>
>

I'd like to think they would, too. Hams as individuals are great guys.
It's when they band together and call themselves "ARRL" that things start
to go a little goofy.

Like nearly all bureaucracies, the League's first mission is self-
preservation. I can't really fault them for that since it *is* the way
of the world, but it sometimes gets in the way of their professed mission
and really does get tiresome.

--
Bill, W7TI

2061. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-12 16:54:39 UTC
From: "Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now>
Message-ID: <Xns93205AA45C84Bpookster@216.168.3.50>
Source record: 61144

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
news:20030212063626.12173.00000516@mb-mr.aol.com:

> Many
> books will tell you that all-electronic TV made its debut at the 1939
> NYC World's Fair, and that it was "invented" by RCA - even though
> Philo T. Farnsworth was the actual inventor, and gave a public
> demonstration five years earlier (1934) in Philadelphia, at the
> Franklin Institute.
>

A perfect example of why beating your own drum sucks. Had other people with no ax to grind been doing the bragging, the truth would have no doubt prevailed.

Remember last summer's Enron commercials? The most successful and wonderful company on earth.

I'm a realist, guys. I don't expect to return to the '50s anytime soon. But there *were* some advantages.

--
Bill, W7TI

2062. Re: A Question on the US Vanity Callsign Program

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-12 17:02:56 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0302120902.188be5a9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61145

jim@qrowireless.com (Jim) wrote in message
news:<982cab6d.0302111152.7c238626@posting.google.com>...
> All,
>
> Question on the US Vanity Callsign program.
>
> The current Status of my application is 2 - meaning "Pending Level 2".
> Anyone know what this means?
>
> I submitted the application on Jan 29, and I see payment was confirmed on
> Jan 30 (used CC online). The applications has spent most of its life in
> "Pending Level 2" status. Just curious if anyone has insight as to what
> Pending Level 2 is.
>
> Thanks & 73,

Ya pore thing, you'd croak if today was back then and you had to wait
the usual six-eight weeks for the mailman to drop yer new ticket thru
the slot. And ya din actually know what yer callsign would be until ya
read the license.

Take a Valium and DON'T call anybody in the morning.

>
> Jim

w3rv

2063. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-12 17:48:56 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0302120948.39e1066@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61146

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message news:<3E49D788.9040202@adelphia.net>...
> Vshah101 wrote:
>
> > From article
> > http://www.msnbc.com/news/869906.asp
> >
> >
> > I did not hear any mention of Ham (or amateur) radio operators, in regard to
> > the Columbia recovery, in the news. Not one. I guess ARRL is the "inside"
> > news
> > organization.
>
> I did.

Mike,

'There are none so blind as those who will not see, nor deaf as those
who will not hear'.

> > "Ham radio has proven to be the only reliable communications options during the
> > recovery effort,"
> > ...
> > "The communications systems used by other federal and state organizations
> > cannot penetrate 'The Pine Curtain' as we know it in East Texas," he said. "The
> > dense forests and hilly terrain just swallow up most radio traffic, and even
> > county sheriff and county fire department radio systems have serious blind
> > spots."
> >
> > Hype.
>
> I guess you don't know about HF versus VHF/UHF Propogation.

Or repeater coverage, antenna patterns, state/county/local
communications budgets, etc.

> > If you look more closely, this actually supports removing amateur radio
> > privileges (to get rid of those serious "blind spots"). Not good for amateur
> > radio.

The main reason there are blind spots is because the various agencies
simply haven't built the necessary infrastructure to cover the entire
area reliably. Probably boils down to $$. Taking away the ham bands
won't make other services' coverage any better.

Because hams are unpaid, and often willing to use recycled and simpler
technology, the cost of a ham repeater can be much lower than the

equivalent "professional" installation. And because hams put emphasis
on operating skill as well as technology, they can make do with
less-than-optimal setups.
> >
> > "Three of the Columbia astronauts were licensed amateur radio operators."
>
> > Irrelevant. In any group, some of them may have amateur radio licenses. Just
> > because they happen to have licenses, does not support the claim. It was
> > part
> > of their work anyway.
>
>
> We lost three hams. I'm sorry you find that irrelevant. I do not. In my
> area, we feel the loss when one of our own dies. I can't even imagine
> you said that

But he did.

Consider for a moment - who does Mr. Shah sound like in this
discussion? He's minimizing the public service contributions of hams,
calling the publicity "hype", and dismissing as "irrelevant" the fact
that quite a few astronauts are also hams, and the loss most of us
feel.
>
> > "Even astronaut hopeful Lance Bass of 'N Sync is a ham - KG4UYY."
> >
> > I doubt it. Why does this celebrity not proclaim he is a Ham in public?
>
> He has a license. look it up.
>
> Now I gotta say it..... SHEESH. Your insensitivity on this issue makes > me
> want to PUKE. You take a national tragedy like this and try to twist it
> to further your dislike of Ham radio operators and the ARS. Do you have
> no shame?
>
> I would suggest you take a minute or day to think about what you have
> said here. You owe the entire group an apology. If you don't like hams
> so be it. But I doubt that the fattest smelliest social misfit ham you
> see at a hamfest (that you so detest) has the decency to care about
> these people.
>
> Shame on you.

Mike, thank you for expressing what many of us felt when we read
Vipul's nonsense, but could not adequately get across.

I'll repeat what I wrote about Mr. Shah and another constant critic a
little while, back:

"Their hobby is wasting time. Your time."

When you read their posts, you are being baited. Perhaps by the master, perhaps by the apprentice. Perhaps they are one and the same. The writing style is a little different but the message is almost identical. They ignore facts and exposing of their faulty logic.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2064. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-12 19:08:45 UTC
From: Herb <Herbie@14313foreverQRM.net>
Message-ID: <b2e62u$ma3$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 61147

You are a professional first responder (firefighter, police officer,
EMT, etc.). What are your first thoughts as the first car load
of ham radio operators arrives on the scene of a disaster or search?
Well, I can tell you, because I have heard it many times. "Tell those
#4%$ CB ham assholes we don't need them. The last time
they were here they ate all the free food and got in the way." And
more than once, some obese ham op himself diverts emergency
resources when he has a heart attack walking in the woods for the
first time in years. Sorry to bring you the painful truth, but the glory
days of ham radio are long over. Ham radio's hey day was in the
1950s and early 60s, just before the shitheads in Newington started
their selfish incentive licensing program to sell more publications.

Herb

"Steve Adell - KF2TI (Landing, NJ FN20qv)" <kf2ti@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:b28s0g$k45$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
>
>
> http://www.msnbc.com/news/869906.asp

2065. Re: A Question on the US Vanity Callsign Program

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-12 19:50:12 UTC
From: Seamus <jmcgrath@removeme.nc.rr.com>
Message-ID: <Uzx2a.34474$ZK1.1635915@twister.southeast.rr.com>
Source record: 61148

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0302120902.188be5a9@posting.google.com...
> jim@qrowireless.com (Jim) wrote in message
news:<982cab6d.0302111152.7c238626@posting.google.com>...
> > All,
> >
> > Question on the US Vanity Callsign program.
> >
> > The current Status of my application is 2 - meaning "Pending Level 2".
> > Anyone know what this means?
> >
> > I submitted the application on Jan 29, and I see payment was confirmed
on
> > Jan 30 (used CC online). The applications has spent most of its life in
> > "Pending Level 2" status. Just curious if anyone has insight as to what
> > Pending Level 2 is.
> >
> > Thanks & 73,
>
> Ya pore thing, you'd croak if today was back then and you had to wait
> the usual six-eight weeks for the mailman to drop yer new ticket thru
> the slot. And ya din actually know what yer callsign would be until ya
> read the license.
>
> Take a Valium and DON'T call anybody in the morning.
>
> >
> > Jim
>
> w3rv

Geez Brian, who peed in your Corn Flakes? I don't go as far back as you,
but do remember having to wait at least 6-8 weeks or so for my original
license.

All I was inquiring about was what did "Pending Level 2" mean. No more, no
less. Last evening, John gave the answer, basically just a normal part of
processing until the FCC either grants or dismisses. Until John HELPED with
his answer, I was thinking Pending Level 2 meant it was going off into the
bit-bucket somewhere.

Sheesh,

Jim

2066. Re: New Field Day Entry Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-12 20:06:07 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0302121206.310c9cf8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61149

"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:<9E3DD1E06A1B3513.4293E68FF30350E7.9A11E9D85041B534@lp.airnews.net>...
> "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
> news:d22b54c3.0302120710.6d30e862@posting.google.com...

> > What the hell does collecting Shuttle parts have to do with Field Day
> > rules? Izzit Field Day in Texas??
> >
>
> In my opinion and without scientific data: for the majority part, amateur
> radio is a hobby for most amateur radio operators. However, we all, nearly
> all of us anyway, realize that the privilege of being able to use the
> frequencies comes with the responsibility to "pay back" our community(ies)
> with some form of public *service*. I think that is the most succinct way
> of putting it. I regard ham radio as nothing but a hobby.

To the point that Part 97 clearly states that it can't be anything BUT
a hobby.

> However, I
> have--from time to time--gladly "put in" my time back to my community(ies)
> for the privilege of being a ham radio operator. Hobby is 98%, Service is
> 2%. Rough estimates, of course.

That's generous, I doubt the ratio is that high. I certainly put in my
volunteer hundreds of hours in radio-related local community public
service efforts. There are gazillions of ways to apply the ham radio
experience to public service work and many of those have nothing to do
with "emergency comms".

> When I considered amateur radio licensing, I didn't say to myself "Wow, I
> think I will find an activity that I can do for free in *service* to my
> community! One where I can spend all kinds of money and hours on my own,
> without reimbursement." What I did say to myself was, "Wow, ham radio!
> Sounds like lots of fun! I think I'll go for it!"

I got into ham radio to chase DX. Period. No aplogies offered.

> And, if most are
> truthful--we just are not prone to doing something without reward: the
> reward for the *tiny* bit most of us spend in service, is the fun we have
> with what we consider little more than a hobby. I actually daresay that
> most who would zealously use "service" as a defense for amateur radio are
> the Larry Roll definitions of nothing but wannabes.

His comments along the lines of "pimply-faced geeks running around an
emergency site screaming into an HT" are right on the money. However,

there are a large number of hams out there who are quite serious about being well prepared to supply emergency comms and they're very good at that game, practiced, disciplined, etc. The Red Cross, the Salvation Army and the National Weather Service know who they are. The ARRL has recently ratcheted the game up via offering courses and certifications in the field. These are good and I doubt Larry has a problem with them. At least I hope not.

>
> The hams combing Texas for shuttle parts--I also daresay--would probably
> agree with my opinion. Maybe not.
>
> Kim W5TIT

w3rv

2067. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-12 21:22:41 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E4ABB11.2D124F81@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61150

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E49D16C.97096E03@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E4858A8.81685CD9@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:

>
> > > > > Anyway, I always thought God would be gracious, not smug.
> > > > >
> > > > > I guess that's what happens when you are a God.
> > > >
> > > > No, that's what happens when you are busy reading between the lines
> > > > instead of attempting comprehension of what is actually written. You're
> > > > a real help in proving a point. Please refer to the portion above where
> > > > I state, "I've never claimed to be a god".
> > >
> > > But you don't deny it, either.
> >
> > I haven't denied being fabulously wealthy either. Is it your opinion
> > that anyone is anything he hasn't denied being? That tangental logic
> > you are using needs a bit of polishing.
>
> You accepted the label of "God."

No, I did not. You continue to be misinformed. You don't have an
answer for the question posed? Do you consider that someone is anything
he has not denied being?

> You are also a known masticator.

Consider yourself masticated up and spit out.

Dave K8MN

2068. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-12 21:44:10 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E4AC077.CC9EBEA2@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61151

"Bill, W7TI" wrote:
>
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
> news:d22b54c3.0302120034.c1e139c@posting.google.com:
>
> > That in itself is not all bad but would the hams in Texas who are
> > actually doing their thing do it if there was no ARRL?? I think so.
> >
> >
> > ----------
>
> I'd like to think they would, too. Hams as individuals are great guys.
> It's when they band together and call themselves "ARRL" that things start
> to go a little goofy.
>
> Like nearly all bureaucracies, the League's first mission is self-
> preservation. I can't really fault them for that since it *is* the way
> of the world, but it sometimes gets in the way of their professed mission
> and really does get tiresome.

Bill,

Dick Irving K3FK and I chewed on this one for months and came to a
similar conclusion. At some point in the fairly recent past, the League
lost sight of its primary mission--to serve its membership--and became
obsessed with perpetuating and expanding the organization.

The removal of "Section News" and contest line scores, the inauguration
of the elitist "Diamond Club", charging applicants for the Rag Chewers
Club and Old Timers Club certificats and doing away with the plastic
mailing sleeve for QST (some years back) are a few of my peeves.

Dave K8MN

2069. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-12 22:05:16 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3E4AC51C.2060708@psu.edu>
Source record: 61152

Herb wrote:
> You are a professional first responder (firefighter, police officer,
> EMT, etc.). What are your first thoughts as the first car load
> of ham radio operators arrives on the scene of a disaster or search?
> Well, I can tell you, because I have heard it many times. "Tell those
> *#4%$* CB ham assholes we don't need them. The last time
> they were here they ate all the free food and got in the way."

In my area, they seek us out.

> And
> more than once, some obese ham op himself diverts emergency
> resources when he has a heart attack walking in the woods for the
> first time in years.

Data to back up that sad claim?

> Sorry to bring you the painful truth, but the glory
> days of ham radio are long over.

Perhaps for you. Some of us think the good times are right now.

> Ham radio's hey day was in the
> 1950s and early 60s, just before the shitheads in Newington started
> their selfish incentive licensing program to sell more publications.

Amazing that some people are still wound up about that.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2070. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-12 23:22:23 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030212182223.04929.00000532@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 61153

>Subject: Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery
>From: "Bill, W7TI" jamspam@upyours.now
>Date: 2/12/03 10:42 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <Xns9320589F257CEpookster@216.168.3.50>

>> "Self-congratulatory"...?!?!
>>
>> Interesting term, since the advertising business, which is
>> essentially the
>> profession of self-congratulating, is a multi-billion dollar industry.
>
>Are you holding the advertising industry up as a role model?
>If so, plonk me now.

Yes I am and not yet.

>> So we're supposed to just sit around and HOPE that someone
>> promotes our
>> activities and programs? Maybe the professional broadcasters, with
>> whom we compete for spectrum allocations, will do this for us...?!?!?
>
>Yes you are and yes they will. Do a good job, be useful, smile, and the
>word will get around. One word from another person is worth a hundred of
>your own.

No I won't and they won't either.

The present day media is living proof that unless it involves sex, drugs, violence or scandal, they don't have any room for it.

The Laci Peterson story is a prime example.

Your expectations of the goodness of the media's heart is pretty poor, Bill, and does not even remotely resemble reality. I dare you to sit down with the paper today and count the "human interest" stories as opposed to the aforementioned "scandal" stories. I know the San Diego area and know there are dozens of worthy causes that should be highlighted in the press. How many are there today?

Self promotion, while perhaps a violation of God's law to avoid vanity, is the only way persons, organizations and programs get what they want or need.

Sorry you don't think so, Bill.

Reality, while in short supply in Southern California, sucks.

73

Steve, K4YZ

2071. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-12 23:23:58 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030212182358.04929.00000533@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 61154

>Subject: Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery
>From: "Bill, W7TI" jamspam@upyours.now
>Date: 2/12/03 10:49 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <Xns932059AEE8708pookster@216.168.3.50>

>Like nearly all bureaucracies, the League's first mission is self-
>preservation. I can't really fault them for that since it *is* the way
>of the world, but it sometimes gets in the way of their professed mission
>and really does get tiresome.

How can they accomplish any of their stated goals if they don't first take steps to ensure their viability?

Steve, K4YZ

2072. Re: Montana and Florida

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-12 23:36:55 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030212183655.23139.00000409@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 61156

In article <E5h2a.78905$vm2.45308@rwcrnsc54>, "Jackie"
<buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> writes:

>"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
>news:b2b29982anc@enews2.newsguy.com...
>> Feel free to ship or divert any snowfalls to Michigan, especially the
>middle
>> and lower parts of the lower peninsula! :)
>
>Would you like some of the blizzard that the western half of Minnesota had
>earlier today? It even shut down some schools. It's yours simply for being
>on a direct path to our east. :-)
>
If it shuts down schools in Minnesota - it's a REAL blizzard!

73 de Jim, N2EY

2073. Re: A Question on the US Vanity Callsign Program

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-12 23:37:22 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0302121537.1730a35b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61155

```
"Seamus" <jmcgrath@removeme.nc.rr.com> wrote in message
news:<Uzx2a.34474$ZK1.1635915@twister.southeast.rr.com>...
> "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
> news:d22b54c3.0302120902.188be5a9@posting.google.com...
> > jim@qrowireless.com (Jim) wrote in message
> news:<982cab6d.0302111152.7c238626@posting.google.com>...
> > > All,
> > >
> > > Question on the US Vanity Callsign program.
> > >
> > > The current Status of my application is 2 - meaning "Pending Level 2".
> > > Anyone know what this means?
> > >
> > > I submitted the application on Jan 29, and I see payment was confirmed
> on
> > > Jan 30 (used CC online). The applications has spent most of its life in
> > > "Pending Level 2" status. Just curious if anyone has insight as to what
> > > Pending Level 2 is.
> > >
> > > Thanks & 73,
> >
> > Ya pore thing, you'd croak if today was back then and you had to wait
> > the usual six-eight weeks for the mailman to drop yer new ticket thru
> > the slot. And ya din actually know what yer callsign would be until ya
> > read the license.
> >
> > Take a Valium and DON'T call anybody in the morning.
> >
> > >
> > > Jim
> >
> > w3rv
>
> Geez Brian, who peed in your Corn Flakes? I don't go as far back as you,
> but do remember having to wait at least 6-8 weeks or so for my original
> license.
>
> All I was inquiring about was what did "Pending Level 2" mean. No more, no
> less. Last evening, John gave the answer, basically just a normal part of
> processing until the FCC either grants or dismisses. Until John HELPED with
> his answer, I was thinking Pending Level 2 meant it was going off into the
> bit-bucket somewhere.
>
> Sheesh,
```

I dunno who's been peeing in my corn flakes but if I catch the
sumbitch I'm gonna wring his neck!

>
> Jim

w3rv

2074. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-12 23:45:09 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0302121545.2aec91f5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61157

"Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now> wrote in message
news:<Xns932059AEE8708pookster@216.168.3.50>...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
> news:d22b54c3.0302120034.c1e139c@posting.google.com:
>
> > That in itself is not all bad but would the hams in Texas who are
> > actually doing their thing do it if there was no ARRL?? I think so.
> >
> >
> > ----------
>
> I'd like to think they would, too. Hams as individuals are great guys.
> It's when they band together and call themselves "ARRL" that things start
> to go a little goofy.
>
> Like nearly all bureaucracies, the League's first mission is self-
> preservation. I can't really fault them for that since it *is* the way
> of the world, but it sometimes gets in the way of their professed mission
> and really does get tiresome.

I could not agree more. I'm a member and I fully support the League on
most of the positions it takes. But when they start their puffery or
get stupid again and the ARRL groupies buy it hook line sinker I go
looking for my harpoons.

w3rv

2075. Re: Getting old call sign back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-13 00:03:12 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.ha689s0.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 61158

On 11 Feb 2003 05:21:00 -0800, N2EY wrote:

>QRZ and ARRL databases both agree on issue date of June 4, 1999, which
>agrees with an SK of about three years ago. But the expiration date is
>in 2006, which doesn't make any sense because a vanity callsign issue
>automatically causes a 10 year renewal. (FCC does it that way so the
>fee isn't pro-rated. Vanity callsign issue is the one way to get a
>renewal outside of the 90 day window. Moving and upgrading don't do it
>anymore).

The only thing that could make it kosher would be if the SK had
requested another call sign for any reason, relinquishing the call
sign in question which becomes available for issuance.

My 1x2 relinquished when the vanity program opened was grabbed
up by a club station (California Highway Patrol and State
Police Officers ARC). The W6 1x3 (issued to me in 1957 which I
relinquished in 1977 to get the 1x2 has never been reissued,
not even as a 1x3 vanity call, according to QEZ.

So much for the scarcity of 1x3 calls.

>So the vanity callsign must have been issued back in 1996?

The Vanity Call Sign program started (Gate 1) June 18, 1996.
One can tell if the call sign is a vanity call by the notation
HV in the Codes section of the QRZ Detailed listing.

>The mind reels.

Sure does.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2076. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-13 01:00:56 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030212200056.15411.00000252@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 61159

From K4YZ:
>>> And >>I<< repeat...Since YOU are a product of the present examining
>system,
>>>we can safely assume that YOU don't know the material

Which means that no a code Technician class can know more than an only-coder
General.

>And if the club recruits ONE person into Amateur Radio with thier program
>that subsequently becomes involved in the promotion of "the radio art" (whcih
>does not EXCLUSIVELY involve "technical achievement"), then they will have
>succeeded.
>
> That's NOT "rationalization".

So, you just said:
If someone joines the club and then this person subsequently promotes "the
radio art", the club can claim "promotion of the radio art" was their goal.

This is a perfect example of rationalization.

Another example of rationalization is: General class license must have higher
technical skill because they have a higher license class.

"the radio art" (whcih
>does not EXCLUSIVELY involve "technical achievement").

Yes, it does. I quoted the paragraph from the "FCC rule book." It describes
technical achievement.

From the ARRL's "FCC rule book":

Advancement of the radio art, [97.1(b)]
"For more than 85 years, hams have carried on a tradition of learning by doing,
and since the beginning have remained at the forefront of technology. Through
experimentation and building, hams have pioneered advances such as
single-sideband transmission, and are currently engaged in state-of-the-art
designs in digital radio and spread-spectrum techniques. Amateurs were among
the first to bounce signals off the moon to extend signal range. Amateurs
design and build satellites, experimental balloons and rockets at a fraction of
the cost of their commercial counterparts. Ham's practical experience has lead
to technical refinements and cost reductions beneficial to the commercial radio
industry."

2077. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-13 01:06:22 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030212200622.15411.00000253@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 61160

From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>> "Three of the Columbia astronauts were licensed amateur radio operators."
>
>
>> Irrelevant. In any group, some of them may have amateur radio licenses.

>We lost three hams. I'm sorry you find that irrelevant. I do not. In my
>area, we feel the loss when one of our own dies. I can't even imagine
>you said that

Sorry, I meant that it was irrelevant that they have amateur radio licenses,
not irrelevant that they died.

2078. Re: Montana and Florida

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-13 01:14:10 UTC
From: Jackie <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com>
Message-ID: <CjC2a.91828$vm2.52432@rwcrnsc54>
Source record: 61161

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030212183655.23139.00000409@mb-da.aol.com...

> If it shuts down schools in Minnesota - it's a REAL blizzard!

Yeah! And when those winds whip down the western prairies (nothin' between here and the North Pole but a coupla barbed wire fences, so they say out there) it doesn't take much snow to occlude the roads and drive the windchills down to 30 below.

Ah, now comes the veritable heat wave-- supposed to be in the 20's and 30's through next week.

Jackie KC0ODY

2079. Re: Getting old call sign back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-13 01:32:23 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.ha7uw92.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 61162

On Tue, 11 Feb 2003 17:41:48 -0500, Ray Fitz wrote:

> Zeigler did not sell ALL the call signs he issued. Many call
>signs he gave away just for the asking. Lets just say I have first
>hand knowledge that he gave many call signs absolutely free of
>charge.

I know that, you know that, but he did take money, and that's why he went to jail. Otherwise, he would have just lost his job, which he did anyhow.

And you know what? Who really gives a shit anyway?

Me. He sold the call sign that I wanted (and was legally entitled to under the pick-your-call program). My application and the attached fee check mysteriously disappeared and the call was issued to the purchaser (a high ranking military person, now deceased) before I could get any info as to why my check was never cashed.

I don't forget those things.

>There are far more important things in the world to worry about!

You are so right, Mister Officer.....

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2080. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-13 01:32:24 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.ha7vhh3.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 61163

On Wed, 12 Feb 2003 01:07:27 GMT, Jackie wrote:

>> Some just want the license plate.
>
>Could be. AR radio plates are only $10 here- compared to, say... what is it
>now... $75 for regular, non-vanity plates?

In both California (where I used to live) and Oregon (where I
live now) the ham plate fee is a one-time fee in the $5.00 range
versus $25 or more per year for "environmental" plates. In Oregon
we have my ham call on a special-series "environmental" plate because
the regular-series plates that ham calls go on are too ugly.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2081. Re: New Field Day Entry Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-13 02:02:07 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0302121802.6c2c643d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61164

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3E4A7A83.9080200@psu.edu>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:

> >
> >
> > What the hell does collecting Shuttle parts have to do with Field Day
> > rules? Izzit Field Day in Texas??
>
> Emergency op's knowing how to pass traffic. FD is glitzy training for
> that sort of thing. It's really a clever way of getting a lot of people
> to train for this sort of thing at their own expense.

You're living an idealistic dream. FD events are either radio picnics
or contests depending on the inclinations of the particular
individuals who set up the stations. I have yet to run into anybody
involved in any FD I've been in "remind" anybody that the whole idea
of FD is to "practice emergency comms". Let alone even start to
advocate any such thing. Not once. Ever.

>
> Do you know exactly the form of comms for any emergency? If the wheels
> fall off ya gotta work with what you have.

Which is exactly what I'll do if an appropriate situation pops up
again and I have a radio handy. In fact I've done just that in several
instances over the years via highway incidents. I got the comms thru
despite them not being "exactly in the approved form". Jeez, I guess
I better clean up my act, next time I need a cop I'll stop everything
and count the words before I transmit and send/confirm the check
number huh? As if.

Since ya chose to respond kindly note that ya completely ignored my
question to Jim. I'll try again: "When was the last time an NTS
formatted "message" to an SCM proved of any value whatsoever during an
emergency in which ham radio was involved? Ditto the pointless
"Message from w1aw" thingey."

> Kinda like I think hams
> should have basic proficiency in CW so they can use that if need be, and
> exposure to as many forms of comms as possible.

I wouldn't place any bets on how many licensed hams are first exposed
to any mode on FD.

>
> I guess you started as a fully experienced ham, eh?

My first FD was 15 years before Jim's first and that was before I was first licenesed. I have yet to learn a bloomin' thing from any of the several I've worked in including my first. The reality is that ya take knowledge INTO FD, not OUT of FD. YMMV.

> Maybe someone will
> see the handout and become interested. Maybe

No problem with that, good idea for radio picnic type operations.

> >>Whole point of FD is "something for everybody"
> >
> >
> > That's exactly what's WRONG with FD for many participants like myself
> > and you too, see following.
>
>
> But Brian, it's for you too! If you want to stay home and QSO, you're
> free to do that. If the scoring is too difficult, you don't have to turn
> in a dupe sheet. A person can participate in FD just firing up their
> station at home and at least give out the exchange. Sounds like a
> no-muss, no fuss Field day if that's what you want.

No, God willing and the creek don't rise I plan to toss up a collection of homebrewed antennas by myself out in the boonies and run score, enjoy the fresh air and have some fun. Without getting booted out of my seat in the middle of a nice run on 20 CW by a couple nitwits who worked a grand total of four stations in the following four hours on 10 ssb. Good thing there were two of 'em . . that crap is NOT gonna happen to me again. In fact I just popped $1,200 for a light compact dc to daylight xcvr specifically for the event.

> No one is forcing
> you to run a station for the newbies, no one is forcing you to copy a
> W1AW bulletin. etc.

I noticed . . .

> We might work a satellite,

What kinda "emergency comms training" is THAT??!

> We will definitely have a GOTA station,
> We'll have a person copying W1AW, we'll have an elected official there,
> we'll have the local newspaper there. We'll have the local Television
> stations there. We want to, and will. If you don't want to, don't.

I don't care for radio picnics with significant farce components so I won't, enjoy.

>
> I've been involved in rule writing for over 10 years now. Some
> observations:
>
> 1. You cannot write a rule that someone cannot misunderstand.

>
> 2. Those who misunderstand the rules invariably blame the rule
> writers.
>
> 3. Those who have problems with the rules cannot do any better. I
> always ask the complainant to come up with something better. they have
> either gone away mumbling something about "I'm not going to do your job
> for you", or come up with something that won't work at all. See rule 1
> of the observations.
>
> I think it is symptomatic of some of the problems in society today that
> people who cannot understand the rules seem to blame those who do for
> their lack of understanding.
>
> The challenge to write better rules still stands. Make us some rules to
> run field day by. Jim's joke about the small font notwithstanding, I'd
> love to see the ideas.

Yer preaching to the choir, I founded a couple radio-based organizations 25 or so years ago, they're both still in operation and there's still grousing about the by-laws I wrote back then. In addition to chairing a municipal gummint committee which wrote ordinances.

Read before ya leap on yer keyboard Mike, I already posted my suggestion for "better rules" for those like Jim and I who can't be bothered with the FD bloat. Ref: SS in the boonies. One page.

>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

w3rv

2082. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-13 02:07:36 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030212210736.09921.00001841@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 61169

In article <20030212063626.12173.00000516@mb-mr.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <Xns931FBB1D73298pookster@216.168.3.50>, "Bill, W7TI"
><jamspam@upyours.now> writes:
>
>>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in news:20030211203627.14527.00000262@mb-
>>cc.aol.com:
>>
>>> How should it be done, Bill?
>>>
>>____
>>
>>Not by us.
>
>Then it won;t get done.

You are in Good Hands with ARRL-State.

>>I'm so tired of people/groups/organizations banging their own drum. If
>>their work is really good and desirable, others will realize it and beat
>>the drum for them.
>
>I wish it were so. But the fact is that the squeaky wheel gets the grease in
>our society. Most nonhams I meet have no idea that amateur radio even exists,
>despite the fact that there are 685,000 of us in the USA alone. Those who do
>know often confuse amateurs with cbers and freebanders.

The USA has a population of approximately 300 million.

Citizens of the USA know about cellular telephones
(little two-way radios connected to the telephone system)
and one out of three are cellphone subscribers according
to the Census Bureau.

Citizens of the USA know that CB exists and that public
safety people use radios. Such has been shown on both
TV news and fictional drama for over two decades.

Citizens of the USA know that radio and television broad-
casting exists since they listen and watch it for news.

Citizens of the USA don't know much about "ham radio."
If they do, they probably don't know any detail such as it
being this "vital service to the nation" etc., etc., etc.

It is doubtful that many citizens of the USA know
"freebanding." ;-)

Or has there been a "poll" that Mr. N2EY (his real surname?)
uses for a "reference?"

>Do you think the MSNBC piece would have happened without somebody pushing it?

Do you really want to know? Journalism 101 should be
available in some nearby night classes there in downtown
Pennsylvania...inquire locally.

>Who is going to push it, if not some organized amateur radio group like ARRL?

"Pushing?" That one bit was "pushing?"

>>You younger folks who grew up in the age of Muhammad Ali may not realize
>>it, but modesty in your accomplishments used to be considered a virtue
>>worthy of respect.
>
>I hear what you are saying, but there's a big difference between bragging and
>telling the story so the credit goes where it is due.

There's an even BIGGER difference between reporting and
careful word-crafting to exclude certain details. ARRL is
very good at such craftsmanship.

>> Nobody *ever* bragged on themself.
>
>"It ain't braggin' if ya really done it" - Babe Ruth

This isn't a baseball or candy newsgroup. And Mr. N2EY
isn't a major league slugger.

>Heck, just look at the history of radio. Marconi, Sarnoff, DeForest and others
>were tireless self-promoters, often to the point of distorting the facts.

Of course. Everyone knows that amateurs and St. Hiram
invented radio, pioneered short waves, perfected everything
as told in the temple at Newington. No problem.

Erich von Daniken wrote no less than five books explaining
visits to earth by ancient astronauts. :-)

>Many
>books will tell you that all-electronic TV made its debut at the 1939 NYC
>World's Fair, and that it was "invented" by RCA - even though Philo T.
>Farnsworth was the actual inventor, and gave a public demonstration five
>years earlier (1934) in Philadelphia, at the Franklin Institute.

Vladimir K. Zworykin of Westinghouse had demonstrated in
1929 a television receiver containing his kinescope picture
tube. RCA Corporation hired him in 1930 and he became a
research director. In 1931 he and his associates invented the
iconoscope camera tube, one more sensitive than he had
invented in 1923. Other approaches lacked the storage

feature of the iconoscope and Philo Farnsworth's image
dissector were less successful.

- ELECTRONICS 50th Anniversary Issue, April 17, 1980

Scotsman John Logie Baird demonstrated much television
in the 1920s and 1930s but those were all using the Nipkow
mechanical scanning disk.

The image orthicon from RCA Corporation became the
studio camera tube of choice by 1950, the iconoscope
relegated to film and transparency pickup. The vidicon
soon followed for small cameras. There was no
"philocon" ever made or used.

>>If you were good,
>>others would do it for you and it meant something.
>
>Wish it was like that today, but it's not.

Nobody recognizes Mr. N2EY's glorious achievements?
How many patents does Miccolis have?

>>Nowdays it's so
>>pervasive us old guys just tune it out. Wish the younger ones would too.
>
>I'm 48. Been a ham 35 years. Publicity has always been a problem - as in not
>enough.

Just think, 35 years! All that time and not being able to
"push" his lifestyle into the media! Tsk, tsk, tsk.

Maybe it's due to all his errors and mistakes? No one can
possibly think he has anything worthwhile to offer after so
many errors and mistakes...tsk, tsk, tsk...

2083. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-13 02:07:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030212210737.09921.00001842@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 61165

In article <c2356669.0302110943.37927a89@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>> I did not hear any mention of Ham (or amateur) radio operators, in regard >to
>> the Columbia recovery, in the news. Not one.
>
>Isn't MNSNBC "the news"?

It is not.

There is no journalistic activity named "MNSNBC."

There is an MSNBC, a news operation of Microsoft
and National Broadcast Company on cable TV.

All such errors and mistakes cast doubt upon the relevancy
of Mr. N2EY to be believed in this newsgroup.

2084. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-13 02:07:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030212210737.09921.00001843@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 61166

In article <k%z1a.19937$LW1.923039@news1.west.cox.net>, "AC6V"
<none@nowhere.com> writes:

>Where in part 97 does it say hobby ?? (nope)
>Where in Part 97 does it say service ?? (yep)
>These and many other debates such as WAA6XYZ for ID can be found in part 97
>of the FCC rules and Regs.
>http://www.arrl.org/FandES/field/regulations/news/part97/
>
>And if we don't believe the FCC -- who do we believe ??? You, me, them, us
>??
>No smart retorts accepted

Throughout all of Title 47 CFR the word "service" is a regulatory
term denoting a type and kind of radio activity defined in the
individual Parts of Title 47.

That is what is. Nothing smart about it.

If you, Mr. AC6V, want to emotionally load the word "service"
with some kind of nobility or civic duty, feel free. Just don't
try a con game about word definitions to soothe your personal
fantasies or demand that others obey those fantasies.

If you feel "hurt" or outraged, don't ever look in other parts
of Title 47 CFR. In Part 95 you will see things like the
Citizens Band Radio SERVICE, even Family Radio
SERVICE and Radio Control SERVICE.

2085. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-13 02:07:38 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030212210738.09921.00001844@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 61167

In article <iYz1a.52359$be.39252@rwcrnsc53>, "Jackie"
<buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030209160051.16280.00001787@mb-
>
>> What?!? "Just a hobby?!?" How can that be?
>>
>> Several other newsgroupies have shouted "it's a SERVICE!"
>
> Some people are into it for the hobby and others for the services, yet
>others are in it for both.

Jackie, you've not been in here for a long time. The Regulars
in here (nearly all PCTAs) are simply elitists who want all to
follow Their directives, Their kind of enjoyment, Their life-
style and NO back-talk from "inferiors." :-)

Throughout all of Title 47 CFR, the word "service" is a regulatory
term denoting a type and kind of radio activity.

The elitist Regulars in here want, love, and cherish the emotional
loading of the word "service" with "service to the nation, the
community," whatever. It puts a lovely radiance on their hobby
activities for basking in a glow of glory and nobility without once
having to actually DO any services to the nation or community
through amateur radio. They point to ARRL Letters as
"explaining it all" as if those were immortal words from the
divine blessing them more than others. PR fluff. False bunting
decorating a stage of twigs, designed to take hobbyists into
membership for the organization's survival. Lifestyle-ism as a
substitute for real life. Emotional sustenance because the real
world is too painful for the elite. <shrug>

2086. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-13 02:07:40 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030212210740.09921.00001845@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 61170

In article <v4dq51pb14aj30@corp.supernews.com>, "KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com>
writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030209125206.03273.00000429@mb-mb.aol.com...
>> In article <v4at0j89b8dv8b@corp.supernews.com>, "KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com>
>> writes:
>>
>> >"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>> >news:20030208154107.29447.00000266@mb-cd.aol.com...
>> >> A number of spiteful regulars in here, unable to take strong
>> >> opposition to their opinions, write about "having to pass a
>> >> ham test" as an absolute must...as if the passing of that
>> >> test and the grant of a license now has evidence of The
>> >> RIGHT Attitude...all others are of inferior status.
>> >
>> ><SNIP>
>> >
>> >If your not a MD Doctor you can't expect to discuss
>> >medical treatments with a Doctor as an equal.
>>
>> Who is the Doogie Howser, MD, equivalent in here? :-)
>
>Irrelevant comment! & Personal attack!

? "Doogie Howser, MD" was a TV sitcom that is defunct.

>> >If your not a rocket scientist you can't expect to
>> >discuss rockets with a rocket scientist as an equal.
>>
>> Tsk, tsk, tsk. I worked at Rocketdyne division of
>> Rockwell International for a number of years,
>> including some work on the SSMEs (Space Shuttle
>> Main Engines). No problem working with REAL
>> rocket scientists.
>
>Good for you! Since I'm not a rocket scientest I am
>not going to discuss it with you, it's not in my area
>of knowlage.

...and neither is spelling of English language. :-)

>You expect to talk about radios when you can't understand
>how the above applies to you.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...I've applied myself to radios for over 50 years
and we (radios and myself) got along just fine. I understand
them very well. :-)

Would you like some personal instruction in radio theory?
Feel free to send e-mail for an educational brochure.
Reasonable rates unless one first learned from ARRL
"Archie" comix...then the price octuples due to necessary
desensitization that must be done first.

>> >If your not a Supreme Court Judge you can't expect to
>> >discuss law with a Supreme Court Judge as an equal.
>>
>> Ahem...nobody here is the analagous equivalent of any
>> supreme. This ain't no "court" either, "counsellor." :-)
>
>Irrelevant comment! It's another example of being one
>before being taken seriously.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, dismissing a comment to your original
irrelevancy as "irrelevant?" :-)

>> >So why do you try to discuss AMATEUR RADIO
>> >with LICENSED AMATEUR RADIO OPERATORS,
>> >when you don't have an AMATEUR RADIO LICENSE
>> >and expect to be accepted as an equal?
>>
>> Tsk, tsk, tsk. Plate overload! Breaker tripped! :-)
>>
>> Please...neutralize that tube final properly before
>> key-down, okay? The transmitter you save may be
>> your own...
>
>Irrelevant comment!

Tsk, tsk, tsk...tripped your own breaker again?

Try a higher-power blower for cooling...you are obviously
over-heated.

>> >Get a license then we'll talk as equals, until then your
>> >just an outsider and your not going to be heard here!
>>
>> Who wants to talk like "equals?" There's no
>> consensus in here on "equality." It's the conservative
>> traditionalists with their Handbook bible against all
>> others. Dichotomy. Schism. Two opposing camps
>> with the conservative traditionalists wanting to "rub
>> the others' noses in their 'business.'"
>
>And for the most part they are all Ham Radio Operators,
>except for you and a couple of others.

"The few, the proud, the amateurs?" :-)

Ah...you (and others) were BORN hams? OK.

>Sorry I normally don't read your initial posts just the
>later ones but I'm afraid I'll not be doing that any more.

Awww. Sigh...I'll have to read comix more in order to
understand how to communicate on your level?

>You don't answer the points made, you just sling crap,
>and try to put down the other person by attacking them.

Oh? Others "don't do that?" :-) :-) :-)

I don't answer pre-loaded questions that others demand
answers on their terms of fantasy, mythos, or lore.

>I have had a nice qso with Larry K3LT and found him
>to be a very nice person even though he doesn't sound
>like that here sometimes.

I've had a very nice talk with my dentist before and
after he pulled a bad wisdom tooth. That's on par
with the above although on a different green. :-)

Larry Roll (amateur radio callsign K3LT, not his surname)
is simply an "attention-wanter" who uses the computer-
modem medium to fulfill his dreams of becoming some
kind of "spokesperson" or "sage" or "guru." He does not
demonstrate any sort of technical knowledge whatsoever
on any part of radio other than reading official amateur
publications and then using a remarkable imagination to
post a large amount of fantasy.

>You on the other hand will
>NEVER have a nice qso with anyone here on the radio
>because you'll never "lower" yourself to become a
>licensed ham operator.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. I've already had "nice cuesoes" on radio,
amateur radio, with real, live human beings, most of
whom I'd known a long while in-person. None of them
had any sort of chip on their shoulders about enjoying
their HOBBY of ham radio.

A few of them did have a trace of the human territorial
imperative about "their turf." That is understandable in
all humans. It just wasn't carried as far as the Regulars
in here go by demonstrated hatred against anyone who
has seen the rest of the world of radio and radios,
working for money (at disclosed locations). Fortunately,
none of them went to the chest-thumping Muhammed Ali
route of self-described superiority because they had
some kind of extra-special "achievement" that no one
else could do. Regulars in here (all of them PCTAs)
do that with regularity.

>And even if you do become
>a ham you never be nice, so PLEASE don't become
>a ham and lower "OUR" standards by your presence.

I wouldn't dream of disturbing your elite little group of
"special people." I might reconsider becoming an
amateur radio licensee in the future because amateur
radio is an enjoyable hobby involving communications
and technology and social interaction among radio
hobbyists.

The PCTA Regulars in here seem to be entirely elitist,
adopting "ham radio" as a virtual lifestyle, obediently
following all directives of ARRL, slavishly devoted to
tradition, and militant in demanding others' obedience
to Their Commands. All must do as they do and did
because they are the elite, the nobles. Of a hobby.

<shrug>

2087. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-13 02:07:42 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030212210742.09921.00001846@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 61168

In article <f45722ac.0302111513.7425cfe0@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
>news:<20030211105851.00111.00001612@mb-mv.aol.com>...
>> In article <20030209150931.03943.00000369@mb-fj.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>> (Len Over 21) writes:
>>
>> >
>> >>Lennie -- you're the Wicked Witch of the West -- and the Scarecrow
>> >>just tossed a bucket of water on you!
>> >
>> > In your dreams coachman...this ain't the NFL.
>> >
>> > Larrie, you are a bus driver after being summa cum laude
>> > in personnel management and ex-USAF desk ace who
>> > shot down officers (according to your own words).
>>
>> Lennie:
>>
>> I only "shot down" the officers who needed "shooting down." I had a lot
>> of very close and satisfactory working relationships with officers and
>Senior
>> NCO's who recognized and appreciated my talents, abilities, and willingness
>> to give my best effort to accomplish the mission. The only ones I had
>> problems with were the ones who were uncomfortable with the fact that I
>> was working rings around them, and making THEM look bad in the process!
>>
>> > You've
>> > never done any military or commercial or government radio
>> > communications on any continuous basis, have no
>> > expertise in radio except having a lot of certificates and
>> > fantasizing a lot of hypothetical emergencies. You DO
>> > have a computer-modem and some experience in that,
>> > are usually a good typist.
>> >
>> > Beyond those narrow boundaries all you have is fantasy
>> > about radio. You've never been IN any big leagues in
>> > anything other than the military. Don't run up your little
>> > flag on the pole because nobody cares to salute it...
>>
>> I don't "fantasize" about radio whatsoever, Lennie! However, I DO have
>> over two decades of varied experience as an Amateur Radio Operator,
>> and am thus qualified to render my judgments and opinions on topics

>> related to that field. You, OTOH, are definitely NOT! So, why don't you
>> get your ticket, spend a few years on the air, and then come back and
>> try again! You may find some of us a bit more interested in what you
>> have to say!
>>
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>Larry, ahem. What Len said.
>
>"Broken leg on mountainside, screaming wife" fantasy. Refuses
>assistance from no-coder with shack-on-belt.

Heh heh heh...I'm still pondering the "floating" Ten-Tec that
washed up on his famous desert island...or the mysterious
foreign girlfriend "Natasha"...or all those claims of getting any
personnel job he wanted after college that awarded the
soma come loud.

It's almost as good as that other ham in here, the one that
must work for Dick Cheney at some "undisclosed location."

Or the loose cannon, ace of the CAP, who always manages
some kind of picture in UNIFORM...many different kinds over
the years...hair receding and greying prematurely while
shouting at dissenters "get down and gimme ten..." :-)

Or that splendid model of decorum and diplomacy for The Ham,
defunct from a quasi-amateur-ambassadorship for State. :-(

Or the katapult kop munching that hoagie while taking pix of
secret soviet aircraft for Navy intelligence. :-)

So much for "movements" among the Regulars... :-)

2088. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-13 02:07:45 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030212210745.09921.00001847@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 61171

In article <20030211220432.28727.00000217@mb-fr.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>Remember when "Ham Radio" became QST? It is representative of the change in
>today's Ham radio.

I'm sure you meant something else, but a new (misdirection)
thread will start up in here where the Faithful will confuse
"QST" with "Ham Radio" magazine (started in 1968, ended
in 1990 by sale to CQ)...and "inform you" that you are a
#$%^&!!! and a $@!$@!! for writing that.

>>>> The ANSWER to that, Vipul, is that the "radio art" is MORE than
>>>>experimentation INSIDE the box...It's how to USE the box too.
>>>
>>>Possibly, if you could give an example.
>>
>> No "possibly" to it.
>
>So, no example.

Steve Cannon will probably trot out one of his old set-pieces
about "extras are So good because they expertly know how
to tune their receivers..." :-) :-) :-)

>>I have been an ACTIVE Amateur Radio
>>licensee, probably before you were born, and I ahve NEVER heard of ANY
>>"definintion" of "radio art" to be ONLY "technical achievement".

Oh, my, another "OF" blowing his trumpet!

Tsk, tsk, tsk, I was actively doing trans-Pacific HF radio comm
before that loose Cannon was even conceived. :-) :-) :-)

Let's take the ARRL quoted paragraph and show what it says
and doesn't say, sentence by sentence -

>From the ARRL's "FCC rule book":
>
>Advancement of the radio art, [97.1(b)]

>"For more than 85 years, hams have carried on a tradition of learning by
doing,
>and since the beginning have remained at the forefront of technology.

Firstly, that's just ambiguous non-speak, having no real
reference anywhere.

"Learning by doing" is itself a hit-and-miss experimentation
that some probably do, but most have a certain knowledge
base to apply what they are doing.

"Since the beginning have remained at the forefront of
technology" will only apply at the beginning. The recognized
beginning of radio as a communications medium is in 1896
in both Italy and czarist Russia. "Technology" of 1896 can
only be described as primitive as far as electronics goes...
iron-filing "detectors" and spark transmitters.

From 1896 onwards, the "forefront" has been described in
scientific and technical journals and periodicals. As this new
radio industry formed to fulfill a new need by maritimers and
common carriers, industry periodicals were formed to further
what is at the "forefront." That continues today with a wealth
of periodicals and texts describing many and various
"forefronts." ARRL doesn't come close to explaining those
"forefronts" or which radio service does what in the EM spectrum
amateurs must share with every other radio service.

>Through
>experimentation and building, hams have pioneered advances such as
>single-sideband transmission, and are currently engaged in state-of-the-art
>designs in digital radio and spread-spectrum techniques.

The first part of that sentence is simply incorrect. Single-
sideband transmission originated on wire long-lines as a
means of frequency-division multiplexing several voice
circuits on a single pair of wires. That was before 1920.
In the decade following 1920, commercial carriers utilized
SSB first in radio transmission, essentially using "carrier"
equipment to, again, frequency multiplex up to four voice
channels per transmitter and receiver. The militaries picked
that up for their own long-distance HF radio circuits while
industry did the pioneering of technology for all in RF linear
amplifiers, frequency multiplexing, AFC techniques working
with "pilot" carrier tones, frequency diversity in tone pairing
to reduce selective fading phenomena, and space diversity
in receiving antenna fields to reduce multipath fading effects.

"State of the art" in either digital or spread-spectrum radio
techniques is definitely not done if one includes all radio.
"Digital" radio is a general term that takes in an enormous
variety of modulations. Time-diversity digitizing of up to four
asynchronous TTY circuits was done in the military in the
early 1950s and, at the same time, various commercial
carriers (RCA Globecom, for one) used majority-voting
techniques of three radio circuits carrying the same message
content to select the optimum one for minimum error. At the
same time there were at least four separate methods of pulse
position modulation over multi-channel radio relay equipment,
all of them using a form of digital sampling of analog voice and

ways to reconstitute the analog from digital information.
Claude Shannon's 1947 seminal Bell Labs paper on laws
relating "bit rate," bandwidth, and noise in the circuit still holds
true today.

Spread-spectrum techniques were done first by the
governments for secure communications work, a fallout of
which was an advancement of information compression
technology that are used in modems of 2400 bits per second
and faster. Those modems were then applied to radio in
various forms (one example is PACTOR) for data transmission.

Until R&O 99-412, US radio amateurs were limited by law to
only a few forms of pseudo-random generator patterns for DSSS
when there were hundreds of different patterns employed in
commercial and government applications. There is still nothing
definitive in US amateur radio regulations on FHSS except as a
vague reference.

If ARRL limited itself solely to amateur accomplishments
within amateur radio, they might have a reasonable case.
Such as direct-conversion receivers pioneered in Europe in
the 1970s or PSK31 devised by an English radio amateur.

>Amateurs were among
>the first to bounce signals off the moon to extend signal range.

The first evidence of moonbounce came from US Army Signal
Corps experimentation in Project Diana. That, in 1946, is
considered the first. According to Gregory Bamford's second
book, "Body of Secrets," NSA (National Security Agency) is
the first to regularly use the lunar surface as a reflector for
communications. In the 1960s.

>Amateurs
>design and build satellites, experimental balloons and rockets at a fraction
>of the cost of their commercial counterparts.

In order to meet very stringent requirements of space flight
and space lifters, satellite design and building is done by
those who are experienced in professional space electronics
who might also be amateur radio hobbyists. There are no
amateur publications that detail design guides or environmental
concerns of space satellites except in short, ambiguous terms.

Balloons carrying radio or electronics are not experimental.
Literally millions of radiosondes have been launched since
WW2, each carrying an RF transmitter telemetering data to
tracker-recorders on the earth. [that number is perhaps in
"many tens of millions"] Very high-altitude balloons, both
manned and unmanned have been launched since WW2,
all carrying some form of communications (manned) and
telemetering (manned and unmanned). Very high-altitude

balloons evolved early in economy, limited only by the cost
of helium for lifting; their balloon material essentially very
thin plastic sheet..

Rockets carrying radio and telemetering were already
developed during WW2 in the Wehrmacht Artillery
"Vengence" weapons program. All of those were quite
expensive to develop but the eventual result were V-1s
(technically an aircraft) and V-2s that worked as weapons.
Several nations developed rocket weapons since WW2,
all of them telemetered and most with secure destruct
radios to prevent damage to launch facilities and friendly
forces.

Outside of hobby "park flying" it is not possible to build
cheap, safe rockets.

Governments who once launched a half million radiosondes
a year go to industry for minimum cost and maximum
reliability. Anything else is pipe-dream nonsense.

>Ham's practical experience has lead
>to technical refinements and cost reductions beneficial to the commercial
>radio industry."

A pure PR bit of ambiguity which has absolutely no sense
of perspective in the "commercial radio industry." The
"commercial radio industry" includes hundreds of different
radio types engineered for maximum profit through minimum
fabrication cost sold in vast quantities to the consumer
electronics industry. Such includes all manner of portable
broadcast radios, cellular telephones, handheld transceivers,
private boat electronics (and single-channel SSB transceivers),
GPS receivers, TV sets, "set-top boxes" to receive and
decode digital TV signals, satellite TV and broadcast receiver
systems all using specific integrated circuits which, in some
cases, were designed just for that design. Those don't use
vacuum tubes.

"Cost reductions to industry" is more ambiguous nonsense
since "cost reductions" come from mass production
efficiency. Business is IN business to make money and it
maximizes profit in a competitive field by definite integrated
design by ingenious engineers and technicians who are
professionals at work first, amateurs away from work maybe.

>---
>The club uses the phrase "advancement of the radio art" and does not do
>anything near what is mentioned in the above paragraph. Not only do they not
do
>these activities, they are uninterested in those activities. Yet, they can
use

>that phrase to make them look good - that's rationalization.

Ambiguous vague statements of wonderfulness in radio are great for use by membership organizations to increase their membership. A definite side-effect is the spoon-feeding and brainwashing into Believers who don't know much of anything outside of amateurism but are both Devout to a fault and also quite enraged by the slightest negativism of their Religious Beliefs.

Membership organizations rationalize their statements by saying "we are talking about amateur radio" despite their constant attempts to align themselves with the rest of the radio world...and not telling their membership much about the rest of that world of radio. Lovely set-up. :-)

2089. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-13 02:36:51 UTC
From: Jackie <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com>
Message-ID: <7xD2a.91351$be.68029@rwcrnsc53>
Source record: 61172

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030212210738.09921.00001844@mb-md.aol.com...

> Jackie, you've not been in here for a long time. The Regulars
> in here (nearly all PCTAs) are simply elitists who want all to
> follow Their directives, Their kind of enjoyment, Their life-
> style and NO back-talk from "inferiors." :-)

I may not have "been here for a long time", but I have been reading long enough and I knows opinions when I see's 'em. Len, I'm not picking on you or singling you out, but the above is an example of your OPINIONS and nothing more.

> Throughout all of Title 47 CFR, the word "service" is a regulatory
> term denoting a type and kind of radio activity.
>
> The elitist Regulars in here want, love, and cherish the emotional
> loading of the word "service" with "service to the nation, the
> community," whatever. It puts a lovely radiance on their hobby
> activities for basking in a glow of glory and nobility without once
> having to actually DO any services to the nation or community
> through amateur radio.

Wait! What's that I hear...? A crescendo of tiny violins in sweet refrain? C'mon Len, I don't think that many people take this all as seriously as you think they do.

OTOH, I and many other hams choose to make ourselves available through ARES and RACES and Skywarn. What's wrong with that? So were are not a part of the Red Cross or other relief organizations- but there are times when even the capability of organizations who're used to disaster response get overwhelmed with the communication aspects of disaster response, and so they call on a pool of trained individuals who make themselves available to help out. Now, I don't know about others, but I certainly do not feel as if my participation in helping out my fellow humans qualifies me for demi-god status or even for bragging rights.

>They point to ARRL Letters as
> "explaining it all" as if those were immortal words from the
> divine blessing them more than others. PR fluff. False bunting
> decorating a stage of twigs, designed to take hobbyists into
> membership for the organization's survival. Lifestyle-ism as a
> substitute for real life. Emotional sustenance because the real
> world is too painful for the elite. <shrug>

How do you define the "real world", Len? Scratch that, nevermind... I live there, so I know something about it.

I somehow doubt that most AR ops see the ARRL as some sort of divine oracle to be obeyed and supplicated to. C'mon, it's a hobby, AND a service, AND some people happen to get some pleasure out of any number of aspects that fall under those two categories. What is the problem with that? You're not even an AR operator Len... so I really fail to see how this affects you personally.

Jackie
KC0ODY

2090. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-13 02:55:13 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BA707341.E70A%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 61173

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> (snip) Many books will tell you that all-electronic
> TV made its debut at the 1939 NYC World's Fair, and
> that it was "invented" by RCA - even though Philo T.
> Farnsworth was the actual inventor, and gave a public
> demonstration five years earlier (1934) in
> Philadelphia, at the Franklin Institute. (snip)

I'll accept that, Jim. However, how many people saw that demonstration at the Franklin Institute versus at the World's Fair? How many saw it in magazines and newspapers as a result of the fair? For most Americans, television did make its debut at the 1939 World's Fair. Why argue with most Americans over a point this minor? The Farnsworth versus RCA controversy is worth noting however (inventors deserve credit).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2091. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-13 03:03:25 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030212220325.08747.00000877@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 61174

In article <20030212210742.09921.00001846@mb-md.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

> Heh heh heh...I'm still pondering the "floating" Ten-Tec that
> washed up on his famous desert island...

Lennie:

Ten Tec's, like a lot of other radios, are packed in styrofoam -- which,
among other things, floats!

>or the mysterious
> foreign girlfriend "Natasha"...

You've never heard of Romania? People do come from there, Lennie!

> or all those claims of getting any
> personnel job he wanted after college that awarded the
> soma come loud.

I'm still unclear on this alleged "claim" I made, and you haven't
seen fit to quote any of them. However, I now have a Job that I
enjoy a whole lot more than I would sitting in a cubicle, and due to
being a union member, I have great benefits and bullet-proof
job security -- which I wouldn't have had in 99% of the HR jobs
I could have taken for about 2/3's of what I'm making now!

> It's almost as good as that other ham in here, the one that
> must work for Dick Cheney at some "undisclosed location."
>
> Or the loose cannon, ace of the CAP, who always manages
> some kind of picture in UNIFORM...many different kinds over
> the years...hair receding and greying prematurely while
> shouting at dissenters "get down and gimme ten..." :-)
>
> Or that splendid model of decorum and diplomacy for The Ham,
> defunct from a quasi-amateur-ambassadorship for State. :-(
>
> Or the katapult kop munching that hoagie while taking pix of
> secret soviet aircraft for Navy intelligence. :-)

Very funny, Lennie. Now, back to the real issue: What's keeping you
from getting an amateur radio license?

73 de Larry, K3LT

2092. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-13 03:25:38 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030212222538.07840.00000698@mb-mg.aol.com>
Source record: 61175

In article <f45722ac.0302120826.5d8d0730@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> More like "Car 59 Where Are You?" in your case.
>>
>> w3rv
>
>Before my time. Tell me about it.

It was titled "Car 54, Where Are You?" [Oo! Oo! :-)]

Brian, there's a definite missing-arithmetic component to
the PCTAs. Such as "7 x 24 = 148." :-)

With all those errors and mistakes, one just can't take
all those PCTAs seriously... :-)

2093. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-13 03:25:41 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030212222541.07840.00000699@mb-mg.aol.com>
Source record: 61176

In article <c2356669.0302120948.39e1066@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>news:<3E49D788.9040202@adelphia.net>...
>> Vshah101 wrote:
>>
>> > From article
>> > http://www.msnbc.com/news/869906.asp
>> >
>> > I did not hear any mention of Ham (or amateur) radio operators, in regard to
>> > the Columbia recovery, in the news. Not one. I guess ARRL is the "inside"
>
>> > news
>> > organization.
>>
>> I did.
>
>Mike,
>
>'There are none so blind as those who will not see, nor deaf as those who will not hear'.

Gosh...been speed-reading Bartlett's Familiar
Quotations again? Should we all laminate that and put
it in our wallets?

None are blinder than the Devout Followers of the Church
of St. Hiram in the morse cult.

>> I guess you don't know about HF versus VHF/UHF Propogation.
>
>Or repeater coverage, antenna patterns, state/county/local
>communications budgets, etc.

Tell us again how inefficient, illogical, and unreliable the
professionals are in radio, how nothing survives the least
disaster or emergency...

>> > If you look more closely, this actually supports removing amateur radio
>> > privileges (to get rid of those serious "blind spots"). Not good for amateur
>> > radio.
>
>The main reason there are blind spots is because the various agencies

>simply haven't built the necessary infrastructure to cover the entire
>area reliably. Probably boils down to $$. Taking away the ham bands
>won't make other services' coverage any better.

Oh? The Columbia shuttle tragedy is now threatening to
take ham bands away from hams?!?!?

>Because hams are unpaid, and often willing to use recycled and simpler
>technology, the cost of a ham repeater can be much lower than the
>equivalent "professional" installation. And because hams put emphasis
>on operating skill as well as technology, they can make do with
>less-than-optimal setups.

All professionals goof up in everything and hams have to
jump in and Save The Day, right? :-)

>> We lost three hams. I'm sorry you find that irrelevant. I do not. In my
>> area, we feel the loss when one of our own dies. I can't even imagine
>> you said that
>
>But he did.

I can't imagine you lifestylers are THAT brainwashed to
think that astronauts were amateur radio operators FIRST
before anything else.

The vast majority of hams were simply requested to add one
minor item to a large list of Tasks To Do...aid NASA PR and
get a Technician license.

>Consider for a moment - who does Mr. Shah sound like in this
>discussion? He's minimizing the public service contributions of hams,
>calling the publicity "hype", and dismissing as "irrelevant" the fact
>that quite a few astronauts are also hams, and the loss most of us
>feel.

Yes, you all "feel" great emotion. Not for those human beings
but for their licenses, Mr. N2EY. Their loss reflects on your
surname, a ham callsign. Great crocodile tears shed...in the
newsgroups.

>Mike, thank you for expressing what many of us felt when we read
>Vipul's nonsense, but could not adequately get across.

Yes...you, Mr. N2EY, are the Emotion and Grief Director of
the newsgroup. All shall grieve as you direct.

Never mind that seven human souls were lost in a Real
Pioneering endeavor, seven who had families and friends.
Your concern was only for the three who were granted
amateur radio licenses.

>I'll repeat what I wrote about Mr. Shah and another constant critic a
>little while, back:

>
>"Their hobby is wasting time. Your time."

You are the one wasting time doing a poor parody of
"shame" and "grief," enjoying some perverse pleasure
of attempted emotional manipulation to win some
message points. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

Isn't it time for another Sermon on The Antenna Mount,
Reverend?

>When you read their posts, you are being baited. Perhaps by the
>master, perhaps by the apprentice. Perhaps they are one and the same.
>The writing style is a little different but the message is almost
>identical. They ignore facts and exposing of their faulty logic.

Yes, according to the Reverend's poor replay of ARRL
dogma, all that do not agree with his righteous opinions
are "ignoring facts" and using exposed faulty logic...

All shall think like the Reverend to be Correct and
Faithful in the Service of the Church of St. Hiram.

Amen...over and out...roger that.

2094. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-13 03:39:52 UTC
From: "Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now>
Message-ID: <Xns9320C808ECCB7pookster@216.168.3.50>
Source record: 61177

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in news:3E4AC51C.2060708@psu.edu:

>> Ham radio's hey day was in the
>> 1950s and early 60s, just before the shitheads in Newington started
>> their selfish incentive licensing program to sell more publications.
>
>
> Amazing that some people are still wound up about that.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>

Mike, it really was better back then, and this is not just the musings of a senile old fart, either. Before incentive licensing, hams were much more fraternal. It was like a club where the newbies either upgraded within a year or dropped out and all the regulars were pretty much equal: Same license, same frequencies, same mode priviliges, everything.

When incentive licensing came, so did the "I have a better license, I'm a better ham" school of thought. And since there were several new levels, not just one, there was ample room for everybody to look down on someone else. In your local club, do the Extras hang out only with the Extras? Do the Generals shun the Novices? Does everyone look down on the "No-Code Techs"? I'll bet most of the no-coders never come to their second meeting.

There are lots of ways individuals could be recognized for their achievments and encouraged to improve themselves. Licensing turned out to be a very poor choice. You know what they say about the road to hell being paved with? Add incentive licensing to the list.

--
Bill, W7TI

2095. Re: A Question on the US Vanity Callsign Program

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-13 04:06:52 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302122006.10e3c6e0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61179

"Seamus" <jmcgrath@removeme.nc.rr.com> wrote in message
news:<Uzx2a.34474$ZK1.1635915@twister.southeast.rr.com>...
> "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
> news:d22b54c3.0302120902.188be5a9@posting.google.com...
> > jim@qrowireless.com (Jim) wrote in message
> news:<982cab6d.0302111152.7c238626@posting.google.com>...
> > > All,
> > >
> > > Question on the US Vanity Callsign program.
> > >
> > > The current Status of my application is 2 - meaning "Pending Level 2".
> > > Anyone know what this means?
> > >
> > > I submitted the application on Jan 29, and I see payment was confirmed
> on
> > > Jan 30 (used CC online). The applications has spent most of its life in
> > > "Pending Level 2" status. Just curious if anyone has insight as to what
> > > Pending Level 2 is.
> > >
> > > Thanks & 73,
> >
> > Ya pore thing, you'd croak if today was back then and you had to wait
> > the usual six-eight weeks for the mailman to drop yer new ticket thru
> > the slot. And ya din actually know what yer callsign would be until ya
> > read the license.
> >
> > Take a Valium and DON'T call anybody in the morning.
> >
> > >
> > > Jim
> >
> > w3rv
>
> Geez Brian, who peed in your Corn Flakes? I don't go as far back as you,
> but do remember having to wait at least 6-8 weeks or so for my original
> license.
>
> All I was inquiring about was what did "Pending Level 2" mean. No more, no
> less. Last evening, John gave the answer, basically just a normal part of
> processing until the FCC either grants or dismisses. Until John HELPED with
> his answer, I was thinking Pending Level 2 meant it was going off into the
> bit-bucket somewhere.
>
> Sheesh,

>
> Jim

Kelly's just that sort of guy. He has "real" military experience.
Ask him about it sometime.

2096. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-13 04:10:43 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302122010.687b070f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61180

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030212014001.29328.00000307@mb-fy.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
> >From: "Jackie" buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com
> >Date: 2/11/03 9:29 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <Ocj2a.79839$HN5.299679@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net>
>
> >Then I'd say that it's time to find-- or perhaps even establish-- a local
> >club that does those things. Seems like you are looking for something more
> >specialized in that regard, and if there is no such club in your area, maybe
> >you would be the best person to start one, by virtue of your background in
> >homebrew and electronics. Get the word out and I'll bet you'll find some
> >instant members, particularly if you live in a larger city or metro area.
>
> Vipul's alrady been suggested that, but he's only looking for a ready-made
> organization into which he can make a grand entrance,

He should try the USMC or the Tenn Militia.

Jackie...When suggested
> HE start such a club, he made some vague reference to having "tried that once",
> and only had one or two people showed up.

I think that's what happened to Larry.

> Now it's his "other obligations" that prevent him from doing it, but
> obviously not from WHINING about the lack of one in THIS forum.
>
> That's what happens when people let thier kids play with the computer at
> night.

Or things get slow in the ER.

2097. Re: Getting old call sign back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-13 04:12:52 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302122012.14bc82fc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61178

"Ray Fitz" <isphouston@houstoncableisp.net> wrote in message
news:<b2bu6f$pa0$0@pita.alt.net>...
> Zeigler did not sell ALL the call signs he issued. Many call
> signs he gave away just for the asking. Lets just say I have first
> hand knowledge that he gave many call signs absolutely free of
> charge. And you know what? Who really gives a shit anyway?
> There are far more important things in the world to worry about!
>
> 73,
>
> Ray
> Houston TX

Wasn't his to "give" away.

2098. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-13 05:20:35 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b2gdig31a93@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 61193

Ahhh what the hell, every once in a while a good laugh is a good thing!

Ryan KC8PMX

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3E49CB7D.3050201@adelphia.net...
> KC8PMX wrote:
>
> > So Mike..... based on the below statement, would you say that he is a
> > "Master Baiter?"
> >
> > Sorry.... ya left that one WIDE OPEN! :)
> >
> >
> > Ryan KC8PMX
>
>
> Heh, heh! I've been doing that a lot lately. Sometimes I feel like the
> world's straight man! 8^)
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

2099. Re: Montana and Florida

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-13 05:22:02 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b2gdih41a93@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 61194

Would gladly accept it! Sure beats the below zero temps we have been
getting. (before wind chill factor.)

Ryan KC8PMX

"Jackie" <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> wrote in message
news:E5h2a.78905$vm2.45308@rwcrnsc54...
>
> "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
> news:b2b29982anc@enews2.newsguy.com...
> > Feel free to ship or divert any snowfalls to Michigan, especially the
> middle
> > and lower parts of the lower peninsula! :)
>
> Would you like some of the blizzard that the western half of Minnesota had
> earlier today? It even shut down some schools. It's yours simply for being
> on a direct path to our east. :-)
>
> Jackie KC0ODY
>
>

2100. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-13 06:51:50 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030213015150.29447.00000399@mb-cd.aol.com>
Source record: 61182

In article <20030212220325.08747.00000877@mb-cg.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>Very funny, Lennie. Now, back to the real issue: What's keeping you
>from getting an amateur radio license?

Nothing...people like you.

2101. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-13 06:51:54 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030213015154.29447.00000400@mb-cd.aol.com>
Source record: 61181

In article <7xD2a.91351$be.68029@rwcrnsc53>, "Jackie"
<buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030212210738.09921.00001844@mb-md.aol.com...
>
>> Jackie, you've not been in here for a long time. The Regulars
>> in here (nearly all PCTAs) are simply elitists who want all to
>> follow Their directives, Their kind of enjoyment, Their life-
>> style and NO back-talk from "inferiors." :-)
>
>I may not have "been here for a long time", but I have been reading long
>enough and I knows opinions when I see's 'em. Len, I'm not picking on you or
>singling you out, but the above is an example of your OPINIONS and nothing
>more.

Absolutely! Now...what about the others?

Do license grants now enoble the certificate holder some
Divine TRVTH engraved in marble? Absolutely NOT.

Everyone has opinions. Problem with the PCTA Regulars
in here is that Their Opinions are the Only Truth. Not only
that, the Words of ARRL are Sacred. All that disagree with
such Divine Words are "mistaken," "error prone," and
worse.

>Wait! What's that I hear...? A crescendo of tiny violins in sweet refrain?
>C'mon Len, I don't think that many people take this all as seriously as you
>think they do.

PCTA Regulars do. :-)

>OTOH, I and many other hams choose to make ourselves available through ARES
>and RACES and Skywarn. What's wrong with that?

Not a thing wrong with that. It's only the Believers in
the Sanctity of CW within those activities that are too
tied up with their traffic handling via CW fantasies.

Actually, Jackie, you have aligned yourself already. You
haven't quite gotten the picture that I am NOT criticizing
the hobby, the recreation of US amateur radio.

I am criticizing the up-tight, do-it-my-way-or-die dumdums
who cannot take one iota of negativism without attempting
the false misdirection that I am "against all hams."

>So were are not a part of the
>Red Cross or other relief organizations- but there are times when even the
>capability of organizations who're used to disaster response get overwhelmed
>with the communication aspects of disaster response, and so they call on a
>pool of trained individuals who make themselves available to help out.

I commend you for your efforts. I volunteer to help without needing a license in anything (except vehicle licenses), just like in the Northridge Earthquake of 17 Jan 94. Despite a total absence of primary electrical power then and the local telephone system beyond its maximum capacity, the only thing "overwhelmed" was the work task for utility companies and construction crews. No ham license would have helped those actually doing the work of restoration of normal function. The utility companies, the public safety people were NOT overwhelmed in their ability to communicate. For that matter, anyone calling IN to the L.A. area could get through fine...the telco was only overloaded for originating local calls.

Licenses in amateur radio are NOT absolutely required to help any emergency/disaster/relief group. TRAINING IS. Neither you nor anyone else gets "trained in emergency communications" by doing ham hobby comm or working up high point scores in "radio sport" contests. It takes, at worst, five minutes to "train" someone to use a utility, police, or fire HT, maybe another five minutes to explain beginning jargon phrases and "listen first before speaking."

Please don't start in with this "pool of trained operators" nonsense. Real emergencies don't need 1912 Save-the-Titanic CW skills. Real emergency/disaster folks don't use CW and haven't done so for decades.

Operating a radio IN land warfare without much training was proven in the field in WW2 and all the minor wars (dozens by many countries) following. Warfare is a true 24/7 emergency environment regardless of our defunct diplomats redefinition.

>Now,
>I don't know about others, but I certainly do not feel as if my
>participation in helping out my fellow humans qualifies me for demi-god
>status or even for bragging rights.

Sorry, but the perception is that you've already chosen up sides by the above. You've not perceived that I was never criticizing the ham hobby en toto, just the minority who insist on the 1930s status quo at all costs. That minority assumes the God-like status repleat with nobless oblige talk-downs to the peasants and infrequent Sermons on the Antenna Mount.

>How do you define the "real world", Len? Scratch that, nevermind... I live
>there, so I know something about it.

Oh? Consider that I've been IN the real world longer, seen
more radio, operated more radio than most hams. I've done
it for half a century spanning the tube era and right into the
semiconductor age. The rest of the radio world is Very Big
and it covers a greater span of the spectrum than a few HF
bands allocated to hobbyists. I've been IN that Big World.

I define the "real world" as the here and now, where radio is
a communications tool that isn't magic or supernatural. It has
known physical properties...known to those who take the time
to understand it instead of being spoon-fed little snippets of
factoids or emotionally bent by clever advertising.

>I somehow doubt that most AR ops see the ARRL as some sort of divine oracle
>to be obeyed and supplicated to.

Supplicants never do. Their Belief is unshakable. They don't
know they are being manipulated by an even smaller minority
of that "church." Worse yet, most simply let that "church"
handle everything for them.

Watch what the PCTAs spout in here. They always point to
ARRL this or that for their references in/for/about ham radio.
Very few know what the RSGB has or much of anything else
by Yurp organizations or Ozzies or New Zealanders or
Japanese or other amateur groups aligned/misaligned with the
IARU. PCTAs are Believers, they wear the same virtual
uniform, march to the same virtual drumbeat, sing the same
virtual virtuous hymnals, and behave as if they lived in some
fantasyland where the only radio was done by amateurs and
broadcasters.

>C'mon, it's a hobby, AND a service, AND
>some people happen to get some pleasure out of any number of aspects that
>fall under those two categories. What is the problem with that?

There's NO problem with that...except when they divorce
themselves from reality or USE the service aspect glow to
light their own personal radiance (when their pilot is nearly
out). It does NOT require an amateur license to be of help
to one's nation, community, or whatever.

>You're not
>even an AR operator Len... so I really fail to see how this affects you
>personally.

It doesn't. My original intent was to engage in debate for the
removal of the morse code test for any amateur radio license
test. Instead, it has been a sort of firefight of personally-aimed
pejoratives fired by amateur marksmen shooting certificates
and titles as if they were ICBMs. Ptui. Those were just BMs.

I have had an interest in radio and electronics technology for over half a century. I've been IN far bigger leagues of HF comm than any defunct diplomat in here, probably working closer to Real high-capacity message traffic handling than the entire amateur NTS put together, having to keep all circuits open and running 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, without many fringe benefits of just 8-hour workdays. Radio and electronics was fascinating enough personally that I switched from an illustrator career to engineering early on in my life, did my whole career mainly in design engineering.

The purists, the traditionalists, the twilight zoners of hamism insist that professionalism is NOT the Amateur Way. They insist on "qualifications" by virtue of the ham license...as if none of the past half century's personal experience had any relevance. I am supposed to learn morse code because, according to the PCTAs, that is the ultimate meaningful skill of their little detached Brotherhood of Radio. Morsemanship wasn't relevant to the needs of the rest of the radio world of fifty years ago and it sure as hell isn't meaningful today.

Ah, but I must "sit for the ham test" to "prove a committment and dedication to the amateur community!" I'm sorry, but that is one of the silliest bogus-brained reasons I've ever heard. Ham radio doesn't operate by "different" radio physics principles and the ham radio waves don't propagate differently than other radio waves. Ham radio does NOT need any morse code test for a license or even any morse code skill at all. It isn't some magic pool of trained whatevers. That's just political hype. Ham radio is a fun hobby, an interesting one, a recreation. It doesn't need to be bogged down by beaurocracy, rigid inflexible rules, and absolute adherence to correct hamspeak.

Ham radio of today has become, for some, a sort of fantasy land where they can indulge in dumb little games of one-upmanship through credentials, certification, callsigns, and calumny directed to those "not of their 'hood." Some have discarded their real names, wanting to be identified only by callsigns. Identity transferrence, achieving something better than their present lives and social position. I need NONE of that. I certainly do not need to sit for some amateur test to prove anydamnthing to anybody about commitment or dedication to some mythical amateur community or ethos.

So, despite the insistence of the defunct diplomat in here, the bus driver, the hoagie muncher, the dill sergeant wanting a uniform real bad, the reverend working at an undisclosed location, or anyone else, that coveted amateur ticket won't be bought to radio never-neverland this week or next week.

Jackie, did you REALLY want an answer or were you just trolling because the bands were dead at the moment? :-)

2102. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-13 09:49:14 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0302130149.2f85af87@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61183

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0302120826.5d8d0730@posting.google.com>...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0302120036.22c11b8b@posting.google.com>...
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0302110446.1ed9f7f8@posting.google.com>...
> > > kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0302101732.5476da76@posting.google.com>...
> > >
> > > > Und doan you fuggedit it Herr Brainiac, ve haf been vatching you und
> > > > ve haf ways of dealing mit you vipul . .
> > >
> > > Hey, I understood that. Too much Hogan's Heroes in my youth (and not
> > > enough F-Troop).
> >
> > More like "Car 59 Where Are You?" in your case.
> >
> > w3rv
>
> Before my time. Tell me about it.

Pair of slapstick cops who were patrol partners.

http://www.timvp.com/car54.html

2103. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-13 11:39:39 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030213063939.14527.00000301@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 61184

In article <BA707341.E70A%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
writes:

>"N2EY" wrote:
>>
>> (snip) Many books will tell you that all-electronic
>> TV made its debut at the 1939 NYC World's Fair, and
>> that it was "invented" by RCA - even though Philo T.
>> Farnsworth was the actual inventor, and gave a public
>> demonstration five years earlier (1934) in
>> Philadelphia, at the Franklin Institute. (snip)
>
>
> I'll accept that, Jim.

Welcome back, Dwight!

> However, how many people saw that demonstration at
>the Franklin Institute versus at the World's Fair? How many saw it in
>magazines and newspapers as a result of the fair? For most Americans,
>television did make its debut at the 1939 World's Fair. Why argue with most
>Americans over a point this minor?

The point I'm making is that Sarnoff and RCA were shameless/tireless
self-promoters. Bill, W7TI, talks of an era when people supposedly didn;t do
such things. I use the example of TV to show it did happen back then.

>The Farnsworth versus RCA controversy is
>worth noting however (inventors deserve credit).
>
The courts ruled that Farnsworth and Armstrong had their patent rights
infringed by Sarnoff's RCA. Zwyorkin was no dummy but he was no Farnsworth,
either.

Sarnoff just didn't like to pay licensing fees.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2104. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-13 11:39:39 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030213063939.14527.00000300@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 61185

In article <d22b54c3.0302120846.196b159d@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>> >That in itself is not all bad but would the hams in Texas who are
>> >actually doing their thing do it if there was no ARRL??
>>
>> If amateur radio hadn't been legislated out of existence, yes. Which
>probably
>> would have happened years ago without ARRL or an equivalent group banging
>the
>> drum on both a national and international level.
>
>Ya picked the wrong example.
>
>There were only two points in history when the existence of ham radio
>was threatened. The first came in 1910 when a Senator Drew wrote a
>bill prohibiting amateur experimentation. The Junior Wireless Club
>squashed that and Hiram Percy was nowhere on the horizon.
>
>The second was in 1919 when the Alexander bill would have eliminated
>ham radio. The ARRL got into it but the league was only one of a
>number of players who helped kill that proposal. Those included Hugo
>Gernsback who has been credited by many with actually turning the tide
>vs. the puffery about Hiram and the ARRL's role in certain League
>publications. Drum:Beating:Twist history. Marconi and Fleming also
>went to bat for ham radio. How much clout do ya 'spose those two icons
>had in Congress vs. Hiram Percy??

There were several bills and other hurdles to be surmounted after WW1, not just the Alexander bill. The WW1 shutdown included receivers. Getting transmitting licenses took more work.

It must be remembered that "amateur wireless" did not mean the same thing in 1919 as today. Same for the licenses. Do not confuse efforts to get the receiving ban lifted with efforts to get transmitting licenses issued.
>
And those were not the only times ham radio was threatened with extinction. In the 1920s there were at least three international conventions for radio allocations. Many other countries did not want wide bands or high power for hams. Some did not want ham radio at all.

>How much column space did QST give Gernsback, Fleming and Marconi (vs.
>Hiram Percy) for their efforts?

Not much! How much space did Gernsback give ARRL in his many publications?

And what about the efforts of Stewart and Warner?

What side were all of the above on when quiet hours were imposed?
>
>There was never an international movement to eliminate ham radio.
>
Wrong. See accounts of the 1924, 1925 and 1927 conventions.

There's also the game of inches. Rather than complete elimination, tie down ham radio with so many limitations (narrow bands, low power, etc.) that it could not survive.

>> > I think so.
>>
>> Reading the blurb, note that ARRL does not say it's an ARRL thing, but a
>ham
>> radio thing. All Newington is doing is getting the word out.
>>
>> Would MSNBC have carried the story about what the hams in Texas are
>actually
>> doing if there was no ARRL?? I don't think so.
>
>I haven't seen anything yet about what the Civil Air Patrol or the Boy
>Scouts are doing in Texas either but you can bet yer bippy both are up
>to their eyeballs in it.

Agreed!

> Ham news is for hams, nobody else cares.

So should we not bang our own drum?
>
>
73 de Jim, N2EY

2105. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-13 11:39:40 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030213063940.14527.00000302@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 61186

In article <Xns9320C808ECCB7pookster@216.168.3.50>, "Bill, W7TI"
<jamspam@upyours.now> writes:

>Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in news:3E4AC51C.2060708@psu.edu:
>
>>> Ham radio's hey day was in the
>>> 1950s and early 60s, just before the

[expletive deleted]

>>> in Newington started
>>> their selfish incentive licensing program to sell more publications.
>>
>> Amazing that some people are still wound up about that.
>>
First, some history:

Incentive licensing was NOT an ARRL idea. It was pushed by the FCC, starting as
early as 1958. Yes, ARRL leadership supported it, but so did a slim majority of
the membership.

And it was not a new idea, either. The pre-1951 ABC system made a big
distinction between Class A and other hams: No HF phone below 25 MHz unless you
have a Class A. The 1951 restructuring created the Extra, Novice and Tech
licenses, renamed the others, and would have continued to restrict the most
popular 'phone bands to Advanceds and Extras. But at the end of '52, FCC gave
all hams except Novices and Techs all operating privileges.
>>
The original 1963 ARRL proposal was very simple: Go back to the old system,
restricting HF phone on 75 to 15 meters to Advanceds and Extras. No subbands,
no additional code tests, just get an Advanced if you want to work 'phone. All
of the complexity was the result of other suggestions and proposals, and the
FCC.
>
>_____
>
>Mike, it really was better back then, and this is not just the musings of
>a senile old fart, either. Before incentive licensing, hams were much
>more fraternal. It was like a club where the newbies either upgraded
>within a year or dropped out and all the regulars were pretty much equal:
>Same license, same frequencies, same mode priviliges, everything.

Was there no animosity between SSB and AM folks? CW vs. 'phone? Where did
Technicians fit into the picture back then?

Did the folks with shiny Collins stations accept the
converted-surplus-and-homebrew folks as equals?

>When incentive licensing came, so did the "I have a better license, I'm a
>better ham" school of thought. And since there were several new levels,
>not just one, there was ample room for everybody to look down on someone
>else.

The Extra began in 1951. The Advanced is the old Class A, which wgoes back to
before WW2. There was a guy who was so ticked off about Gnerals and
Conditionals getting 'phone on HF that he would call CQ and say "no kids, no
lids, no space cadets, Class A operators only".

>In your local club, do the Extras hang out only with the Extras?

Nope. Not in any of the clubs I've belonged to.

>Do the Generals shun the Novices?

Nope. Not at all.

> Does everyone look down on the
>"No-Code Techs"? I'll bet most of the no-coders never come to their
>second meeting.

Not in any club I've been to. Nobody give's a [expletive deleted] what
somebody's license class is, unless they need a control op for something. Just
not an issue.
>
>There are lots of ways individuals could be recognized for their
>achievments and encouraged to improve themselves. Licensing turned out
>to be a very poor choice. You know what they say about the road to hell
>being paved with? Add incentive licensing to the list.

Take a look at the 1965 FCC plan: Advanceds demoted to General, four code test
speeds, distinctive callsign blocks for every license class from Novice to
Extra. Fortunately, the opposition of ARRL and others stopped the worst of
that.
>
Look at what's left of the 1968-69. Only three classes of license open to new
issues. One code test speed, kept alive by treaty requirement alone. Three
written tests from published Q&A pools. No waiting/experience period for any
license.

What system do you propose if/when FCC dumps Element 1?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2106. Re: Montana and Florida

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-13 11:39:41 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030213063941.14527.00000303@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 61187

In article <CjC2a.91828$vm2.52432@rwcrnsc54>, "Jackie"
<buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030212183655.23139.00000409@mb-da.aol.com...
>
>> If it shuts down schools in Minnesota - it's a REAL blizzard!
>
>Yeah! And when those winds whip down the western prairies (nothin' between
>here and the North Pole but a coupla barbed wire fences, so they say out
>there) it doesn't take much snow to occlude the roads and drive the
>windchills down to 30 below.

The northwestern part of New York State (where I got this 2-land call) gets like that. Cold air comes across the lakes, picks up moisture and dumps it as snow. Lots of snow. I remember working alone outside in the country with temperatures (not windchills) in the negative teens and twenties. One night I was working on the car in an unheated garage, and it got down to 30 below before I was done and came inside.

>
>Ah, now comes the veritable heat wave-- supposed to be in the 20's and 30's
>through next week.
>
HAW! We also got weeks of overcast. One day I'm out working with Bud and Flash (nicknames used to protect the innocent) and the overcast breaks, so we start to see shadows. Flash looks up, squints, and asks "Hey, what's that?" Bud says "Sun". Flash looks at me and says "Is it safe to be out in it?"

Dry Yankee humor.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2107. Re: Getting old call sign back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-13 12:28:47 UTC
From: Will <Will671@lekopetron.net>
Message-ID: <b2g31etal0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 61188

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0302122012.14bc82fc@posting.google.com...
> "Ray Fitz" <isphouston@houstoncableisp.net> wrote in message
news:<b2bu6f$pa0$0@pita.alt.net>...
> > Zeigler did not sell ALL the call signs he issued. Many call
> > signs he gave away just for the asking. Lets just say I have first
> > hand knowledge that he gave many call signs absolutely free of
> > charge. And you know what? Who really gives a shit anyway?
> > There are far more important things in the world to worry about!
> >
> > 73,
> >
> > Ray
> > Houston TX
>
> Wasn't his to "give" away.

Brilliant! I think you have a future in Communications Law.

Will

2108. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-13 12:39:40 UTC
From: "Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now>
Message-ID: <Xns93212F6A37563pookster@216.168.3.50>
Source record: 61189

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
news:20030213063939.14527.00000300@mb-cc.aol.com:

> And those were not the only times ham radio was threatened with
> extinction.

That's right. You should have met my neighbor two doors down.

--
Bill, W7TI

2109. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-13 12:45:01 UTC
From: "Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now>
Message-ID: <Xns932130525954Apookster@216.168.3.50>
Source record: 61190

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in news:20030213063939.14527.00000301@mb-cc.aol.com:

> Bill, W7TI, talks of an era when people supposedly didn;t do
> such things.

That isn't what I said. It was frowned on, it was rare and most people didn't behave that way because that was the custom. Today's custom is just the opposite. The bell-shaped curve rule applied then just like now. There's always the fringe element out at the ends.

And it wasn't "supposedly".

--
Bill, W7TI

2110. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-13 13:07:32 UTC
From: Jackie <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com>
Message-ID: <oMM2a.97310$be.72203@rwcrnsc53>
Source record: 61191

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030213015154.29447.00000400@mb-cd.aol.com...
> Actually, Jackie, you have aligned yourself already. You
> haven't quite gotten the picture that I am NOT criticizing
> the hobby, the recreation of US amateur radio.

I have aligned myself with no one.

> I am criticizing the up-tight, do-it-my-way-or-die dumdums
> who cannot take one iota of negativism without attempting
> the false misdirection that I am "against all hams."

Well I don't like them either.

> I commend you for your efforts. I volunteer to help without
> needing a license in anything (except vehicle licenses),
> just like in the Northridge Earthquake of 17 Jan 94. Despite
> a total absence of primary electrical power then and the
> local telephone system beyond its maximum capacity, the
> only thing "overwhelmed" was the work task for utility
> companies and construction crews. No ham license would
> have helped those actually doing the work of restoration of
> normal function.

No, but that would not have stopped someone from helping out by using their
other skills.

> Licenses in amateur radio are NOT absolutely required to
> help any emergency/disaster/relief group. TRAINING IS.

Of course.

> Neither you nor anyone else gets "trained in emergency
> communications" by doing ham hobby comm or working up
> high point scores in "radio sport" contests.

And I never suggested that they did. The above is an example of how AR is a
hobby.

> Please don't start in with this "pool of trained operators"
> nonsense.

I merely illustrated one way that hams can and do help out with what they
have.

> Sorry, but the perception is that you've already chosen up
> sides by the above.

Assume nothing. You don't know me, nor does anything i have posted make it obviously clear what I think about certain aspects of this hobby and the people who are in it. It's more complex than I will bother to let on.

>You've not perceived that I was never
> criticizing the ham hobby en toto, just the minority who
> insist on the 1930s status quo at all costs. That minority
> assumes the God-like status repleat with nobless oblige
> talk-downs to the peasants and infrequent Sermons on the
> Antenna Mount.

Come on, Len, no one can go back to the 30's even if they insisted on it! Ignore them if they piss you off.

> Oh? Consider that I've been IN the real world longer, seen
> more radio, operated more radio than most hams. I've done
> it for half a century spanning the tube era and right into the
> semiconductor age. The rest of the radio world is Very Big
> and it covers a greater span of the spectrum than a few HF
> bands allocated to hobbyists. I've been IN that Big World.

Another illustration that proves the point that others have made here. You think that SOME hams think they're superior because of this and that attitude they display and you apparently don't bother to look at some of the stuff you type. Seems pretty haughty to me!

> Supplicants never do. Their Belief is unshakable. They don't
> know they are being manipulated by an even smaller minority
> of that "church." Worse yet, most simply let that "church"
> handle everything for them.

I don't take this as seriously as you do.

> Ah, but I must "sit for the ham test" to "prove a committment
> and dedication to the amateur community!" I'm sorry, but that is
> one of the silliest bogus-brained reasons I've ever heard.

Okay, so you won't take the requirements to get the license, you won't get one. What makes you think the rules should be changed just because you think you know more than the average person that sits for an AR test?

> Jackie, did you REALLY want an answer or were you just
> trolling because the bands were dead at the moment? :-)

I never troll. I have better things to do with my time. I wanted to get a better idea of where you are coming from so I asked the questions.

One thing you might want to remember... just because I may not be as critical as you, does not mean I've "aligned" myself to anyone in here. I speak for myself only. I got into AR because I was a SWL for years, and there are certain things about it that are fun to me. I could not care less about the code/no-code debate. I just took the test because it was a requirement to get on HF. I don't see it as some eeeevil conspiracy to keep people out, nor do I use the fact that I passed the code test as some badge of superiority that I can hold over others. Means to an end was all it was.

Gotta go to work.

Jackie

2111. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-13 13:36:26 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030213083626.03273.00000478@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 61192

In article <3E4AC077.CC9EBEA2@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>At some point in the fairly recent past, the League
>lost sight of its primary mission--to serve its membership--and became
>obsessed with perpetuating and expanding the organization.

I'd phrase it another way, Dave. I'd say that in some areas the ARRL leadership
has become out of touch with what "serving the membership" entails.
>
>The removal of "Section News" and contest line scores, the inauguration
>of the elitist "Diamond Club", charging applicants for the Rag Chewers
>Club and Old Timers Club certificats and doing away with the plastic
>mailing sleeve for QST (some years back) are a few of my peeves.
>
Mine too. Also the removal of Board minutes. Here's another:

Back in 1975, FCC proposed a complex "dual-ladder" license scheme. This was
just a few years after the hotly-debated incentive licensing changes.

So ARRL leadership sent out a multipage questionaire to all members.
Standardized 5-point agree-disagree format on most of the questions. Results
were published in QST, and ARRL policy closely followed those results.

Fast forward to 1996. ARRL sends out a flawed survey to 1500 or so hams, mostly
members. Partial results are published in QST. The flaws are discussed in
detail here and elsewhere.

In 1998, both ARRL and FCC propose restructuring. Is there a new all-members
survey? Nope. Yet it would have been simple to dust off and rework the 1975
survey, and get a detailed view of what members think. Costs too much? They had
the money in '75. And I for one would be gald to donate some bucks to fund an
in-depth survey.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2112. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-13 15:56:38 UTC
From: kf6vyh@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030213105638.03326.00000179@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 61195

Lets keep the young people interested. I have heared some 50 and 60 years olds that do not belong on the radio.

2113. Re: Getting old call sign back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-13 17:05:35 UTC
From: George McCouch <K3UD@charter.net>
Message-ID: <K3UD-9436FE.11053513022003@news.uswest.net>
Source record: 61196

In article <d22b54c3.0302100847.5865be30@posting.google.com>,
kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote:

> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> news:<20030210063633.27873.00000540@mb-mj.aol.com>...
> > (3) pretty much says it all, about reassigning an S-K's call. Two year wait
> > unless you're a close relative and can provide documentation.
> >
> > Perhaps just a clerical mistake at FCC. How long since he passed away?
>
> He passed away maybe three years ago and his callsign was reissued
> within months after his passing. His XYL did not inform the FCC of his
> passing.
>
> "Clerical mistake" . . right . . same kinda "clerical accident" which
> got Joe Hertzberg K3JH decades before anybody else had vanity
> callsigns. Look up W3DW in QRZ.
>
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> w3rv

I always wondered how Joe got that call.
Sometimes it does not work out. Jim Millen was "promised" W1HRO but
ended up with W1HRX.

73
George
K3UD

2114. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-13 17:19:43 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0302130919.11796f70@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61197

"Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now> wrote in message
news:<Xns9320C808ECCB7pookster@216.168.3.50>...
> Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in news:3E4AC51C.2060708@psu.edu:
>
> >> Ham radio's hey day was in the
> >> 1950s and early 60s, just before the shitheads in Newington started
> >> their selfish incentive licensing program to sell more publications.
> > >
> > >
> > > Amazing that some people are still wound up about that.
> > >
> > > - Mike KB3EIA -
> > >
> > >
> > ____
>
> Mike, it really was better back then, and this is not just the musings of
> a senile old fart, either. Before incentive licensing, hams were much
> more fraternal. It was like a club where the newbies either upgraded
> within a year or dropped out and all the regulars were pretty much equal:
> Same license, same frequencies, same mode priviliges, everything.

Having been on the air since about two years after "the first
incentive licensing scenario" got dropped on ham radio (the 1951
creation of the Novice & Tech tickets. Another long forgotten major
uproar) I was obviously there and there were "pecking orders". Maybe
they were a bit more "fraternal" but they were there. The engineers
patting us technical newbie kid Novices on their lame heads. No, they
didn't usually take the time to do any elmering, they told us to go
buy a handbook. Novices spoke only when spoken to at meetings
dominated by the OFs. The real biggie was the money. I clearly
remember the first time I visited a Big Gun's station, stacks of
Collins gear. I was dumbstruck and it showed. His comment was
something like "Some of us have it and some just don't, that's the way
it is kid." With a sneer. Fortunately the dramatic changes in personal
and equipment economics since then have leveled that particular
pecking order.

My point is that human nature hasn't changed a damned bit since then,
the establishment of pecking orders are normal human behavior by
whatever means they can be generated and they *will* happen. At this
point in ham radio the details are just minor details which shift over
time based on the FCC fiat of the moment. All of it is completely
ignorable. If ya don't ignore it, YOU own the problem.

> When incentive licensing came, so did the "I have a better license, I'm a
> better ham" school of thought. And since there were several new levels,
> not just one, there was ample room for everybody to look down on someone
> else. In your local club, do the Extras hang out only with the Extras?

Hams around here with similar interests clump together, they
definitely do not clump based on license class. The dxers & contesters
clump and we're overwhelmingly Extras or Advanced licensees simply
because ya need an Extra or an Advanced if yer serious about dxing.
Has absolutely nothing to do with pecking orders or "classism".

Hell, I sailed along happy as a clam dxing & contesting my buns off
for 14 years as a General with never a thought of upgrading until the
FCC lowered the boom in '68 and tossed us Generals out of the HF DX
windows. So I took the frigging test and got the windows back. Big
deal.

> Do the Generals shun the Novices? Does everyone look down on the
> "No-Code Techs"? I'll bet most of the no-coders never come to their
> second meeting.

We have clubs around here chaired by Techs & Generals and the machines
are loaded with nocodes who are nice guys and good ops and get
seriously involved in various events. While numbers of lethargic 20wpm
Extras sit on their dead butts and do nothing. To the point that of
the numerous neighborhood type clubs around here I don't know of one
chaired by an Extra.

On the rare occasions I've run into here when somebody got stupid and
took a swipe at nocodes on one of the machines, for instance, the
machine lit up like an Xmas tree with guys telling the jerk to go
pound sand and worse. Like as not it's 1x2 who will suggest the sand.
It just ain't tolerated.

I've noticed over time that ham behavior seems to be a tad different
on the left coast than it is here on the right coast . . ?

> There are lots of ways individuals could be recognized for their
> achievments and encouraged to improve themselves. Licensing turned out
> to be a very poor choice. You know what they say about the road to hell
> being paved with? Add incentive licensing to the list.

That was 35 years ago fer chrissake, when do we get to finally bury
it??

w3rv

2115. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-13 17:27:35 UTC
From: "Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now>
Message-ID: <Xns9321603AE9E5pookster@216.168.3.50>
Source record: 61198

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in news:d22b54c3.0302130919.11796f70
@posting.google.com:

> That was 35 years ago fer chrissake, when do we get to finally bury
> it??
>

Reminds me of Clinton: "Fer chrissake, can we get beyond the blue dress
and move on to more important things?"

IOW, the discussion will go away when the problem goes away. Clinton
didn't consider the blue dress a problem; you don't consider incentive
licensing a problem. Others do.

--
Bill, W7TI

2116. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-13 17:32:53 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0302130932.71aab0bd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61199

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030212220325.08747.00000877@mb-cg.aol.com>...
> In article <20030212210742.09921.00001846@mb-md.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> (Len Over 21) writes:

> Very funny, Lennie. Now, back to the real issue: What's keeping you
> from getting an amateur radio license?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Drop it willya Larry? Ham radio already has enough problems to deal with.

w3rv

2117. Re: New Field Day Entry Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-13 17:37:22 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0302130937.73a8b506@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61200

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0302120710.6d30e862@posting.google.com>...
> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0302110934.8e477f8@posting.google.com>...
> > Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3E47CA18.7060001@psu.edu>...
> > > Brian Kelly wrote:
> > > > "Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now> wrote in message
news:<Xns931D8151D8BF0pookster@216.168.3.50>...
> > > >
> > > >>Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in news:3E46AE95.8070102
> > > >>@adelphia.net:
>
> > > >>>There are 5 pages of rules, the rest is submission and log forms, and
> > > >>>some Q and A. Is that too complicated?
> ----------
> > > >>
> > > >>Five pages of rules? I think the question is self-answering.
>
> Heh!
>
>
> >
> > Not too complicated, considering all the ground to be covered. The
> > rules themselves only take up 3 pages.
> > > >>
> > > >>This is a hobby, not a Federal Project.
> >
> > Tell the hams combing Texas for shuttle parts that "it's a hobby"....
>
>
> What the hell does collecting Shuttle parts have to do with Field Day
> rules?

Not much.

Point is, one of the common buzzphrases for anything that involves the
slightest complexity, knowledge or skill is "it's only a hobby" or
some variation thereof.

> Izzit Field Day in Texas??
>
Not yet.
>
> > Gotta remember that the 28 page packet is meant to be self-contained.
>

> So are the Bible and the tax codes, the similarities between those and
> the FD "rules" package is striking.

Not at all. Three pages of rules, with lots of white space. Izzat too
complicated for ya?

> > Log sheets, summary sheets, W1AW schedules and freqs, typical
> > message-to-the-SCM formats,
>
> When was the last time an NTS formatted "message" to an SCM proved of
> any value whatsoever during an emergency in which ham radio was
> involved?

Prolly never.

> Ditto the pointless "Message from w1aw" thingey.

Not pointless at all. And it's a bulletin, not a message.

> Because
> that's the way Hiram Percy imagined how ham emergency traffic should
> be done? Pffft.

Not at all.

> Dump it, It's

[expletive deleted]
> which has notting to do with
> notting. There goes at least one page.

Ya missed the point.

Copying a 100+ word bulletin sent at a specific time and freq with no
repeats or fills requires a different skill set than running QSOs
where the exchange is three pieces of info like "W1ABC 4A EMA"
repeated over and over. Composing and sending a coherent message
requires a different skill set as well.

The format is chosen as a guide. It's the skills associated that
matter.
>
> Hiram Percy did die ya know . .

Nothin' to do with him.

See below about contest exchange.

> > Whole point of FD is "something for everybody"
>
> That's exactly what's WRONG with FD for many participants like myself
> and you too, see following.

Not wrong for me.

> > which means lotsa
> > rules. Can't get away from it. The new Class F will hopefully do two
> > things:
> >
> > 1) Get more EOCs on-the-air during FD, which is better than having
> > them gather dust
> >
> > 2) Generate publicity both in the media and among govt. types.
> >
> > Are either of those a bad thing?
>
> But are you gonna take DELCOM into the ham bands during this year's
> FD?
>
Not my bag this year. But somebody else might. More power to 'em if
they do. What's wrong with an operating activity that is aimed at the
widest possible audience?

> > > But that is small beans compared to FD.
> > >
> > > Here is a challenge. come up with a one page set of rules for FD that
> > > addresses everything. Just for grins, go ahead and ignore the EC and
> > > GOTA sections. Make the rules explicit enough that there is no
> > > questioning them. Encompass all the different modes in use during field day.
> > >
> > On one page? Easy, just use a little tiny font.
> >
> Smack!

I solved the problem.
>
> > Result was that most FD operations consisted of gas engine generators
> > powering SSB transceivers, some antennas and not much else in the way
> > of radio stuff. A beginner might get a shot at a rig around 3AM on a
> > dead band. Satellites? GOTA station? Publicity, natural power, new
> > modes? Ferget it, no points, not worth the effort.
> >
> Who are you kidding?? How are you gonna run in FD this year?

Probably a CW transceiver powered by a battery. If I see a good deal
on a solar panel, I'll go for the natural power bonus.

> Are you
> gonna work a satellite? Are you gonna set up a GOAT station? Of course
> not. You're gonna toss up some antennas and churn score. Just like it
> "used to be." And I'm gonna do the same drill for exactly the same
> reasons.

And if a couple of EOCs and GOTA stations get on, there will be that
many more stations for me to work and get points from.

How many points did you score last year, compared to my operation?
>

> > Having all the catgeories and such is meant to widen the scope of FD.
> > Not a bad thing.
>
> Much of it is, as a minimum, a goofy thing at best. Generates gross
> confusion, lotta pointless pushups, wasted manpower, general BS, yadda
> yadda . .

How is it wasted? The folks who are going to do the GOTA thing or the satellite thing or the EOC thing would probably just stay home otherwise. They surely aren't going to be churning points in the CW tent at 3 AM.

You shoulda been there when I was doing the one-man deal back in the late '80s and early '90s. 866As flashing away in the tent at 3 AM, working the west coast on 80 like they were locals. Best year was '95, 629 CW and 11 phone QSOs in 1B-1. Just under 3000 points with the bonuses. Southgate Type 7 and the homebrew antenna setup sure proved themselves that year.

> which is why we both opted away from the annual k3mn "radio
> picnic".

The reason I opted out was because there was no plan, and I wasn't going to be the planner.

I like the picnic idea.

> Preaching in one direction and going in the other direction
> is bad form.

I think I got more FDs with that bunch than you have FDs. They weren't at an EOC, anyway.

> > > A lot of people
> > > wouldn't care for that. IMO, a home station operating off the mains is
> > > the same thing as a EC station. So should either of those participate
> > > (FWIW, I am quite happy with both participating)
> >
> > Of course! But not against set-up-in-the-field stations. Thus the new
> > class.
>
> I can see the k3mn squad moving the operation from Clayton Park to the
> courthouse front lawn so that they can compete in the F class.

Not an EOC, won't count.

> This
> one is almst as good an idea as the Diamond Club.

Remember the "mobile aggregate score" thing?
>
> There is a solution. We need two field events per year. One would be
> FD the way it exists. I could care less, don't bore me with it, let
> 'em go work GOATs, do some radio and pass out PR sheets or whatever

> other ARRL flag-waving exercises they get off on. Except call it the
> annual ARRL National Radio Picnic and drop the "emergency comms"
> nonsense because in truth FD as it exists today has about as much
> relevance to emergency comms as the ARRL cw dx contest has.
>
> The new one would be taking Sweepstakes into the bushes. Same rules as
> SS except that it would have to be done in the field per FD and both
> phone and CW would be used on an equal points basis on the same
> weekend. One page.

There useta be two FDs per summer, way back in the mid 1930s. Early
June. late August.
>
> Lemmee guess which event you'd jump all over . .
>
I'd do both. The picnic thing with a club, the other as a serious
single op. Heck, the first would be a warmup/testout for the second.

My biggest complaint about contest exchanges is that they're too dang
simple. Callsign, class, section, all repeated over and over, 3 pieces
of info, whatta weenie way to make points.

Lookit SS: Unique serial number, class, callsign, check, section.
Five pieces of info, one of them unique to the QSO. Back when I
started, there was a sixth piece of info in the SS exchange, the date
(month and day of yer birthday).

I say make the exchanges longer. More credit for actual messages
handled. Have W1AW send several different FD messages. Allow multiple
power levels at the same multi-multi.

If all FD does is get some sedentary hams outa their houses and
exposes them to some fresh air, it's a good thing. If maybe they learn
a skill or two, all the better.

Your '897 show up yet?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2118. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-13 18:10:45 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030213131045.29328.00000326@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 61301

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 2/12/03 7:00 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030212200056.15411.00000252@mb-df.aol.com>

>Which means that no a code Technician class can know more than an only-coder
>General.

"Only coder"...?!?! Please provide a reference and definition.

Since a General has to pass two written tests instead of one, your
suggestion is silly.

>So, you just said:
>If someone joines the club and then this person subsequently promotes "the
>radio art", the club can claim "promotion of the radio art" was their goal.
>
>This is a perfect example of rationalization.

You were one of those kids who liked to ride the playground merry-go-round
until he couldn't stand up anymore, weren't you...?!?!?

>Yes, it does. I quoted the paragraph from the "FCC rule book." It describes
>technical achievement.

But what it does NOT do, Vipul, is say that "The radio art is solely
achivement in technical development".

>From the ARRL's "FCC rule book":
>
>Advancement of the radio art, [97.1(b)]
>"For more than 85 years, hams have carried on a tradition of learning by
>doing,
>and since the beginning have remained at the forefront of technology....(SNIP)

Yep...the >>ARRL's<< Rulebook. A lot of nice editorialization, tehre,
Vipul, AND nothing that says "radio art" is solely "technical achievement".

Try again. You're still not getting it right.

Steve, K4YZ

2119. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-13 18:16:06 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030213131606.29328.00000327@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 61302

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/12/03 8:07 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030212210738.09921.00001844@mb-md.aol.com>
>
>In article <iYz1a.52359$be.39252@rwcrnsc53>, "Jackie"
><buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> writes:

>> Some people are into it for the hobby and others for the services, yet
>>others are in it for both.
>
> Jackie, you've not been in here for a long time. The Regulars
> in here (nearly all PCTAs) are simply elitists who want all to
> follow Their directives, Their kind of enjoyment, Their life-
> style and NO back-talk from "inferiors."

She's been in here long enough to see through you, Your Lyingness.

And her "tenure" here has nothing to do with the accuaracy of ehr
statement. It was (is) 100% on the money.

>The elitist Regulars in here...(SNIP)

Which includes ex "professional" technicians who feel they are too good
to BE Amateurs, yet feel compelled to tell them how they should be doing thier
"thing".

>Emotional sustenance because the real world is too painful for the elite.

"Real world", as in a VE testing session, Lennie...?!?! Like the one you
haven't the temerity to participate in?

Elitist Putz.

2120. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-13 18:42:03 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030213134203.29328.00000328@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 61303

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/13/03 12:51 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030213015154.29447.00000400@mb-cd.aol.com>

>Actually, Jackie, you have aligned yourself already. You
> haven't quite gotten the picture that I am NOT criticizing
> the hobby, the recreation of US amateur radio.

No...Lennie's not "criticizing" the recreation of "amateur radio"...Just
the regulations, the art, the practice, the organizations and the people who
make UP Amateur Radio....That's all.

>I am criticizing the up-tight, do-it-my-way-or-die dumdums
> who cannot take one iota of negativism without attempting
> the false misdirection that I am "against all hams."

Speaking of not taking any "negativism"....

Pot/Kettle/Black, Your Putziness.

>Please don't start in with this "pool of trained operators"
> nonsense.

Please show where it is "nonsense", Lennie. So far, every MOU-supported
agency has renewed thier agreements with the ARRL to provide JUST THAT.

> Real emergencies don't need 1912 Save-the-
> Titanic CW skills. Real emergency/disaster folks don't use
> CW and haven't done so for decades.

And "ral emergencies" have been suppoerted by Amateurs with a plethora of
other modes for those same decades, lennie...INCLUDING Morse Code.

>Sorry, but the perception is that you've already chosen up
> sides by the above. You've not perceived that I was never
> criticizing the ham hobby en toto, just the minority who
> insist on the 1930s status quo at all costs.

Sorry, Lennie, but your assertion that thee is some "minority" that
insists on the retention of 1930's standards is a lie.

You are asked, no, demanded to show where even ONE person in this
newsgroup has suggested such silliness.

>That minority
> assumes the God-like status repleat with nobless oblige
> talk-downs to the peasants and infrequent Sermons on the

> Antenna Mount.

Kinda-like alleged ex radio engineers who insinuate that their
"professional" standing makes them the creme-de-le-creme of the radio
community...Kinda like you do...

>I define the "real world" as the here and now, where radio is
> a communications tool that isn't magic or supernatural. It has
> known physical properties...known to those who take the time
> to understand it instead of being spoon-fed little snippets of
> factoids or emotionally bent by clever advertising.

In as much as you are NOT a "here-and-now" participant in the Amateur
Radio Service (this newsgroup notwithstanding), your above quote is pretty
funny.

>Watch what the PCTAs spout in here. They always point to
> ARRL this or that for their references in/for/about ham radio.
> Very few know what the RSGB has or much of anything else
> by Yurp organizations or Ozzies or New Zealanders or
> Japanese or other amateur groups aligned/misaligned with the
> IARU.

Why would Americans (the majority of posters herein with apologies to the
few non-US posters here) be interested in the policies or programs of
organizations of which they are NOT members or do NOT impact their
participation in Amateur Radio?

None of the agencies you cite impact US Amateur Radio practice or
regulations, Lennie.

>>C'mon, it's a hobby, AND a service, AND
>>some people happen to get some pleasure out of any number of aspects that
>>fall under those two categories. What is the problem with that?
>
> There's NO problem with that...except when they divorce
> themselves from reality or USE the service aspect glow to
> light their own personal radiance (when their pilot is nearly
> out). It does NOT require an amateur license to be of help
> to one's nation, community, or whatever

I think Jackie's already gotten the idea that you do not deem any
"service" of any degree as relevent, Lennie...especially when those facts ruin
your rants.

> It doesn't. My original intent was to engage in debate for the
> removal of the morse code test for any amateur radio license
> test. Instead, it has been a sort of firefight of personally-aimed
> pejoratives fired by amateur marksmen shooting certificates
> and titles as if they were ICBMs. Ptui. Those were just BMs.

Whatever yor intent, Lennie, YOU changed it to the character that it is
today.

Criticize "Google" as you will, if Jackie's of a mind, she can research your previous screen names and see who said what and who started what.

And I see you're spitting again. Not nice in public. (How'd you get those BM's in your mouth anyway, Lennie???)

>Ah, but I must "sit for the ham test" to "prove a committment
> and dedication to the amateur community!" I'm sorry, but that is
> one of the silliest bogus-brained reasons I've ever heard.

No, Your Putziness, you must sit for an Amateur license to GET an Amateur license and then become active in real-life, day-to-day Amateur Radio programs in order to make INFORMED opinions on them.

>I'm sorry, but that is one of the silliest bogus-brained reasons I've ever heard.

That's because you're not listening.
>Ham
> radio doesn't operate by "different" radio physics principles and
> the ham radio waves don't propagate differently than other radio
> waves.

It's not about physics...it's about practice.

>Ham radio does NOT need any morse code test for a
> license or even any morse code skill at all.

As of today it does. So says the Congress of the Untied States, by virtue of the Communications Act of 1934 as ammended, and by Congressional ratification of various international treaties.

>It doesn't need to be bogged down by beaurocracy, rigid
> inflexible rules, and absolute adherence to correct hamspeak.

It's not. If you were a participating licensee you'd know that.

By the way, Lennie, how many different modes and frequency bands can YOU operate on RIGHT NOW...this VERY moment, with your GROL...?!?!

>Ham radio of today has become, for some, a sort of fantasy
> land...(SNIP)

The fantasies about what Amateur Radio is or has become are in your mind, Lennie.

>So, despite the insistence of the defunct diplomat in here,
> the bus driver, the hoagie muncher, the dill sergeant wanting
> a uniform real bad, the reverend working at an undisclosed
> location, or anyone else, that coveted amateur ticket won't
> be bought to radio never-neverland this week or next week.

I think Jackie can get a pretty good idea where the name calling, obfuscations and perjoratives originate from after THAT little tirade, Lennie.

>Jackie, did you REALLY want an answer or were you just
> trolling because the bands were dead at the moment?

Jackie just found out that any question posed to you opens the door for more hatred and scornful admonitions of Amateur Radio in general and Amateur Radio Operators in particular.

Usual Lennieisms.

Steve, K4YZ

2121. ukirlp feb 2003 newsletter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-13 20:24:50 UTC
From: g3zhi@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <3e51fdb7.2138923@news.btinternet.com>
Source record: 61304

http://www.qsl.net/g3zhi/2003.doc

http://www.qsl.net/g3zhi - many ham radio links

United Kingdom Internet Radio Linking Project

http://www.ukirlp.co.uk http://www.irlp.net

I usually monitor G4NJI node 5200 simplex 145.2875mhz and GB3DV node
5130 repeater 433.025mhz

Ian Abel G3ZHI
52 Hollytree Ave
Maltby
Rotherham
Yorkshire
S66 8DY

Tel: 01709 799911
Mobile 0776 481 3363

2122. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-13 20:52:24 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3E4C0587.44BAC154@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 61305

Brian Kelly wrote:

> The real biggie was the money. I clearly
> remember the first time I visited a Big Gun's station, stacks of
> Collins gear. I was dumbstruck and it showed. His comment was
> something like "Some of us have it and some just don't, that's the way
> it is kid." With a sneer. Fortunately the dramatic changes in personal
> and equipment economics since then have leveled that particular
> pecking order.
>

That's more of the "established working adult" vs the "starving unemployable teenager" pattern than anything else. And some of the adult's demand that the teenager to kiss his ass. Ever notice that the more accomplished adults are less likely to demand "respect" than less accomplished ones?

2123. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-13 21:02:57 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030213160257.11182.00000693@mb-cl.aol.com>
Source record: 61306

In article <f45722ac.0302130410.6a164c7a@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3E4ABB11.2D124F81@earthlink.net>...
>> Brian wrote:
>> >
>> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3E49D16C.97096E03@earthlink.net>...
>> > > Brian wrote:
>> > > >
>> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3E4858A8.81685CD9@earthlink.net>...
>> > > > > Brian wrote:
>>
>>
>> > > > > > Anyway, I always thought God would be gracious, not smug.
>> > > > > >
>> > > > > > I guess that's what happens when you are a God.
>> > > > >
>> > > > > No, that's what happens when you are busy reading between the lines
>> > > > > instead of attempting comprehension of what is actually written.
>You're
>> > > > > a real help in proving a point. Please refer to the portion above
>where
>> > > > > I state, "I've never claimed to be a god".
>> > > >
>> > > > But you don't deny it, either.
>> > >
>> > > I haven't denied being fabulously wealthy either. Is it your opinion
>> > > that anyone is anything he hasn't denied being? That tangental logic
>> > > you are using needs a bit of polishing.
>> >
>> > You accepted the label of "God."
>>
>> No, I did not. You continue to be misinformed. You don't have an
>> answer for the question posed? Do you consider that someone is anything
>> he has not denied being?
>>
>> > You are also a known masticator.
>>
>> Consider yourself masticated up and spit out.
>
>Now you claim you're a cannibal.

The defunct diplomat is looking for a new "first personal?"

"Cannibal Lecture."

:-)

2124. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-13 21:02:58 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030213160258.11182.00000694@mb-cl.aol.com>
Source record: 61309

In article <20030213063939.14527.00000300@mb-cc.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>It must be remembered that "amateur wireless" did not mean the same thing in >1919 as today. Same for the licenses.

Yes, try not to be influenced by old aphorisms like "the past is prologue!" :-)

How many SSB and FM rigs were used by hams in 1919, old timer?

>And those were not the only times ham radio was threatened with extinction. In >the 1920s there were at least three international conventions for radio >allocations. Many other countries did not want wide bands or high power for >hams. Some did not want ham radio at all.
>
>>How much column space did QST give Gernsback, Fleming and Marconi (vs. >>Hiram Percy) for their efforts?
>
>Not much! How much space did Gernsback give ARRL in his many publications?
>
>And what about the efforts of Stewart and Warner?
>
>What side were all of the above on when quiet hours were imposed?

Answer the questions, old timer. How did all of that affect your ham operations?

>>There was never an international movement to eliminate ham radio.
>>
>Wrong. See accounts of the 1924, 1925 and 1927 conventions.
>
>There's also the game of inches. Rather than complete elimination, tie down ham >radio with so many limitations (narrow bands, low power, etc.) that it could >not survive.

Yes, a little thing like World War 2 sort of tied things down, didn't it? :-)

>> Ham news is for hams, nobody else cares.
>
>So should we not bang our own drum?

Unlike Elvis, the drumbeat hasn't left the building...

Gosh, old timer, after 35 years experience you might have
found SOMEONE to listen to your bongos?

2125. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-13 21:02:59 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030213160259.11182.00000695@mb-cl.aol.com>
Source record: 61307

In article <20030213063939.14527.00000301@mb-cc.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <BA707341.E70A%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart
<stewart@say.net>writes:

>> However, how many people saw that demonstration at
>>the Franklin Institute versus at the World's Fair? How many saw it in
>>magazines and newspapers as a result of the fair? For most Americans,
>>television did make its debut at the 1939 World's Fair. Why argue with most
>>Americans over a point this minor?
>
>The point I'm making is that Sarnoff and RCA were shameless/tireless
>self-promoters.

So is ARRL. :-)

>Bill, W7TI, talks of an era when people supposedly didn;t do
>such things. I use the example of TV to show it did happen back then.

Not really. You made a point of spotlighting Philadelphia.

Camden, NJ, was the center of RCA Corpoartion, right acress
the Delaware River from Philly. Do we sense some local
sociopolitical antipathy? :-)

Here's some more "examples" on TV:

Bell Labs did their first TV transmission on April 7, 1927.
Using a "flying spot" scanner camera system, they
transmitted their "Felix the Cat" image in 1930, that
received image shown on movie theater newsreels later.

First installation of a TV antenna on NYC's Empire State
building was in 1931, first TV transmission from there on
October 30, 1931. Oops, that was by greedy, evil,
capitalistic RCA! :-)

Telefunken used iconoscope TV cameras at the 1936
Berlin summer Olympics. In the same year there were
six US companies making TV sets for the NYC market.

Whatever happened to ol' Philo's image dissector?

>>The Farnsworth versus RCA controversy is
>>worth noting however (inventors deserve credit).
>>
>The courts ruled that Farnsworth and Armstrong had their patent rights

>infringed by Sarnoff's RCA. Zwyorkin was no dummy but he was no Farnsworth,
>either.

That's nice. Mrs. Farnsworth and Mrs. Zworykin must have been
happy about being able to distinguish one from the other.

Note Vladimir's surname spelling. If you keep on making all
those errors and mistakes, no one will take you seriously in
here... :-)

>Sarnoff just didn't like to pay licensing fees.

Greedy, evil capitalists are like that. It affected Ed Armstrong
so much (about all the law suits, some of which he started)
that his wife left him and he eventually committed suicide.

Business is IN business FOR pecuniary interest. Hello?

Amateur radio is defined by law as NOT for pecuniary
interest...

2126. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-13 21:03:03 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030213160303.11182.00000696@mb-cl.aol.com>
Source record: 61308

In article <oMM2a.97310$be.72203@rwcrnsc53>, "Jackie"
<buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030213015154.29447.00000400@mb-cd.aol.com...
>> Actually, Jackie, you have aligned yourself already. You
>> haven't quite gotten the picture that I am NOT criticizing
>> the hobby, the recreation of US amateur radio.
>
>I have aligned myself with no one.

Please try to hold onto that attribute.

>> I am criticizing the up-tight, do-it-my-way-or-die dumdums
>> who cannot take one iota of negativism without attempting
>> the false misdirection that I am "against all hams."
>
>Well I don't like them either.

Okay, we agree on that. :-)

>> I commend you for your efforts. I volunteer to help without
>> needing a license in anything (except vehicle licenses),
>> just like in the Northridge Earthquake of 17 Jan 94. Despite
>> a total absence of primary electrical power then and the
>> local telephone system beyond its maximum capacity, the
>> only thing "overwhelmed" was the work task for utility
>> companies and construction crews. No ham license would
>> have helped those actually doing the work of restoration of
>> normal function.
>
>No, but that would not have stopped someone from helping out by using their
>other skills.

Amateur radio was conspicuously missing in the 1994 damage
area during the week following that earthquake. FEMA put in
its fly-away sat terminals featuring video message boards for
relatives of the victims. That was on TV news.

No doubt other easterners think of that earthquake like some
little event on the "left coast." That 1994 earthquake affected
a population area of about 10 million.

>> Licenses in amateur radio are NOT absolutely required to
>> help any emergency/disaster/relief group. TRAINING IS.
>
>Of course.

Others think that professional public safety communications
"always goes down in an emergency and hams rush in to
help save the day." [that's been said, in different words, but
with the same obvious meaning, for years]

If that were the case, why are those morse/minutemen allowing
their local governments to waste so much of their tax dollars on
professional equipment that "always breaks down in an
emergency?"

>> Neither you nor anyone else gets "trained in emergency
>> communications" by doing ham hobby comm or working up
>> high point scores in "radio sport" contests.
>
>And I never suggested that they did. The above is an example of how AR is a
>hobby.

Amateur radio has always been a hobby, a recreational activity
involving radio. A problem with some hobbyists is that isn't
enough glory reflection on them...they want the feel-good
myth of Being Important/Better-than-average and organizations
like ARRL serve that to them on a silver (somewhat tarnished)
platter.

Some hobbyists NEED emotionally-loaded redefinitions. The
amateur radio "service" is very popular for self-grandiosement.

Throughout all of Title 47 CFR, the word "service" is a regulatory
term denoting a type and kind of radio activity.

>> Please don't start in with this "pool of trained operators"
>> nonsense.
>
>I merely illustrated one way that hams can and do help out with what they
>have.

And I'm pointing out that such political phraseology ("pool of
trained operators") is just such a high-sounding, emotionally-
loaded, political buzz-phrase.

>> Sorry, but the perception is that you've already chosen up
>> sides by the above.
>
>Assume nothing. You don't know me, nor does anything i have posted make it
>obviously clear what I think about certain aspects of this hobby and the
>people who are in it. It's more complex than I will bother to let on.

All anyone has for perception in this particular medium are words
on a screen. The same words are repeated on everyone's screen.

Those words DO reflect SOME of what individual messagers
think. Or not think as is the case with some others. :-)

>> You've not perceived that I was never
>> criticizing the ham hobby en toto, just the minority who

>> insist on the 1930s status quo at all costs. That minority
>> assumes the God-like status repleat with nobless oblige
>> talk-downs to the peasants and infrequent Sermons on the
>> Antenna Mount.
>
>Come on, Len, no one can go back to the 30's even if they insisted on it!
>Ignore them if they piss you off.

Some others seem desperately in need of going back to a
time when things were simpler. Their hindsight isn't just
20/20, it is practically 20/10! :-)

Think about how the illustrious ARRL got started, how it got
its name. [that's all history from their own words] Three men
thought it would be a nice idea to relay messages for their
own purposes. American Radio RELAY League. It wasn't
about relay devices (electromagnets activating switches).

Back in 1914 telegrams (sent by manual telegraphy in most
parts of the US) cost money and anyone sending one would
have to go to a telegraph office to start it (when the telegraph
office was open, of course). Delivery to a recipient's home
might be an extra charge...standard rate was for pickup at
the delivery offices.

If you look at that situation and reason now, it looks
suspiciously like 1914-style "hacking," doesn't it? Guys
using their CW rigs to send their own "telegrams." No money
paid out for that service, just use their "radios" (if one can call
that gear such) to send telegrams. Western Union and other
telegram carriers weren't really worried since hams were very,
very few then, didn't impact the Real telegram carriers unduly.

Eventually ARRL grew to a large membership organization
through a number of different actions. Hiram Percy Maxim
became "president for life" (so to speak) as the only club
president for its first two decades running. Maxim had extra
personal cash to play "leader," make trips to DC and do
lobbying, etc.

>> Oh? Consider that I've been IN the real world longer, seen
>> more radio, operated more radio than most hams. I've done
>> it for half a century spanning the tube era and right into the
>> semiconductor age. The rest of the radio world is Very Big
>> and it covers a greater span of the spectrum than a few HF
>> bands allocated to hobbyists. I've been IN that Big World.
>
>Another illustration that proves the point that others have made here. You
>think that SOME hams think they're superior because of this and that
>attitude they display and you apparently don't bother to look at some of the
>stuff you type. Seems pretty haughty to me!

Now, now, you are showing irritation. :-)

Some amateurs DO consider themselves "superior" and have
done so for years in here. They seem to want and need a
fantasy concept of their apparent lifestyle devotional activity
and talk down to all who don't agree with them. I just point
that out...and that enrages them no end. :-)

I DO "look at everything I type." Can't help it when there's a
monitor right above my keyboard. As a semi-professional
writer (to other publications besides HR) since 1968, I don't
take the trouble to polish everything for a final draft version.
This medium doesn't pay enough for that. [it pays nothing]

>> Supplicants never do. Their Belief is unshakable. They don't
>> know they are being manipulated by an even smaller minority
>> of that "church." Worse yet, most simply let that "church"
>> handle everything for them.
>
>I don't take this as seriously as you do.

I don't "take it seriously" either. Other hams (PCTAs, mostly
"brain-dead old farts" in the immortal words of Jim Kehler,
KH2D) really and truly Do Take It Seriously. :-)

They come across as veritable Apostles of a New Creed even
though none of them sat at the feet of those at that last
supper. :-)

>> Ah, but I must "sit for the ham test" to "prove a committment
>> and dedication to the amateur community!" I'm sorry, but that is
>> one of the silliest bogus-brained reasons I've ever heard.
>
>Okay, so you won't take the requirements to get the license, you won't get
>one.

Slight correction. I haven't taken the trouble to take an amateur
radio license test. That wasn't my intention five years ago and
it still isn't a personal goal. Why is that license, that
certificate, so "meaningful" just to TALK about requirements?

I took a REAL test (commercial First 'Phone) in an FCC field
office in Chicago in 1956. I've taken real tests since on other
things, things like college finals rather scattered in the time
domain of night classes.

>What makes you think the rules should be changed just because you think
>you know more than the average person that sits for an AR test?

That isn't, never was "my argument." I'm just arguing against
the morse code test for an amateur radio license. Others,
nearly all of them self-centered brain-dead old farts (thanks
again, Jim) keep harping on "personal this" or "personal that."
To them, the "personal" aspect is all they can argue about.

US radio regulations are NOT concerned with "personals" but
apply to ALL CITIZENS. All. Not just those who are licensed
in a particular radio service. All citizens.

Taking a ham test to "show personal courage, committment,
or dedication to the amateur radio community" is total brainless
self-glorification any way one slices it. That "community" is not
"owed" a damn thing by anyone and neither does that
"community" regulate US radio legally or illegally.

Do I "know more about radio (and electronics) than the average
person sitting for an AR test?" Probably so. There's no Poll
to prove anything. I've only been IN radio and electronics for
a half century, getting paid to do engineering design work in
that. I've had to read and understand all sorts of different
(very required) specifications and other radio service rules
and regulations from the FCC. I find radio and electronics to
be very interesting. Enough interest to make that my prime
career choice in life. I don't find fraternal orders to be the same
and as a result I don't belong to any fraternal orders. :-)

A few others, again BDOFs, insist on Taking The Test To
Prove Something! To "prove" what? That I can approach
their noble, divine accomplishments? In a HOBBY?!? ptui.

Ah, but others, as yet unlicensed, "must prove their
personal courage, committment, and dedication to the
amateur radio community by taking a ham test!" Those
wonderful BDOFs pile into them like Spanish Inquistors
needing to light their fires. [they don't know how to flick
their bics, but they keep rubbing two cliches' together]

>> Jackie, did you REALLY want an answer or were you just
>> trolling because the bands were dead at the moment? :-)
>
>I never troll. I have better things to do with my time. I wanted to get a
>better idea of where you are coming from so I asked the questions.

I sensed trolling. :-) It is the "radio sport" of choice among
the newsgroupies here.

>One thing you might want to remember... just because I may not be as
>critical as you, does not mean I've "aligned" myself to anyone in here. I
>speak for myself only.

I think that thinking for oneself is an excellent attribute.

Others don't. They need to be spoon-fed requirements,
rigidly follow orders, march to the same drumbeat, etc.,
etc., etc. Thinking for themselves is difficult, Following
Orders is easy.

>I got into AR because I was a SWL for years, and
>there are certain things about it that are fun to me.

Fine. Excellent. Good on you. Amateur radio has always
been a hobby, a recreational activity.

>I could not care less
>about the code/no-code debate. I just took the test because it was a
>requirement to get on HF.

Okay. Fine. The "hoops" were there and you jumped through
them. You made it. Good on you. I'm questioning the
existance of certain "hoops" is all. :-)

Others in here don't think so. To them the "hoops" are the Main
Thing. It shows They can Do Things Others Haven't Done.
Oh, wow, yeah. Like cool. :-)

>I don't see it as some eeeevil conspiracy to keep
>people out, nor do I use the fact that I passed the code test as some badge
>of superiority that I can hold over others.

I'm not saying your are one of Them. :-)

>Means to an end was all it was.

To some in here the Means justifies the End. :-)

>Gotta go to work.

Done that for 52 years. Don't have to now. "Work" is a four-
letter word, isn't it? :-)

2127. Re: New Field Day Entry Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-13 22:37:03 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0302131437.27ebf77@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61310

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0302121802.6c2c643d@posting.google.com>...
> Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3E4A7A83.9080200@psu.edu>...
> > Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> > Do you know exactly the form of comms for any emergency? If the wheels
> > fall off ya gotta work with what you have.
>
> Which is exactly what I'll do if an appropriate situation pops up
> again and I have a radio handy. In fact I've done just that in several
> instances over the years via highway incidents. I got the comms thru
> despite them not being "exactly in the approved form". Jeez, I guess
> I better clean up my act, next time I need a cop I'll stop everything
> and count the words before I transmit and send/confirm the check
> number huh? As if.
>
> Since ya chose to respond kindly note that ya completely ignored my
> question to Jim. I'll try again: "When was the last time an NTS
> formatted "message" to an SCM proved of any value whatsoever during an
> emergency in which ham radio was involved? Ditto the pointless
> "Message from w1aw" thingey."

While it's not a message to the SCM, how about this:

BEGIN GOOGLE QUOTE:

From: "Arnie Macy" <kt4st@csam.net>
Subject: Hurricanes and Emergency ops
Date: 1999/10/10
Message-ID: <630M3.10516$iN6.185449@news2.mia>#1/1
X-Trace: news2.mia 939560258 216.76.74.217 (Sun, 10 Oct 1999 08:57:38
EDT)
NNTP-Posting-Date: Sun, 10 Oct 1999 08:57:38 EDT
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

To the Group:

We recently had to activate the EOC in our countyl. The entire county
was
under a mandatory evacuation for hurricane Floyd. I learned a few
real
world lessons and would like to share them here. A while back we had
a
discussion concerning emergency operations and what we would need and
do

should that occur. Some said that VHF would rule the day, and that it is
90% of emergency operations. Still others (like myself) said that HF was
more of a factor and that CW and other modes should play a part.

Well, we were all right to some extent. VHF was used extensively in
providing local information to the EOC via the local repeaters and
simplex.
That information was sent via HF (3975) to all parts of the state. HF was a
huge player in coordinating state resources during the evacuation. I am
told that something like 300,000 plus people left our local area. HF was
used to keep in contact with the shelters located hundreds of miles away,
with GEMA and with FEMA.

SSB and CW was utilized to pass informal and formal traffic to the SEC, GEMA
and FEMA. We can argue about this all day, but the fact is that both were
used as appropriate. Luckily, we had CW competent operators at our EOC and
reliable CW ops at all parts to receive the messages that came via that
mode. What mode was used the most? SSB, of course. But it was nice to
know that CW was still utilized when conditions dicated. As a matter of
fact, the last message out of the Chatham County EOC was sent to the SEC via
CW.

Since then, we have discussed the need for even more mode capabilities.
Things like HF packet and, yes even PSK31 have been tossed about. What we
learned with this real world situation is that *all* available modes should
be used and that relying on SSB or VHF only is a risky business.

Over this past weekend, we had a SET (Simulated Emergency Test) statewide.
A friend of mine attempted to send a simulated message to the Macon area,
about 180 miles away. He was running about 100 watts, but conditions were
very poor, and he wasn't getting through. So, he split his frequency,
setting up -600 on B, and sent the message via CW. The NCS in Atlanta

took
the message for the Macon station and answered via voice for fills.
(which
my friend could hear) It was very cool hearing the NCS talk to him.
"Got
it here Ed. All stations stand by while the CW station in Savannah
sends a
message to KR4OL" Ed said later that he would have used SSB, but he
just
wasn't getting through, so he thought he would try CW. (it worked)

Bottom line is that we should use *all* the modes we have available
and
maybe even incorporate a few that we haven't thought of before.

Regards,

Arnie -
KT4ST

END GOOGLE QUOTE

Note that Arnie was talking about a full-scale, wide-area emergency in
his neck of the woods (Hurricane Floyd, Georgia, 1999). Note also the
use of formal and informal NTS type messages for contact between the
county and state EOCs, GEMA, FEMA, etc. Most of all note that he was
there - it's a first-hand account, not a news blurb.

In other words, it ain't all HTs by any means. Widespread emergencies
need longer-distance comms. Which means HF/MF, when hams are involved.

Before anybody gets the idea that this quote is meant to prove some
point or other about code testing, I'll say that that's not what it's
about at all.

> > Kinda like I think hams
> > should have basic proficiency in CW so they can use that if need be, and
> > exposure to as many forms of comms as possible.
>
> I wouldn't place any bets on how many licensed hams are first exposed
> to any mode on FD.
>
> >
> > I guess you started as a fully experienced ham, eh?
>
> My first FD was 15 years before Jim's first and that was before I was
> first licenesed.

How many since then? I'm at 35 and still learning.

> I have yet to learn a bloomin' thing from any of the
> several I've worked in including my first. The reality is that ya take
> knowledge INTO FD, not OUT of FD. YMMV.

>
Our experiences are different, then. We'll see how the scores work
out. You gotta do 3000 points to beat the N2EY singlehanded record.
And that was made in 1995, near bottom of the cycle.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2128. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-13 22:59:05 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0302131459.24d2601e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61311

"Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now> wrote in message
news:<Xns9321603AE9E5pookster@216.168.3.50>...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in news:d22b54c3.0302130919.11796f70
> @posting.google.com:
>
> > That was 35 years ago fer chrissake, when do we get to finally bury
> > it??
> >
> ----------
>
> Reminds me of Clinton: "Fer chrissake, can we get beyond the blue dress
> and move on to more important things?"

. . and he was right.

> IOW, the discussion will go away when the problem goes away. Clinton
> didn't consider the blue dress a problem; you don't consider incentive
> licensing a problem. Others do.

All three of ya clump together and enjoy.

w3rv

2129. Re: Getting old call sign back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-13 23:03:39 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302131503.3799c537@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61312

"Will" <Will671@lekopetron.net> wrote in message news:<b2g31etal0@pita.alt.net>...

> > Wasn't his to "give" away.
>
> Brilliant! I think you have a future in Communications Law.
>
> Will

For a hamburger today I will gladly pay you Tuesday.

2130. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 00:27:31 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030213192731.23275.00000358@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 61313

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/12/03 8:07 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030212210742.09921.00001846@mb-md.aol.com>

>Or the loose cannon, ace of the CAP...(SNIP)

And UNLIKE you, Lennie, still serving something OTHER than MYSELF.

Scumbag putz.

Steve

2131. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 00:32:27 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030213193227.23275.00000359@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 61314

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 2/12/03 10:10 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0302122010.687b070f@posting.google.com>

>> Vipul's alrady been suggested that, but he's only looking for a
>ready-made
>> organization into which he can make a grand entrance,
>
>He should try the USMC or the Tenn Militia.

I doubt that Vipul could make the grade in the Marine Corps, and there is
no such thing as the "Tenn Militia".

You should get your "facts" from some source other than Lennie's
ill-prepared rantings in here, Brain.

> Jackie...When suggested
>> HE start such a club, he made some vague reference to having "tried that
>once",
>> and only had one or two people showed up.
>
>I think that's what happened to Larry.

Strange...Vipul made that assertion only 10 days ago.

>> That's what happens when people let thier kids play with the computer
>at
>> night.
>
>Or things get slow in the ER.

Define "slow", Brain. There's never a "slow" day in the ER.

Steve, K4YZ

2132. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 00:38:20 UTC
From: Jackie <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com>
Message-ID: <0UW2a.103392$Ec4.86784@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 61315

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030213160303.11182.00000696@mb-cl.aol.com...

Large snip.

> To them the "hoops" are the Main
> Thing.

One thing that has irritated me (and I should state that it's not been anyone on this NG that has done this to me personally) is that there've been a couple of people who I've talked with on the air and via e-mail that were not willing to do a code conversation with me, because not only was I a beginner, but I am also one of the products of the slow code requirements. As if I had anything to do with the level of speed that is required to pass the test. Lucky for me that I found one nice person who was willing to slow down to my level so that I could practice it and we had a nice (but challenging for me) conversation.

While I am not pro- or anti-code testing, this indicates that some people out there in radio land have a serious attitude problem if they choose to blame us new operators for the way the rules have changed.

Jackie
KC0ODY

2133. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 00:54:05 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030213195405.23275.00000360@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 61316

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/13/03 3:03 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030213160303.11182.00000696@mb-cl.aol.com>

>Amateur radio was conspicuously missing in the 1994 damage
> area during the week following that earthquake. FEMA put in
> its fly-away sat terminals featuring video message boards for
> relatives of the victims. That was on TV news.

The only thing that was "conspicuously missing" was anyone taking the time
to blow trumpets and make grand proclimations.

>Others think that professional public safety communications
> "always goes down in an emergency and hams rush in to
> help save the day." [that's been said, in different words, but
> with the same obvious meaning, for years]

Quotes, please, Lennie.

> A problem with some hobbyists is that isn't
> enough glory reflection on them...they want the feel-good
> myth of Being Important/Better-than-average and organizations
> like ARRL serve that to them on a silver (somewhat tarnished)
> platter.

The "problem" here is a self-absorbed ex-radio technician who
self-worships his rather lack-luster "career" as being "better" than Amateur
Radio when the fact is that he doesn't realize he's trying to mix the oil with
water.

>Some hobbyists NEED emotionally-loaded redefinitions. The
> amateur radio "service" is very popular for self-grandiosement.

And it appears it also serves YOUR needs for the same reason, Lennie.

>And I'm pointing out that such political phraseology ("pool of
> trained operators") is just such a high-sounding, emotionally-
> loaded, political buzz-phrase.

No..you're trying to rationalize your rant into something reasonable
sounding when the TRVTH of the matter is that that very "political buzz phrase"
[it's nothing of the sort] has been proven FACT for almost NINE decades.

>Some amateurs DO consider themselves "superior" and have
> done so for years in here.

As opposed to an "amateurish" ex-radio technician who does the same thing?
OOOOOOPS! That would be YOU, Yuor Putziness!

>As a semi-professional
> writer (to other publications besides HR) since 1968, I don't
> take the trouble to polish everything for a final draft version.

Which explains why so MANY of yuor posts are rife with errors.

>>Okay, so you won't take the requirements to get the license, you won't get
>>one.
>
> Slight correction. I haven't taken the trouble to take an amateur
> radio license test. That wasn't my intention five years ago and
> it still isn't a personal goal. Why is that license, that
> certificate, so "meaningful" just to TALK about requirements?

Ooooops. Caught lying again.

Shall we ahve Jim re-post your own words, Lennie? The one's wherein you
stated you were getting an "extra out of the box"...?!?!

>I took a REAL test (commercial First 'Phone) in an FCC field
> office in Chicago in 1956.

The tests I took were real, too. No pass=No license. That's real enough
for me.

>That isn't, never was "my argument." I'm just arguing against
> the morse code test for an amateur radio license. Others,
> nearly all of them self-centered brain-dead old farts (thanks
> again, Jim) keep harping on "personal this" or "personal that."
> To them, the "personal" aspect is all they can argue about.

The personal part comes from being told by someone with no experience in
the matter how we SHOULD be doing things.

>Do I "know more about radio (and electronics) than the average
> person sitting for an AR test?" Probably so.

Not by eveidence herein.

>Taking a ham test to "show personal courage, committment,
> or dedication to the amateur radio community" is total brainless
> self-glorification any way one slices it. That "community" is not
> "owed" a damn thing by anyone and neither does that

It's not about showing personal courage, etc etc etc.

It's about participating. So far you are not. Your "posts" are merely
opinions of thrid-hand information. No experience.

>A few others, again BDOFs, insist on Taking The Test To
> Prove Something! To "prove" what? That I can approach
> their noble, divine accomplishments? In a HOBBY?!? ptui.

It's about participating. So far you are not. Your "posts" are merely opinions of thrid-hand information. No experience.

And quit spitting.

>Ah, but others, as yet unlicensed, "must prove their
> personal courage, committment, and dedication to the
> amateur radio community by taking a ham test!"

You keep citing a quote, Lennie. Who made it? No one in ehre that I remember......

>Fine. Excellent. Good on you. Amateur radio has always
> been a hobby, a recreational activity.

It's a hobby for some. A tool for others. A means to an ends for even others.

>Done that for 52 years. Don't have to now. "Work" is a four-
> letter word, isn't it?

So is "test". Is that why you can't seem to muster up the intestinal fortitude to take one?

Steve, K4YZ

2134. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 00:56:15 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0302131656.3ddcd85a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61317

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0302130410.6a164c7a@posting.google.com>...
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E4ABB11.2D124F81@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E49D16C.97096E03@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E4858A8.81685CD9@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > >
> > > > > > > > Anyway, I always thought God would be gracious, not smug.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > I guess that's what happens when you are a God.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > No, that's what happens when you are busy reading between the lines
> > > > > > > > instead of attempting comprehension of what is actually written. You're
> > > > > > > > a real help in proving a point. Please refer to the portion above where
> > > > > > > > I state, "I've never claimed to be a god".
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > But you don't deny it, either.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I haven't denied being fabulously wealthy either. Is it your opinion
> > > > > > that anyone is anything he hasn't denied being? That tangental logic
> > > > > > you are using needs a bit of polishing.
> > > > >
> > > > > You accepted the label of "God."
> > >
> > > No, I did not. You continue to be misinformed. You don't have an
> > > answer for the question posed? Do you consider that someone is anything
> > > he has not denied being?
> > >
> > > > You are also a known masticator.
> > >
> > > Consider yourself masticated up and spit out.
> >
> Now you claim you're a cannibal.

If he was he'd have had for a snack eons ago.

2135. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 01:06:20 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030213200620.03512.00000114@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 61318

>Subject: Re: NR-1 Book
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 2/13/03 6:06 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0302130406.399bdf41@posting.google.com>

>I take them about as seriously as an abcessed tooth. The quicker you
>root 'em out, the better.

"ABCESSED TOOTH!"

MY BUST! I thought you were interested in the ABSOLUTE TRUTH!

Guess all that swelling in your head made it hard to understand you!

Steve, K4YZ

2136. CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 01:16:32 UTC
From: Jackie <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com>
Message-ID: <QrX2a.101930$be.73749@rwcrnsc53>
Source record: 61319

This really isn't a policy question, but I figgered that some of the regulars here might know the answer to this question.

Regarding next weekend's CW contest-- is this generally for more experienced CW ops? Or do you get a bunch of the slower code on the bands at that time as well? I don't know that I'm going to try contesting myself (since I'm limited to the # of bands I can work on) but if I can be someone else's contact, it would give me good practice. Do the faster coders usually slow down for a slow coder's answer to their CQ, or is this not a good place and time to be answering CQ's if you're slow on the key? Just curious.

Jackie KC0ODY

2137. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 01:38:49 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030213203849.23875.00000438@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 61320

>Subject: CW DX? (somewhat OT)
>From: "Jackie" buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com
>Date: 2/13/03 7:16 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <QrX2a.101930$be.73749@rwcrnsc53>

>Regarding next weekend's CW contest-- is this generally for more experienced
>CW ops?

To tell you the truth, I wonder how many of the high speed CW sgnals you
will hear are really "experienced ops" or "experienced programs"...!

Most of the higher speed ops will go lower in the band, Jackie. Work
upwards from .040 up early in the contest. (ie: 14.040). You might also try
the "Novice" sub bands, although I don't think folks go that "high" in the band
anymore.

>Do the faster coders usually slow
>down for a slow coder's answer to their CQ, or is this not a good place and
>time to be answering CQ's if you're slow on the key? Just curious.

Unless they think you are in a multiplier they need they will probably
skip past you anyway. Now on voice, that "YL" thing might get you more "Q's",
regardless of need...Just a male chauvinist thing, I guess!

73

Steve, K4YZ

2138. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 02:03:52 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030213210352.25403.00000369@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 61323

In article <Xns93205AA45C84Bpookster@216.168.3.50>, "Bill, W7TI"
<jamspam@upyours.now> writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
>news:20030212063626.12173.00000516@mb-mr.aol.com:
>
>> Many
>> books will tell you that all-electronic TV made its debut at the 1939
>> NYC World's Fair, and that it was "invented" by RCA - even though
>> Philo T. Farnsworth was the actual inventor, and gave a public
>> demonstration five years earlier (1934) in Philadelphia, at the
>> Franklin Institute.
>>
>>--
>
>A perfect example of why beating your own drum sucks. Had other people
>with no ax to grind been doing the bragging, the truth would have no
>doubt prevailed.

Agreed. But the guy who banged his own drum got the money and fame. And only
now is the true story becoming widely known.
>
>Remember last summer's Enron commercials? The most successful and
>wonderful company on earth.

Shades of the 1920s....

>I'm a realist, guys. I don't expect to return to the '50s anytime soon.
>But there *were* some advantages.

Agreed. But it wasn't the licensing system that was the cause of those
advantages, in my view.

Heck, there were at least three license levels back in those days anyway:

Novices, with extremely limited privs and an upgrade-or-leave-the-air ticket.
(talk about incentives to learn!)

Technicians, who had no HF at all and not even all of 6 and 2 - even though
they'd passed the same written as the General

Generals/Conditionals, the vast majority

There were also about 40,000 Advanceds, at least some of whom were REALLY
ticked at having lost their top of the heap position in 1951-53.

And about 4,000 Extras, mostly "because it's there" types, or those in search
of the 1x2 at the end of the 25 year rainbow.

That period of "Generals and above get it all" lasted less than 16 years. Been almost 35 years since it ended.

I remember getting my first LM back in 1966 or so, and wondering why there were three full-privs license classes, one of which wasn't even open to new issues. Strange.

I'll ask again: What should the system look like if/when S25.5 disappears and FCC dumps Element 1?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2139. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 02:03:53 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030213210353.25403.00000370@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 61322

In article <Xns932130525954Apookster@216.168.3.50>, "Bill, W7TI"
<jamspam@upyours.now> writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in news:20030213063939.14527.00000301@mb-
>cc.aol.com:
>
>> Bill, W7TI, talks of an era when people supposedly didn;t do
>> such things.
>____
>
>That isn't what I said.

OK, Bill, here's what you wrote that I'm referring to:

"Nobody *ever* bragged on themself."

I took that to mean it just didn't happen. Now it's clear that what you meant
was:

>It was frowned on, it was rare and most people
>didn't behave that way because that was the custom.

OK, fine. I think we could use a more of that these days.

>Today's custom is
>just the opposite. The bell-shaped curve rule applied then just like
>now. There's always the fringe element out at the ends.
>
>And it wasn't "supposedly".

I'll take your word for it, Bill. The exceptions I referred to were just that -
exceptions.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2140. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 02:03:54 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030213210354.25403.00000371@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 61321

In article <3E4C0587.44BAC154@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>Brian Kelly wrote:
>
>> The real biggie was the money. I clearly
>> remember the first time I visited a Big Gun's station, stacks of
>> Collins gear. I was dumbstruck and it showed. His comment was
>> something like "Some of us have it and some just don't, that's the way
>> it is kid." With a sneer. Fortunately the dramatic changes in personal
>> and equipment economics since then have leveled that particular
>> pecking order.
>>
>
>That's more of the "established working adult" vs the "starving unemployable
>teenager" pattern than anything else.

Sort of. You have to remember that in the time period of which W3RV speaks
(50s/60s) a Collins setup cost serious amounts of dough. Example: In 1958, a
75A-4 cost about $700 new - without the special reduction knob, and with just
one mechanical filter. This was back when a $5000/yr pre-tax income was
considered solidly middle class. And the 'A-4 was just a receiver! You don't
even want to think about what the matching KWS-1 transmitter cost.

Of course Collins was top of the line ham gear back then, like the FT-1000 or
an Orion is today.

>And some of the adult's demand that
>the teenager to kiss his ass.

Which just goes to prove 'RV's point. There was a "pecking order" or "class
system" back then, too.

Which would you rather have: a system based on skill and knowledge, (as
exemplified by license classes with serious tests) or one based on age and $$?

>Ever notice that the more accomplished
>adults are less likely to demand "respect" than less accomplished ones?

Sure. And they are also more likely to give respect, too.
>
73 de Jim, N2EY

2141. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 02:10:27 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030213211027.09027.00000414@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 61324

From K4YZ:
>>Which means that no a code Technician class can know more than an only-coder
>>General.
>
> "Only coder"...?!?! Please provide a reference and definition.

The only coder only wants to do Morse code, contesting, and collect wallpaper. The only coder does not want to do anything technical, except possibly antennas.

> Since a General has to pass two written tests instead of one, your
>suggestion is silly.

No, its not. Since each test is very easy (even trivial) to pass, the written tests are meaningless. Therefore all the General and Extra licenses really prove is one learned Morse code.

> But what it does NOT do, Vipul, is say that "The radio art is solely
>achivement in technical development".

Yes, it does. The FCC rule book, biased towards Ham radio as it is, has a paragraph on each of the subparts. Operations is in a separate paragraph. It is solely achievement in technical development, because that's what the paragraph describes. The non technical goals are in the other sections.

Everything in the paragraph describes technical accomplishment. Seems to me, you need a definition of the phrase, a description won't be enough for you. Its a matter of reading comprehension.

> Yep...the >>ARRL's<< Rulebook. A lot of nice editorialization, tehre,

So, you admit the ARRL is biased! (Saying things like they did " editorialization ").

>Vipul, AND nothing that says "radio art" is solely "technical achievement".

If you believe it means something else, please give an example.

"Radio art" is always with the words technical achievement in the CFR 47. If you need an exact definition, I can't provide it. Since most people that use it understand its meaning, no formalized definition is provided. Its too bad you cannot understand the meaning of the phrase "radio art".

2142. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 02:19:27 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E4C528A.6A0F4E3C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61325

Len Over 21 wrote:

>
> Heh heh heh...I'm still pondering the "floating" Ten-Tec that
> washed up on his famous desert island...or the mysterious
> foreign girlfriend "Natasha"...or all those claims of getting any
> personnel job he wanted after college that awarded the
> soma come loud.
>
> It's almost as good as that other ham in here, the one that
> must work for Dick Cheney at some "undisclosed location."
>
> Or the loose cannon, ace of the CAP, who always manages
> some kind of picture in UNIFORM...many different kinds over
> the years...hair receding and greying prematurely while
> shouting at dissenters "get down and gimme ten..." :-)
>
> Or that splendid model of decorum and diplomacy for The Ham,
> defunct from a quasi-amateur-ambassadorship for State. :-(
>
> Or the katapult kop munching that hoagie while taking pix of
> secret soviet aircraft for Navy intelligence. :-)
>
> So much for "movements" among the Regulars... :-)

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

That just about sums it up.

Dave K8MN

2143. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 02:32:35 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E4C5537.37780A5A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61326

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <c2356669.0302110943.37927a89@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> (N2EY) writes:
>
> >> I did not hear any mention of Ham (or amateur) radio operators, in regard
> >to
> >> the Columbia recovery, in the news. Not one.
> >
> >Isn't MNSNBC "the news"?
>
> It is not.

>
> There is an MSNBC, a news operation of Microsoft
> and National Broadcast Company on cable TV.

> All such errors and mistakes cast doubt upon the relevancy
> of Mr. N2EY to be believed in this newsgroup.

Would that type of thinking also apply to your use of "National
Broadcast Company" rather than the National Broadcasting Company?

Whew! You're certainly good for some grins, Leonard.

Dave K8MN

2144. Re: NR-1 Book

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 02:43:09 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E4C57B0.795EE434@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61327

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <f45722ac.0302120826.5d8d0730@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >> More like "Car 59 Where Are You?" in your case.
> >>
> >> w3rv
> >
> >Before my time. Tell me about it.
>
> It was titled "Car 54, Where Are You?" [Oo! Oo! :-)]
>
> Brian, there's a definite missing-arithmetic component to
> the PCTAs. Such as "7 x 24 = 148." :-)
>
> With all those errors and mistakes, one just can't take
> all those PCTAs seriously... :-)

Nor with mistakes like "Go such an 807 plate cap", "immagure" and
"National Broadcast Company" can you take an NCNT (No code, no ticket)
type very seriously. ;-) ;-) :>(

Dave K8MN

2145. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 03:16:40 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E4C5F89.6049AC04@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61328

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <7xD2a.91351$be.68029@rwcrnsc53>, "Jackie"
> <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> writes:
>
> >"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20030212210738.09921.00001844@mb-md.aol.com...
> >
> >> Jackie, you've not been in here for a long time. The Regulars
> >> in here (nearly all PCTAs) are simply elitists who want all to
> >> follow Their directives, Their kind of enjoyment, Their life-
> >> style and NO back-talk from "inferiors." :-)
> >
> >I may not have "been here for a long time", but I have been reading long
> >enough and I knows opinions when I see's 'em. Len, I'm not picking on you or
> >singling you out, but the above is an example of your OPINIONS and nothing
> >more.
>
> Absolutely! Now...what about the others?
>
> Do license grants now enoble the certificate holder some
> Divine TRVTH engraved in marble? Absolutely NOT.
>
> Everyone has opinions. Problem with the PCTA Regulars
> in here is that Their Opinions are the Only Truth.

Would that be...ummmm...your *opinion*?

> Not only
> that, the Words of ARRL are Sacred.
> All that disagree with
> such Divine Words are "mistaken," "error prone," and
> worse.

Your statement is unsupported by fact. Additionally, you are no more a
player in the ARRL than you are in amateur radio.

> >Wait! What's that I hear...? A crescendo of tiny violins in sweet refrain?
> >C'mon Len, I don't think that many people take this all as seriously as you
> >think they do.
>
> PCTA Regulars do. :-)
>
> >OTOH, I and many other hams choose to make ourselves available through ARES
> >and RACES and Skywarn. What's wrong with that?

>
> Not a thing wrong with that. It's only the Believers in
> the Sanctity of CW within those activities that are too
> tied up with their traffic handling via CW fantasies.

Unsupported by fact.

> Licenses in amateur radio are NOT absolutely required to
> help any emergency/disaster/relief group. TRAINING IS.
> Neither you nor anyone else gets "trained in emergency
> communications" by doing ham hobby comm or working up
> high point scores in "radio sport" contests. It takes, at
> worst, five minutes to "train" someone to use a utility, police,
> or fire HT, maybe another five minutes to explain beginning
> jargon phrases and "listen first before speaking."

We'll chalk this one up to just another thing of which you aren't really
knowledgeable.

> Please don't start in with this "pool of trained operators"
> nonsense. Real emergencies don't need 1912 Save-the-
> Titanic CW skills. Real emergency/disaster folks don't use
> CW and haven't done so for decades.

There are plenty of everyday emergencies in which radio amateurs use
SSB, FM and packet. Your discounting of trained amateur radio operators
is beyond silly.

> Operating a radio IN land warfare without much training was
> proven in the field in WW2 and all the minor wars (dozens by
> many countries) following. Warfare is a true 24/7 emergency
> environment regardless of our defunct diplomats redefinition.

That'd be "diplomat's". You keep making these errors, Len. War can be
24/7. You've never been a participant for 24/7. Your 24/7 activities
are pretty much limited to using oxygen and taking up space.

> >Now,
> >I don't know about others, but I certainly do not feel as if my
> >participation in helping out my fellow humans qualifies me for demi-god
> >status or even for bragging rights.
>
> Sorry, but the perception is that you've already chosen up
> sides by the above.

Pssst--Jackie! He means "perceived by him".

> You've not perceived that I was never
> criticizing the ham hobby en toto, just the minority who
> insist on the 1930s status quo at all costs. That minority
> assumes the God-like status repleat with nobless oblige
> talk-downs to the peasants and infrequent Sermons on the
> Antenna Mount.

That'd be your opinion once again, Leonard? It really sounds like the
attitude of one who is frustrated that mere radio amateurs won't give
him what he feels is his due.

> >How do you define the "real world", Len? Scratch that, nevermind... I live
> >there, so I know something about it.
>
> Oh? Consider that I've been IN the real world longer, seen
> more radio, operated more radio than most hams. I've done
> it for half a century spanning the tube era and right into the
> semiconductor age. The rest of the radio world is Very Big
> and it covers a greater span of the spectrum than a few HF
> bands allocated to hobbyists. I've been IN that Big World.

Right. Do the words "assumes the God-like status repleat with nobless
oblige
talk-downs to the peasants and infrequent Sermons on the Antenna Mount"
sound familiar? They should--they're yours. Try to clean up the
errors. You misspelled "noblesse".

> I define the "real world" as the here and now, where radio is
> a communications tool that isn't magic or supernatural. It has
> known physical properties...known to those who take the time
> to understand it instead of being spoon-fed little snippets of
> factoids or emotionally bent by clever advertising.

Amateur radio isn't magic or supernatural. It has known physical
properties.
You aren't involved in it.

> >I somehow doubt that most AR ops see the ARRL as some sort of divine oracle
> >to be obeyed and supplicated to.
>
> Supplicants never do. Their Belief is unshakable. They don't
> know they are being manipulated by an even smaller minority
> of that "church." Worse yet, most simply let that "church"
> handle everything for them.

Unsupported by fact.

> Watch what the PCTAs spout in here. They always point to
> ARRL this or that for their references in/for/about ham radio.
> Very few know what the RSGB has or much of anything else
> by Yurp organizations or Ozzies or New Zealanders or
> Japanese or other amateur groups aligned/misaligned with the
> IARU.

Unsupported by fact.

> PCTAs are Believers, they wear the same virtual
> uniform, march to the same virtual drumbeat, sing the same
> virtual virtuous hymnals, and behave as if they lived in some
> fantasyland where the only radio was done by amateurs and
> broadcasters.

Unsupported by fact.

> >C'mon, it's a hobby, AND a service, AND
> >some people happen to get some pleasure out of any number of aspects that
> >fall under those two categories. What is the problem with that?
>
> There's NO problem with that...except when they divorce
> themselves from reality or USE the service aspect glow to
> light their own personal radiance (when their pilot is nearly
> out). It does NOT require an amateur license to be of help
> to one's nation, community, or whatever.

Then feel free to go and be of help to your nation, community or
whatever.

> >You're not
> >even an AR operator Len... so I really fail to see how this affects you
> >personally.
>
> It doesn't. My original intent was to engage in debate for the
> removal of the morse code test for any amateur radio license
> test. Instead, it has been a sort of firefight of personally-aimed
> pejoratives fired by amateur marksmen shooting certificates
> and titles as if they were ICBMs. Ptui. Those were just BMs.

A hit's a hit. Why don't you take a few minutes and describe for Jackie
how you are an uninvited "advocate for..."

> I have had an interest in radio and electronics technology for
> over half a century. I've been IN far bigger leagues of HF comm
> than any defunct diplomat in here, probably working closer to
> Real high-capacity message traffic handling than the entire
> amateur NTS put together, having to keep all circuits open and
> running 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, without many fringe
> benefits of just 8-hour workdays. Radio and electronics was
> fascinating enough personally that I switched from an illustrator
> career to engineering early on in my life, did my whole career
> mainly in design engineering.

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

> The purists, the traditionalists, the twilight zoners of hamism
> insist that professionalism is NOT the Amateur Way. They
> insist on "qualifications" by virtue of the ham license...as if
> none of the past half century's personal experience had any
> relevance. I am supposed to learn morse code because,
> according to the PCTAs, that is the ultimate meaningful skill
> of their little detached Brotherhood of Radio. Morsemanship

> wasn't relevant to the needs of the rest of the radio world of
> fifty years ago and it sure as hell isn't meaningful today.

Quite a rant, Len old boy. I can almost see the flecks of spittle at
the corners of your mouth. You'll still need that morse at the moment
if you'd like to have HF access as a radio amateur.

> Ah, but I must "sit for the ham test" to "prove a committment
> and dedication to the amateur community!" I'm sorry, but that is
> one of the silliest bogus-brained reasons I've ever heard. Ham
> radio doesn't operate by "different" radio physics principles and
> the ham radio waves don't propagate differently than other radio
> waves. Ham radio does NOT need any morse code test for a
> license or even any morse code skill at all. It isn't some
> magic pool of trained whatevers. That's just political hype.
> Ham radio is a fun hobby, an interesting one, a recreation.
> It doesn't need to be bogged down by beaurocracy, rigid
> inflexible rules, and absolute adherence to correct hamspeak.

Uh, the Commission seems to think you'll still need to pass the exams,
Leonard.
It isn't just politcal hype.

> Ham radio of today has become, for some, a sort of fantasy
> land where they can indulge in dumb little games of one-
> upmanship through credentials, certification, callsigns, and
> calumny directed to those "not of their 'hood." Some have
> discarded their real names, wanting to be identified only by
> callsigns. Identity transferrence, achieving something better
> than their present lives and social position. I need NONE of
> that. I certainly do not need to sit for some amateur test to
> prove anydamnthing to anybody about commitment or
> dedication to some mythical amateur community or ethos.

No, you'll just need to do it in order to become a participant. Until
then, the only place you can indulge in dumb little games of
one-upmanship through frequest mention of your professional credentials
is...here.

> So, despite the insistence of the defunct diplomat in here,
> the bus driver, the hoagie muncher, the dill sergeant wanting
> a uniform real bad, the reverend working at an undisclosed
> location, or anyone else, that coveted amateur ticket won't
> be bought to radio never-neverland this week or next week.
>
N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

Dave K8MN

2146. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 03:23:22 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E4C611C.8E74D8F7@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61329

"Bill, W7TI" wrote:
>
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in news:d22b54c3.0302130919.11796f70
> @posting.google.com:
>
> > That was 35 years ago fer chrissake, when do we get to finally bury
> > it??
> >
> ----------
>
> Reminds me of Clinton: "Fer chrissake, can we get beyond the blue dress
> and move on to more important things?"
>
> IOW, the discussion will go away when the problem goes away. Clinton
> didn't consider the blue dress a problem; you don't consider incentive
> licensing a problem. Others do.

Incentive licensing wasn't perceived as a problem by me until a year or so after the intial phase took place in 1968. I was living in Shreveport at the time. I handled it by driving the 200 miles to Dallas and passing the Advanced exam. When incentive licensing started cramping my style in chasing DX on both SSB and CW, I took the Extra exam. Anyone still carping about incentive licensing thirty-five years after the fact needs more fiber in his diet.

Dave K8MN

2147. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 03:36:31 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030213223631.29016.00000308@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 61330

In article <0UW2a.103392$Ec4.86784@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net>, "Jackie"
<buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> writes:

>One thing that has irritated me (and I should state that it's not been
>anyone on this NG that has done this to me personally) is that there've been
>a couple of people who I've talked with on the air and via e-mail that were
>not willing to do a code conversation with me, because not only was I a
>beginner, but I am also one of the products of the slow code requirements.
>As if I had anything to do with the level of speed that is required to pass
>the test.

Exactly!

I look at it this way: It's kind of like the person who paid $300 for a VCR
many years ago being mad at the person who gets an equivalent one today for
$100.

I ran into the same thing 35 years ago, from one or two hams. The funny thing
was that I later discovered that the real reason they didn't want a CW QSO with
me was that they couldn't do even 5 wpm any more.

>Lucky for me that I found one nice person who was willing to slow
>down to my level so that I could practice it and we had a nice (but
>challenging for me) conversation.
>
Choose a time and frequency and I'll have a CW QSO with you, no problem.

>While I am not pro- or anti-code testing, this indicates that some people
>out there in radio land have a serious attitude problem if they choose to
>blame us new operators for the way the rules have changed.

Agreed.

20 meters some early evening? EPA to MN is not that far.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2148. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 03:57:22 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E4C696F.8715FCB4@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61331

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
> >Subject: CW DX? (somewhat OT)
> >From: "Jackie" buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com
> >Date: 2/13/03 7:16 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <QrX2a.101930$be.73749@rwcrnsc53>
>
> >Regarding next weekend's CW contest-- is this generally for more experienced
> >CW ops?
>
> To tell you the truth, I wonder how many of the high speed CW sgnals you
> will hear are really "experienced ops" or "experienced programs"...!
>
> Most of the higher speed ops will go lower in the band, Jackie. Work
> upwards from .040 up early in the contest. (ie: 14.040). You might also try
> the "Novice" sub bands, although I don't think folks go that "high" in the band
> anymore.

I go along with Steve's advice, Jackie. Most ops participating in the
DX 'test have some experience under their belts.

> >Do the faster coders usually slow
> >down for a slow coder's answer to their CQ, or is this not a good place and
> >time to be answering CQ's if you're slow on the key? Just curious.

Your main problem will be (if your code speed isn't all that high) to
decipher just who it is you are hearing. This is great practice in
bringing up your speed. If you find a station who is sending faster
than you think you can copy, concentrate on several of his CQ's, picking
up a bit more of his call each time. Once you've got his call, give him
a call at the speed at which you can copy. He'll likely QRS to your
speed or at least something slower than he's been using. He'll be
sending you a signal report (generally 599) and his power. You might
hear "KW" rather than "1000". Many ops will use "cut numbers" like
"5NN" rather than "599" and "5TT" for "500". Some (mostly Europeans)
will use something like "ATT" for "100" or "ATTT" for "1000".

Have fun!

Dave K8MN

2149. Re: New Field Day Entry Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 03:59:45 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E4C69B2.4070806@adelphia.net>
Source record: 61332

Brian Kelly wrote:

> Since ya chose to respond kindly note that ya completely ignored my
> question to Jim. I'll try again: "When was the last time an NTS
> formatted "message" to an SCM proved of any value whatsoever during an
> emergency in which ham radio was involved?

Okay, I'd have to say I don't know when if ever.

> No, God willing and the creek don't rise I plan to toss up a
> collection of homebrewed antennas by myself out in the boonies and run
> score, enjoy the fresh air and have some fun. Without getting booted
> out of my seat in the middle of a nice run on 20 CW by a couple
> nitwits who worked a grand total of four stations in the following
> four hours on 10 ssb. Good thing there were two of 'em . . that crap
> is NOT gonna happen to me again.

Now *that* I understand. I've had the same thing happen. My solution was to "give up" the day, and run the GOTA station. Then at night, I'll take over when the only people left are the hard-core. So it helps the newbies learn how to operate properly, and the other stations get properly worked.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2150. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 04:06:16 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030213230616.01510.00000479@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 61333

N2EY wrote:

>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

If you replace the word "Mr. Anderson" with the word "Steve, K4YZ", the above paragraph will be more correct.

2151. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 04:11:56 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E4C6CB6.1AB7870C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61334

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From K4YZ:
> >>Which means that no a code Technician class can know more than an only-coder
> >>General.
> >
> > "Only coder"...?!?! Please provide a reference and definition.
>
> The only coder only wants to do Morse code, contesting, and collect wallpaper.

Vipul, you are way out there, pal. I know fellows who use only morse
but who don't do any contesting or collecting of awards. I know fellows
who enter contests but only on SSB. I know fellows who work toward
awards but who have never been near a key.

> The only coder does not want to do anything technical, except possibly
> antennas.

Again, I know fellows who use CW often or even always who are very
skilled technicians. I know people who aren't very technically inclined
but they knew enough to pass the exam--which is what counts. An amateur
license basically permits you to operate on the amateur bands. You can
build anything you like without one.

I submit that you have built up a false case based on a near total lack
of information on your part about what hams in your area (or any area)
do.

> > Since a General has to pass two written tests instead of one, your
> >suggestion is silly.
>
> No, its not. Since each test is very easy (even trivial) to pass, the written
> tests are meaningless. Therefore all the General and Extra licenses really
> prove is one learned Morse code.

Are you attempting to make a case for retention of the morse exam?
You're doing a pretty good job. The written elements are not all the
same, Vipul.
The one you took to obtain your Technician license is much easier than
than taken by an applicant for the Amateur Extra. Since the five word
per minute code exam is ridiculously easy and since you think the
written exams are trivial, you should have your Extra by the next time
the exams are given in your area.

Dave K8MN (not K4YZ)

2152. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 04:17:30 UTC
From: Jackie <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com>
Message-ID: <u5_2a.105945$vm2.60334@rwcrnsc54>
Source record: 61335

Thanks for the advice. What I am planning on doing is listening a lot a bit higher up in the band and just seeing who I can copy. If I can understand what I am hearing, then I might answer a CQ. If it's too fast, then I will at least concentrate on increasing my listening comprehension.

Jackie KC0ODY

Icom IC-718 @ 100 W.
Crappy triband trap dipole 11' off the ground
(that has still managed to work South America with a good deal of success)

2153. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 04:24:33 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E4C6F82.4050800@adelphia.net>
Source record: 61336

Jackie wrote:

> This really isn't a policy question, but I figgered that some of the
> regulars here might know the answer to this question.
>
> Regarding next weekend's CW contest-- is this generally for more experienced
> CW ops? Or do you get a bunch of the slower code on the bands at that time
> as well? I don't know that I'm going to try contesting myself (since I'm
> limited to the # of bands I can work on) but if I can be someone else's
> contact, it would give me good practice. Do the faster coders usually slow
> down for a slow coder's answer to their CQ, or is this not a good place and
> time to be answering CQ's if you're slow on the key? Just curious.

You have to start somewhere, Jackie. Go for it! Steve's advice about going higer on the band is good. If you CQ then whoever answers will already know the speed you are working at. And many others will slow down for you.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2154. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 04:31:15 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E4C7104.9A44D21D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61337

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> N2EY wrote:
>
> >No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> >government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
> >amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
> >Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
> >slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."
>
> If you replace the word "Mr. Anderson" with the word "Steve, K4YZ", the above
> paragraph will be more correct.

Did you ever provide information on your job, educational level,
government/military/ service? If you did so and I missed it, kindly
give us a reference as to when these items were used by K4YZ in
targeting you.

I have to admit that I don't take your postings very seriously since
they don't seem to be based in reality.

Dave K8MN

2155. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 04:35:50 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030213233550.05016.00000017@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 61340

In article <20030213195405.23275.00000360@mb-da.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve HAH Cannon) writes:

>>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 2/13/03 3:03 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20030213160303.11182.00000696@mb-cl.aol.com>
>
>>Amateur radio was conspicuously missing in the 1994 damage
>> area during the week following that earthquake. FEMA put in
>> its fly-away sat terminals featuring video message boards for
>> relatives of the victims. That was on TV news.
>
> The only thing that was "conspicuously missing" was anyone taking the
>time to blow trumpets and make grand proclimations.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. The President of the USA flew into the area with his staff to see, personally, the damage. No trumpets or even "Hail to the Chief" but there were some "proclamations."

Note: P-R-O-C-L-A-M-A-T-I-O-N-S. :-)

Did you miss all that because of another "hostile action heroism" episode?

>>Others think that professional public safety communications
>> "always goes down in an emergency and hams rush in to
>> help save the day." [that's been said, in different words, but
>> with the same obvious meaning, for years]
>
> Quotes, please, Lennie.

Go get your own from Google. Hundreds of them there. :-)

>> A problem with some hobbyists is that isn't
>> enough glory reflection on them...they want the feel-good
>> myth of Being Important/Better-than-average and organizations
>> like ARRL serve that to them on a silver (somewhat tarnished)
>> platter.
>
> The "problem" here is a self-absorbed ex-radio technician who
>self-worships his rather lack-luster "career" as being "better" than Amateur
>Radio when the fact is that he doesn't realize he's trying to mix the oil
>with water.

Poor baby. Keeps setting his "oil" on fire, then passing water. :-)

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Jealous that some have actually made a career
in radio and electronics and have actually had experience in
HF comm before you were even conceived? Poor baby.

Such a pity that the Loose Cannon can only talk-down others
who've done more in radio than he. Poor baby.

>>Some hobbyists NEED emotionally-loaded redefinitions. The
>> amateur radio "service" is very popular for self-grandiosement.
>
> And it appears it also serves YOUR needs for the same reason, Lennie.

Not "my needs," Sgt Putz. You need a place to vent, taking
out your frustrations on senior citizens. That's the brave
"hostile action hero." :-)

I'm just advocating the removal of the morse code test for any
amateur radio license...and also taking some badly-aimed
fire from uncivil radio amateurs whose skin is too thin for
newsgroups.

How was that purchasing agent job in that "big" cable TV
company? Get to do any real engineering design? Get any
patents awarded for that? Did you write articles in radio and
electronics magazines? No? My gosh, big fella putz-tosser,
shouldn't the radio world elevate you on some pedestal and
honor/worship your amateur accomplishments?!?

>>And I'm pointing out that such political phraseology ("pool of
>> trained operators") is just such a high-sounding, emotionally-
>> loaded, political buzz-phrase.
>
> No..you're trying to rationalize your rant into something reasonable
>sounding when the TRVTH of the matter is that that very "political buzz
>phrase" [it's nothing of the sort] has been proven FACT for almost NINE
decades.

Of course. All that the Loose Cannon can reference is good
old ARRL Letter news...and "CW saving the day in every
emergency because the professional comms always go down."

Gosh and golly, the big Cannon, being one of that big Pool,
should have gotten a medal-awarding military comms job,
right? He didn't? Oh, my, a veritable Congressional Oversight!
Call the Oversight Committee! Get that Medal of Freedom
ready for awarding!

"TRVTH" is from the old comic strip "B.C." The "U" always
(in the Roman fashion) engraved as a "V." Tsk, tsk, tsk,
still up-tight about losing the commission in the TN militia?

>>Some amateurs DO consider themselves "superior" and have
>> done so for years in here.
>

> As opposed to an "amateurish" ex-radio technician who does the same
>thing? OOOOOOPS! That would be YOU, Yuor Putziness!

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Outrage causes typos. Y-O-U-R.

It's been a long time since I worked (and got paid) for being a
technician. Been a design engineer longer than the Loose
Cannon was licensed as an amateur. No problem. The
poopie-suited T6 backseater got as far as purchasing agent.

>>As a semi-professional
>> writer (to other publications besides HR) since 1968, I don't
>> take the trouble to polish everything for a final draft version.
>
> Which explains why so MANY of yuor posts are rife with errors.

"Rife with errors?!?" Note: Y-O-U-R. :-)

>>>Okay, so you won't take the requirements to get the license, you won't get
>>>one.
>>
>> Slight correction. I haven't taken the trouble to take an amateur
>> radio license test. That wasn't my intention five years ago and
>> it still isn't a personal goal. Why is that license, that
>> certificate, so "meaningful" just to TALK about requirements?
>
> Ooooops. Caught lying again.

I've not made any sort of appointment or request to take an
amateur radio test, anywhere, anytime. No lie.

Poor poopie-suited baby. Imagining "lies" again. Tsk, tsk.

> The personal part comes from being told by someone with no experience in
>the matter how we SHOULD be doing things.

Awww. Someone telling the Gunnery Sergeant Major of the
Tennessee State Militia Corps and mighty CAP Air Force
"how he should DO things?!? Tsk, tsk, tsk.

All old poopie-suit has to do is keep telling the FCC that only
a select few (of his approval) may comment on federal laws
and absolutely forbid any sort of talk by anyone not possessing
an amateur radio license.

>>Do I "know more about radio (and electronics) than the average
>> person sitting for an AR test?" Probably so.
>
> Not by eveidence herein.

Awwww. "Judge" throwing out evidence because he doesn't
like it? Tsk, tsk, tsk.

Note: E-V-I-D-E-N-C-E. Take a trank before posting....

>>Taking a ham test to "show personal courage, committment,
>> or dedication to the amateur radio community" is total brainless
>> self-glorification any way one slices it. That "community" is not
>> "owed" a damn thing by anyone and neither does that
>
> It's not about showing personal courage, etc etc etc.

No?!? The Hostile Action Hero doesn't demand "courage
under fire?" :-) Stop setting your oil on fire and passing
water. That's unbecoming a mighty officer in the TN militia.

> It's about participating. So far you are not. Your "posts" are merely
>opinions of thrid-hand information. No experience.

Surrrre...in order to get IN to ham radio, one has to be already
IN it...otherwise "no experience." :-) :-) :-)

Oh mighty radio person, tell us your award-winning designs
for purchasing parts? Let us know your big medals won in
the purchasing department where you got all that "experience
in engineering." Tell us all about the decorations you won as
a military communicator during all those "hostile actions."

> It's about participating. So far you are not. Your "posts" are merely
>opinions of thrid-hand information. No experience.

Note: T-H-I-R-D, not "thrid."

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Rage and anger sure mess up the Cannon's roar.

Okay, so one can't get IN to ham radio without already
being IN ham radio. Did you connect a couple neurons
and "design" your own oxymoron? Or did you turn off
the oxy?

> And quit spitting.

Why not? "Ptui" rhymes with "Putz." Both 4-letter words.

Big brave "seven times in hostile action taking fire" poopie-
suit can't take SPITTING?!?!?

Tsk, tsk, tsk.

> It's a hobby for some. A tool for others. A means to an ends for even
>others.

The aphorism is "a means to an end." You stuck your S on the
ending. :-) :-) :-)

Ham radio is a TOOL?!? Oh, my, all those Licensed Toolkits!
:-)

> So is "test". Is that why you can't seem to muster up the intestinal
>fortitude to take one?

Poor baby. The doctor Kildare wanna-be who likes to play doctor but is afraid of pre-med school. The "engineering expert" who never got beyond purchasing agent for a TV company. The Great Communicator who never did any military communications...but had this "commission" in the TN state militia. The "hostile action hero" on paper, lots of pretense, uniform-wearing, cussing out seniors who've done more in radio than he. :-)

Old poopie-suit "challenges" someone? [nothing new...he can't accept a challenge to debate a subject or SPELL calmly when enraged and upset... :-)]

The few, the proud, the hams?

Temper fry...

2156. Re: New Field Day Entry Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 04:35:51 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030213233551.05016.00000018@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 61339

In article <c2356669.0302131437.27ebf77@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>elly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
>news:<d22b54c3.0302121802.6c2c643d@posting.google.com>...
>> Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
>news:<3E4A7A83.9080200@psu.edu>...
>> > Brian Kelly wrote:
>>
>> > Do you know exactly the form of comms for any emergency? If the wheels
>> > fall off ya gotta work with what you have.
>>
>> Which is exactly what I'll do if an appropriate situation pops up
>> again and I have a radio handy. In fact I've done just that in several
>> instances over the years via highway incidents. I got the comms thru
>> despite them not being "exactly in the approved form". Jeez, I guess
>> I better clean up my act, next time I need a cop I'll stop everything
>> and count the words before I transmit and send/confirm the check
>> number huh? As if.
>>
>> Since ya chose to respond kindly note that ya completely ignored my
>> question to Jim. I'll try again: "When was the last time an NTS
>> formatted "message" to an SCM proved of any value whatsoever during an
>> emergency in which ham radio was involved? Ditto the pointless
>> "Message from w1aw" thingey."
>
>While it's not a message to the SCM, how about this:
>
>BEGIN GOOGLE QUOTE:
>
>From: "Arnie Macy" <kt4st@csam.net>
>Subject: Hurricanes and Emergency ops
>Date: 1999/10/10
>Message-ID: <630M3.10516$iN6.185449@news2.mia>#1/1
>X-Trace: news2.mia 939560258 216.76.74.217 (Sun, 10 Oct 1999 08:57:38
>EDT)
>NNTP-Posting-Date: Sun, 10 Oct 1999 08:57:38 EDT
>Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
>X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

<snip>

>Arnie -
>KT4ST
>

>END GOOGLE QUOTE
>
>Note that Arnie was talking about a full-scale, wide-area emergency in
>his neck of the woods (Hurricane Floyd, Georgia, 1999). Note also the
>use of formal and informal NTS type messages for contact between the
>county and state EOCs, GEMA, FEMA, etc. Most of all note that he was
>there - it's a first-hand account, not a news blurb.
>
>In other words, it ain't all HTs by any means. Widespread emergencies
>need longer-distance comms. Which means HF/MF, when hams are involved.

As if the existing US government "has no HF/MF," right?

Try looking up SHARES and finding out what goes on
there. Betcha can't tear yourself away from good old
Google... :-)

Oh, what fun. As usual, the professional communications
"always goes down" during emergencies and the only
"real emergencies" are always hurricanes. Naturally, CW
and NTS will save the day like it always has... :-)

>Before anybody gets the idea that this quote is meant to prove some
>point or other about code testing, I'll say that that's not what it's
>about at all.

Now how could ANYONE think that?!? :-) :-) :-)

>> > Kinda like I think hams
>> > should have basic proficiency in CW so they can use that if need be, and
>> > exposure to as many forms of comms as possible.
>>
>> I wouldn't place any bets on how many licensed hams are first exposed
>> to any mode on FD.
>>
>> > I guess you started as a fully experienced ham, eh?
>>
>> My first FD was 15 years before Jim's first and that was before I was
>> first licenesed.
>
>How many since then? I'm at 35 and still learning.
>
>> I have yet to learn a bloomin' thing from any of the
>> several I've worked in including my first. The reality is that ya take
>> knowledge INTO FD, not OUT of FD. YMMV.
>>
>Our experiences are different, then. We'll see how the scores work
>out. You gotta do 3000 points to beat the N2EY singlehanded record.
>And that was made in 1995, near bottom of the cycle.

:-)

2157. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 04:35:52 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030213233552.05016.00000019@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 61338

In article <0UW2a.103392$Ec4.86784@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net>, "Jackie"
<buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030213160303.11182.00000696@mb-cl.aol.com...
>
>Large snip.
>
>> To them the "hoops" are the Main Thing.
>
>One thing that has irritated me (and I should state that it's not been
>anyone on this NG that has done this to me personally) is that there've been
>a couple of people who I've talked with on the air and via e-mail that were
>not willing to do a code conversation with me, because not only was I a
>beginner, but I am also one of the products of the slow code requirements.
>As if I had anything to do with the level of speed that is required to pass
>the test. Lucky for me that I found one nice person who was willing to slow
>down to my level so that I could practice it and we had a nice (but
>challenging for me) conversation.

Some might be like the resident bus driver, saying "ham
radio (as he knows it) is not for you!" :-)

>While I am not pro- or anti-code testing, this indicates that some people
>out there in radio land have a serious attitude problem if they choose to
>blame us new operators for the way the rules have changed.

Those "attitude" people DO exist. Some are carbon copies
of the regular BDOFs in here.

That's a negative inducement to enter amateur radio. Perhaps
that is really what they want? Keeping newcomers out will
(in their perverse way) "secure their position" in ham radio. :-)

Think about this for an attitude: Perusing practically any issue,
any year, of ham radio periodicals with pictures of hams and
their stations shows that they are predominantly white and
male. :-)

2158. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 05:28:11 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BA71E89A.EADE%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 61341

"Bill, W7TI" wrote:
>
> IOW, the discussion will go away when the
> problem goes away. Clinton didn't consider
> the blue dress a problem; you don't consider
> incentive licensing a problem. Others do.

But neither of those problems are going to go away. The blue dress is a past that cannot be changed, and there is no move towards removing incentive licensing. Therefore, I think the point is that to continue to dwell on either is somewhat useless.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2159. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 05:35:00 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BA71EA34.EAE0%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 61342

"N2EY" wrote:
>> I'll accept that, Jim.
>
> Welcome back, Dwight!

My involvement online is a little shaky (moving again), but I'm back for the moment anyway.

> The point I'm making is that Sarnoff and RCA
> were shameless/tireless self-promoters. (snip)

I understood your point, Jim. My comments were not a criticism.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2160. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 05:36:23 UTC
From: "Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now>
Message-ID: <Xns9321DBCAC6FB3pookster@216.168.3.50>
Source record: 61343

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
news:d22b54c3.0302131459.24d2601e@posting.google.com:

> . . and he was right.

Can't do logic...

> All three of ya clump together and enjoy.

Can't count.

By any chance, were you on Governor Davis' energy advisory board last
summer? I see some similarities.

>
--
Bill, W7TI

2161. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 05:38:00 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030214003800.16280.00002075@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 61347

In article <3E4C696F.8715FCB4@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>I go along with Steve's advice, Jackie. Most ops participating in the
>DX 'test have some experience under their belts.

...and a lot more fat... :-)

2162. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 05:38:01 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030214003801.16280.00002076@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 61345

In article <3E4C7104.9A44D21D@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Vshah101 wrote:

>I have to admit that I don't take your postings very seriously since
>they don't seem to be based in reality.

No problem, is there Herr Robust. Are any of yours? :-)

2163. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 05:38:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030214003804.16280.00002078@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 61344

In article <3E4C528A.6A0F4E3C@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>That just about sums it up.

7 x 24 = 168, not 148

Did you fail remedial arithmetic too, defunct diplomat?

2164. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 05:38:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030214003804.16280.00002077@mb-mo.aol.com>
Source record: 61346

In article <3E4C5F89.6049AC04@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> Everyone has opinions. Problem with the PCTA Regulars
>> in here is that Their Opinions are the Only Truth.
>
>Would that be...ummmm...your *opinion*?

No. It's supported by Google as well as on everyone's
screen.

>Your statement is unsupported by fact. Additionally, you are no more a
>player in the ARRL than you are in amateur radio.

Ah, true. Do you still play in ham radio, colonel?

[broadcasting music isn't allowed by the rules...]

>Unsupported by fact.

Supported by observation. You need a supporter.

>We'll chalk this one up to just another thing of which you aren't really
>knowledgeable.

More knowledgeable than the defunct diplomat is about
working HF comms according to procedure.

>There are plenty of everyday emergencies in which radio amateurs use
>SSB, FM and packet. Your discounting of trained amateur radio operators
>is beyond silly.

What, that "everyday" emergency action was written up
in MAD magazine? :-)

>That'd be "diplomat's". You keep making these errors, Len. War can be
>24/7. You've never been a participant for 24/7. Your 24/7 activities
>are pretty much limited to using oxygen and taking up space.

Oh? You "know" about "war," defunct diplomat?

Did you participate in Hostile Action like the Hero in the
poopie-suit?

Wow, the diplomat-that-never-was is really milking his own
little definition of a common euphamism, isn't he? :-)

>Pssst--Jackie! He means "perceived by him".

Don't let the cashew brandy go to your head, diplomat.

Jackie can understand. Poor baby, you can't...

>That'd be your opinion once again, Leonard? It really sounds like the
>attitude of one who is frustrated that mere radio amateurs won't give
>him what he feels is his due.

Nothing is "due" me, colonel. Problem is your chains got
pulled a long time ago when you innovated order-wires at
State in some truly third-world posting. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

>Try to clean up the
>errors. You misspelled "noblesse".

Yes, your haughtiness. As soon as you complete your
Remedial Arithmetic. Remember? 7 x 24 = 168.

"24/7" is a common American phrase that includes being
on call and having to work at any time when directed. It
isn't your peculiar redefinition. Sure, I typoed "noblesse,"
now you "oblige" by trying to be a civil human instead of
a hammy version of Ugly American to Americans.

>Amateur radio isn't magic or supernatural. It has known physical
>properties.

Amazing! An ex-government employee who actually
LEARNED something!

>You aren't involved in it.

With all you Nobles obleging yourselves as Ham Gods,
it's unlikely I would be. It wasn't on my agenda for
Things to Do Today. Or tomorrow.

With such diplomacy and decorum, why doesn't the
colonel take a job with ARRL getting new members? :-)

>Unsupported by fact.

A macro? Your pension doesn't pay for supporters?
What?

>Unsupported by fact.

Tsk, tsk, tsk.

>Unsupported by fact.

Insufferable by repetition the colonel is...

>Then feel free to go and be of help to your nation, community or
>whatever.

Did it, doing it, and the exportation of undesireable diplomats-
that-never-were are high on that list.

>A hit's a hit. Why don't you take a few minutes and describe for Jackie
>how you are an uninvited "advocate for..."

You are mainlining? Don't shoot up and post, colonel.

>Quite a rant, Len old boy. I can almost see the flecks of spittle at
>the corners of your mouth.

Wild imagination. Having bad dreams about "hostile action,"
diplomat-that-never-was? Or was that your poopie-suited
buddy? Have him give you one of his tranks. You need it.

>You'll still need that morse at the moment
>if you'd like to have HF access as a radio amateur.

I'm not after a license, colonel. I'm just here advocating
elimination of a morse code test...and to watch you
up-tight anal-retentives get all upset when your thin,
thin skin gets bruised. :-)

>Uh, the Commission seems to think you'll still need to pass the exams,
>Leonard.
>It isn't just politcal hype.

Oh, my. The "teacher" speaking or the poor ex-diplomat-
that-never-was and continues-to-be?

7 x 24 = 168, not 148.

>No, you'll just need to do it in order to become a participant. Until
>then, the only place you can indulge in dumb little games of
>one-upmanship through frequest mention of your professional credentials
>is...here.

Poor baby. Still upset are you? The diplomat-that-never-was
is the one indulging in dumb little games in here.

>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

Yes, another overly-proud BDOF who can't take return
fire. No doubt because he wants to hide in his
"undisclosed location" where he works, waving all his
certificates around over his collection of chassis punches.
:-)

Now, back to the subject...which Altar do you want to be
worshipped at this week?

2165. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 06:30:31 UTC
From: "Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now>
Message-ID: <Xns9321E4F82F1A8pookster@216.168.3.50>
Source record: 61348

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
news:20030213210352.25403.00000369@mb-fm.aol.com:

> I'll ask again: What should the system look like if/when S25.5
> disappears and FCC dumps Element 1?
>

I'd like to see a beginner's class and a regular class and that's it. Kind of like driving a car where you get a learner's permit with restricions and when you can show you know the ropes, a regular driver's license.

Just having a driver's license doesn't mean you're Richard Petty. It means you know enough to not be a menace on the road. I'd like to see something similar with ham licenses.

If I were making the rules for the FCC, I'd focus lots more on good operating techniques and less on the technical stuff. I'd rather have a new ham understand how to correctly tune an amplifier than to know Ohm's law, for example. Memorize the band edges instead of antenna patterns. How to work split instead of how to calculate impedance.

The technical stuff is fun; in fact it's my favorite part of ham radio, but I'm not convinced it should be a priority in licensing.

--
Bill, W7TI

2166. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 07:42:19 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030214024219.04766.00000500@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 61349

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 2/13/03 8:10 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030213211027.09027.00000414@mb-mf.aol.com>

>> "Only coder"...?!?! Please provide a reference and definition.
>
>The only coder only wants to do Morse code, contesting, and collect
>wallpaper.
>The only coder does not want to do anything technical, except possibly
>antennas.

No reference. Vipul is certainly NOT an engineer.

And I know DOZENS upon DOZENS of NON-CW operators who "collect
wallpaper", like to contest, and could give a rat's kazoo about ANYTHING
technical, INCLUDING antennas.

So how does THAT fit into your "only coder" rant, Vippy?

>No, its not. Since each test is very easy (even trivial) to pass, the written
>tests are meaningless. Therefore all the General and Extra licenses really
>prove is one learned Morse code.

And again you are reminded that even the code tests can be "beaten", ergo
you STILL have proven nothing, Vippy. And upon whose "opinion" do you declare
the written tests "very easy (even trivial) to pass"...?!?!

Seems there's still a significant number of folks who can't get past THAT
"hoop".

>> But what it does NOT do, Vipul, is say that "The radio art is solely
>>achivement in technical development".
>
>Yes, it does.

I can see you're back on the merry-go-round and still have not cited a
quote that says ANYTHING like "radio art is solely technical achievement".

Need a meclizine?

>> Yep...the >>ARRL's<< Rulebook. A lot of nice editorialization, there,
>
>So, you admit the ARRL is biased!

(Whew) WHERE do you get THAT from, Vippy?

>>Vipul, AND nothing that says "radio art" is solely "technical achievement".
>
>If you believe it means something else, please give an example.

I am not the one making the certain assertion that it does. I am asking you to prove your assertion. So far you have quoted a passage from an ARRL textbook that certainly mentions technical achievement, but does NOT substantiate your claim anywhere near a certainty.

>"Radio art" is always with the words technical achievement in the CFR 47. If
>you need an exact definition, I can't provide it.

Ahhhhh...an admission of NO FACTS. Finally..a breath of fresh air.

>Since most people that use it
>understand its meaning, no formalized definition is provided. Its too bad
>you
>cannot understand the meaning of the phrase "radio art".

"The radio art" is ALSO meant the employment of the radio in any myriad of applications, Vipul. It is the manner and the skill with which radio is utilized to achieve any one of hundreds of goals.

THAT is art.

Steve, K4YZ

2167. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 07:46:51 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030214024651.04766.00000501@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 61350

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 2/13/03 10:06 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030213230616.01510.00000479@mb-mk.aol.com>

>If you replace the word "Mr. Anderson" with the word "Steve, K4YZ", the above
>paragraph will be more correct.

Getting to ya, am I, Vippy old man?

Good. You deserve it.

Stop making up these rediculous farces that you bring to this and the CB forum, and perhaps the tone will change. As long as you continue to act like an idiot, you'll get treated like one. And right now you've built up a pretty good head of steam.

Steve, K4YZ

2168. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 08:39:37 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030214033937.29328.00000335@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 61251

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/13/03 10:35 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030213233550.05016.00000017@mb-cv.aol.com>

>>>Others think that professional public safety communications
>>> "always goes down in an emergency and hams rush in to
>>> help save the day." [that's been said, in different words, but
>>> with the same obvious meaning, for years]
>>
>> Quotes, please, Lennie.
>
> Go get your own from Google. Hundreds of them there

Oh no, Lennie, it is YOUR assertion that "others" say public service communications "always" go down and that 'hams" rush in to save the day.

I'd like to see YOUR evidence to support YOUR assertion.

>Such a pity that the Loose Cannon can only talk-down others
> who've done more in radio than he

Are we talking about "others" or you, Lennie. If it's "others", I'd like to see who it is you think I've talked down to. If it's you, your three years in the Army are STILL not anywhere NEAR the years I have spent on HF or anyother band OPERATING radios.

>You need a place to vent, taking out your frustrations on senior citizens

You spelled "senile" wrong, Lennie.

>I'm just advocating the removal of the morse code test for any
> amateur radio license.

No, you're lying.

>..and also taking some badly-aimed
> fire from uncivil radio amateurs whose skin is too thin for
> newsgroups.

I think the "fire" is well aimed, Your Putziness. And with the exception of Brain (who doesn't know the difference between "authority" and a "butterbar') and Vippy (who doesn't know anything), I'd say it's all aimed at you, Oh Sleazy One.

>How was that purchasing agent job in that "big" cable TV
> company?

Enjoyed it while I was there. Anyone should have the benefit of leaving a healthcare profession for some period if they so desire...especially after the death of a loved one.

Please notice I AM back in the SAME job as before...As a nurse.

>Get to do any real engineering design?

Nope.

>Get any patents awarded for that?

They issue patents for not doing anything? BUT OF COURSE! You have one, don't you...?!?!?

>Did you write articles in radio and electronics magazines?

Nope. I hear you did, but that magazine went belly-up.

Nice shot.

>My gosh, big fella putz-tosser,
> shouldn't the radio world elevate you on some pedestal and
> honor/worship your amateur accomplishments?!?

Are you insinuating that we should elevate YOU, Lennie? Sure sounds like it.

>Of course. All that the Loose Cannon can reference is good
> old ARRL Letter news...and "CW saving the day in every
> emergency because the professional comms always go down."

Ooops...there goes Lennie "citing" quotes that were never made again.

>"TRVTH" is from the old comic strip "B.C." The "U" always
> (in the Roman fashion) engraved as a "V."

Yes Your Gayness, we know.

>Tsk, tsk, tsk,
> still up-tight about losing the commission in the TN militia?

"TN Militia"...?!?!

>Tsk, tsk, tsk. Outrage causes typos. Y-O-U-R

From the grand typoist himself. Shall we revisit Dave's recent highlighting of some of YOUR errors, Lennie?

>It's been a long time since I worked (and got paid) for being a
> technician.

Thank God for that.

>Been a design engineer longer than the Loose
> Cannon was licensed as an amateur.

Speaking of which, let's consider what happened to "American Engineering"
while His Putziness was "on watch" as an "engineer":

The Soviets beat us into space with an unmanned probe.

The Soviets beat us into orbit with a manned craft.

The Soviets beat us into space with a manned space station.

The Japanese put practical consumer electronics into every American home,
causing the collapse of countless American firms.

The Red Chinese managed to not only get "the bomb" while Lennie was an
engineer, but developed technology to deliver it to the United States, all the
while stealing it from American "engineers" who were more intent on their
401K's and retirement homes in Southern California.

Nice job, Lennie. Hope you're comfortable.

>> Which explains why so MANY of yuor posts are rife with errors.
>
> "Rife with errors?!?" Note: Y-O-U-R.

I am not the one making the claim to be a "semi-professional editor"
either, Lennie...You are...

>>> Slight correction. I haven't taken the trouble to take an amateur
>>> radio license test. That wasn't my intention five years ago and
>>> it still isn't a personal goal. Why is that license, that
>>> certificate, so "meaningful" just to TALK about requirements?
>>
>> Ooooops. Caught lying again.
>
> I've not made any sort of appointment or request to take an
> amateur radio test, anywhere, anytime. No lie

Yes...a lie, Your Gutlessness. Shall we once again re-post YOUR assertion
that you were going to get an "extra out of the box"...?!?!

In the above paragraph you state "I haven't taken the trouble to take an
amateur radio license test. That wasn't my intention five yeas ago and it
still isn't a personal goal".

Obviously you are eithr lying now, or you were lying when you made the
assertion to get "an extra lite".

Which was it?

>Poor poopie-suited baby. Imagining "lies" again. Tsk, tsk.

Nope....reading them right there in front of me...Straight from your
keyboard to my screen.

>Awww. Someone telling the Gunnery Sergeant Major of the
> Tennessee State Militia Corps and mighty CAP Air Force
> "how he should DO things?!?

Whew. Some pique there, Lennie!

>Oh mighty radio person, tell us your award-winning designs
> for purchasing parts? Let us know your big medals won in
> the purchasing department where you got all that "experience
> in engineering." Tell us all about the decorations you won as
> a military communicator during all those "hostile actions."

If any of that were pertinent to Amateur Radio, I'd be glad to.

Now, WHAT was it you had to offer US that is pertinent to Amateur Radio, Lennie? OTHER THAN, of course, the usual "back in 1953" war stories about how the unit you were in in JAPAN suffered all those KIA's in KOREA, three years before YOU got tehre?

And PLEASE, tell us how any of that is germane to your CLAIMED intent of changing the Morse Code requirements in Amateur Radio.

>The doctor Kildare wanna-be who likes to play
> doctor but is afraid of pre-med school.

OK...I'll wait to see where you pulled THAT from.

>The "engineering
> expert" who never got beyond purchasing agent for a TV
> company.

"TV" company? What TV's...?!?!

>The Great Communicator who never did any
> military communications...but had this "commission" in the
> TN state militia.

Yes, I did "military communications" while on ACTIVE duty, Lennie, and as an enlisted.

>The "hostile action hero" on paper, lots of
> pretense, uniform-wearing, cussing out seniors who've done
> more in radio than he.

Your sole claim to "have done more in "radio" is, by current evidence, limited to military duties in 1953-56. If you are the senior you are refering to, then your claim is hollow.

>The few, the proud, the hams?

Yep. Leaves you out.

Steve

2169. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 11:36:55 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030214063655.25403.00000379@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 61252

In article <Xns9321E4F82F1A8pookster@216.168.3.50>, "Bill, W7TI"
<jamspam@upyours.now> writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
>news:20030213210352.25403.00000369@mb-fm.aol.com:
>
>> I'll ask again: What should the system look like if/when S25.5
>> disappears and FCC dumps Element 1?
>>
>____
>
>I'd like to see a beginner's class and a regular class and that's it.
>Kind of like driving a car where you get a learner's permit with
>restricions and when you can show you know the ropes, a regular driver's
>license.

Interesting. That's only one less class than we have now (for new license
issues, anyway).

Would you make the beginner class 10-year-renewable, or something else, like
the old Novice?
>
>Just having a driver's license doesn't mean you're Richard Petty. It
>means you know enough to not be a menace on the road. I'd like to see
>something similar with ham licenses.

Understood. I presume that you would match the test requirements to the
privileges granted, too. Example: Beginner's license doesn't allow high power,
but also doesn't include a lot of RF exposure questions. Am I on the right
track?
>
>If I were making the rules for the FCC, I'd focus lots more on good
>operating techniques and less on the technical stuff. I'd rather have a
>new ham understand how to correctly tune an amplifier than to know Ohm's
>law, for example. Memorize the band edges instead of antenna patterns.
>How to work split instead of how to calculate impedance.
>
Interesting concept! Of course some techno stuff is needed in order to
understand the rules (knowing the band edge is at 7000 kHz doesn't mean much
unless ou know what a kHz is). But more focus on operating might be worthwhile.

>The technical stuff is fun; in fact it's my favorite part of ham radio,
>but I'm not convinced it should be a priority in licensing.
>
Good points, all. I don;t necessarily agree 100%. but good points.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2170. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 12:51:05 UTC
From: Jackie <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com>
Message-ID: <ZC53a.111315$Ec4.92828@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 61253

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030213233552.05016.00000019@mb-cv.aol.com...

> Think about this for an attitude: Perusing practically any issue,
> any year, of ham radio periodicals with pictures of hams and
> their stations shows that they are predominantly white and
> male. :-)

My other hobby (amateur astronomy) has a higher proportion of male participants as well. The more I listen to the HF bands, the more YL's I hear. I was listening to quite a few women on the 10-10 Net yesterday. I don't care which gender the people are that I talk to, what counts is that they are nice and fun to talk to. I've never met a more helpful crew of people than I have in AR. I have some new friends coming over to help shoot a dipole up into a tree because I didn't quite know how to do it myself short of renting a cherry-picker. I didn't even have to ask, they just offered to come over and help.

Jackie

2171. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 13:31:01 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302140531.64d24ff7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61254

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030212220325.08747.00000877@mb-cg.aol.com>...

> I'm still unclear on this alleged "claim" I made, and you haven't
> seen fit to quote any of them. However, I now have a Job that I
> enjoy a whole lot more than I would sitting in a cubicle, and due to
> being a union member, I have great benefits and bullet-proof
> job security -- which I wouldn't have had in 99% of the HR jobs
> I could have taken for about 2/3's of what I'm making now!

In Ohio, the only ones to get layed off are the ones with union cards.
The exempt employees have been safe.

2172. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 13:33:42 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302140533.34052837@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61255

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030213193227.23275.00000359@mb-da.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 2/12/03 10:10 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0302122010.687b070f@posting.google.com>
>
> >> Vipul's alrady been suggested that, but he's only looking for a
> ready-made
> >> organization into which he can make a grand entrance,
> >
> >He should try the USMC or the Tenn Militia.
>
> I doubt that Vipul could make the grade in the Marine Corps, and there is
> no such thing as the "Tenn Militia".

The militia you're a member of is not the Tennessee Militia?

2173. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 13:42:53 UTC
From: "Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now>
Message-ID: <Xns93223A21EF9F6pookster@216.168.3.50>
Source record: 61256

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
news:20030214063655.25403.00000379@mb-fm.aol.com:

> Would you make the beginner class 10-year-renewable, or something
> else, like the old Novice?
>>
>>Just having a driver's license doesn't mean you're Richard Petty. It
>>means you know enough to not be a menace on the road. I'd like to see
>>something similar with ham licenses.
>
> Understood. I presume that you would match the test requirements to
> the privileges granted, too. Example: Beginner's license doesn't allow
> high power, but also doesn't include a lot of RF exposure questions.
> Am I on the right track?
>>
>>If I were making the rules for the FCC, I'd focus lots more on good
>>operating techniques and less on the technical stuff. I'd rather have
>>a new ham understand how to correctly tune an amplifier than to know
>>Ohm's law, for example. Memorize the band edges instead of antenna
>>patterns. How to work split instead of how to calculate impedance.
>>
> Interesting concept! Of course some techno stuff is needed in order to
> understand the rules (knowing the band edge is at 7000 kHz doesn't
> mean much unless ou know what a kHz is). But more focus on operating
> might be worthwhile.
>
>>The technical stuff is fun; in fact it's my favorite part of ham
>>radio, but I'm not convinced it should be a priority in licensing.
>>
> Good points, all. I don;t necessarily agree 100%. but good points.
>
>

Thank you, Jim. I expected massive incineration and instead get
reasonable, well thought out comments. How nice!

To answer your questions:

1. I envision the Learner's class like a driving learner's permit. You
only have so long, then you either upgrade or take the bus. The purpose is
to learn and qualify for the "regular" license, not to operate in
restricted mode forever.

2. Correct about beginner's licence restrictions. A beginner doesn't need a KW to learn radio. Doesn't need a bunch of bands or modes (like satellite) or other fancy stuff. When you're learning to drive, you don't need a Ferrari, a Chevy will do fine. Once you show you can do it responsibly, enjoy the Ferrari!

3. Also correct about the tech stuff overlapping the operating stuff. Whoever puts the actual tests and restrictions together needs to be a cut above the typical lazy bureaucrat.

--
Bill, W7TI

2174. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 13:49:31 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0302140549.5699bbe8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61257

"Jackie" <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> wrote in message
news:<QrX2a.101930$be.73749@rwcrnsc53>...
> This really isn't a policy question, but I figgered that some of the
> regulars here might know the answer to this question.
>
> Regarding next weekend's CW contest-- is this generally for more experienced
> CW ops? Or do you get a bunch of the slower code on the bands at that time
> as well? I don't know that I'm going to try contesting myself (since I'm
> limited to the # of bands I can work on) but if I can be someone else's
> contact, it would give me good practice. Do the faster coders usually slow
> down for a slow coder's answer to their CQ, or is this not a good place and
> time to be answering CQ's if you're slow on the key? Just curious.

Both Steve and Dave have offered very sound advice, I've been in it
many times and I'll offer my two cents worth too. The ARRL dx cw
contest is a pretty brutal affair even for the experienced high-speed
ops with big stations. And there are some really lousy operating
practices involved. It is a highly competitive radio sporting event
with all the connotations which go with a major competition in any
sport.

I can easily imagine a first crack at this contest being very
discouraging. If you do jump into the thing don't let yourself become
discouraged. None of us were born with any of the skills required to
be competitive in any dx contest. We all started right where you are
now in this game, ground zero and you can do it too. But ya can't
acquire the skills if ya don't perservere. My suggestion is if you
find yourself not being very successful at actually working the dx
forget the paddles and turn it into a listening contest with yourself.
The fact of the matter is that this contest is 95% a listening contest
anyway. So see how many countries you can identify & log, push your
code speed envelope, use it as an educational experience vs. a
competition.

If you do get into it I'd be interested in seeing a post about your
experience after the 'test.

> Jackie KC0ODY

w3rv

2175. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 14:12:17 UTC
From: Janet <janet11@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <59up4vslesjgdfa1rc15ntniblbct2r3gg@4ax.com>
Source record: 61258

in case anyone is interested in the subject:

http://www.dallasnews.com/sharedcontent/dallas/latestnews/stories/021303dnricdebris.50a29.html

Janet - WB9ZPH

2176. Re: New Field Day Entry Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 15:06:37 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0302140706.67bc792b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61259

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0302130937.73a8b506@posting.google.com>...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0302120710.6d30e862@posting.google.com>...

> Ya missed the point.
>
> Copying a 100+ word bulletin sent at a specific time and freq with no
> repeats or fills

On CW ya need a clock, a rcvr and a pencil. What's the big deal about
that? If ya do it right though ya go "File, Mode", select RTTY on yer
logger screen and get it over with in seconds and get back to the run.
And for this ya get a 100 bonus points?? Beats me.

> requires a different skill set than running QSOs
> where the exchange is three pieces of info like "W1ABC 4A EMA"

The only difference is in the patience the individuals have for
participation in pointless pushups which don't do anything for anybody
and prove nothing.

> Composing and sending a coherent message
> requires a different skill set as well.

Now I'm really lost. I think you're postulating that twitching the
paddles for a quick contest exchange requires a different skill set
from twitching the paddles to send a "coherent message"? NOT.

> Ditto the pointless "Message from w1aw" thingey.

> Not pointless at all. And it's a bulletin, not a message.

I see. A w1aw bulletin is not a message. Or is it that a message is
not a bulletin? WTF??!

> > But are you gonna take DELCOM into the ham bands during this year's
> > FD?
> >
> Not my bag this year. But somebody else might. More power to 'em if
> they do. What's wrong with an operating activity that is aimed at the
> widest possible audience?

The same thing which was wrong with some uncountable number of failed
corporations which wandered too far from their core businesses.

> > Who are you kidding?? How are you gonna run in FD this year?
>

> Probably a CW transceiver powered by a battery. If I see a good deal
> on a solar panel, I'll go for the natural power bonus.

Enjoy.

>
> > Are you
> > gonna work a satellite? Are you gonna set up a GOAT station? Of course
> > not. You're gonna toss up some antennas and churn score. Just like it
> > "used to be." And I'm gonna do the same drill for exactly the same
> > reasons.
>
> And if a couple of EOCs and GOTA stations get on, there will be that
> many more stations for me to work and get points from.

There's a noteworthy rationalization.

> How many points did you score last year, compared to my operation?

Pffft! That silly shot was about as lame as they come. My radio blew
up ten minutes into the event. Duh? Shouldn't happen this year, new
reddio. Slick little boy toy, I can punch a button, jump off 15ssb and
be all over a satellite in seconds. If I choose to do that of course.
Do you have those choices? Either of 'em??

> > > Having all the catgeories and such is meant to widen the scope of FD.
> > > Not a bad thing.
> >
> > Much of it is, as a minimum, a goofy thing at best. Generates gross
> > confusion, lotta pointless pushups, wasted manpower, general BS, yadda
> > yadda . .
>
> How is it wasted? The folks who are going to do the GOTA thing or the
> satellite thing or the EOC thing would probably just stay home
> otherwise.

I see. One of the objectives of FD is to get the couch potatos out of
the house. I missed it, on which page the FD package is that objective
mentioned?
I need more pages. Did I miss downloading an appendix or something?

> You shoulda been there when I was doing the one-man deal back in the
> late '80s and early '90s. 866As flashing away in the tent at 3 AM,
> working the west coast on 80 like they were locals. Best year was '95,
> 629 CW and 11 phone QSOs in 1B-1. Just under 3000 points with the
> bonuses. Southgate Type 7 and the homebrew antenna setup sure proved
> themselves that year.

Yeah, yeah, and you ougta been there when I was rolling EUs on 80 wih
my ARC-5. Without any 866s.

> > which is why we both opted away from the annual k3mn "radio
> > picnic".

>
> The reason I opted out was because there was no plan, and I wasn't
> going to be the planner.

Now wait a minnit here . . you've already stated that you're not going
to run with the Clayton Park bunch but you have no idea what their
planning will be like on this pass. I smell a fishy tale. A very old
dead fish.

>
> I like the picnic idea.

So do I. I've already insructed my cook to do another Saturday nite
Cajun filet for FD.

> I think I got more FDs with that bunch than you have FDs. They weren't
> at an EOC, anyway.

> > I can see the k3mn squad moving the operation from Clayton Park to the
> > courthouse front lawn so that they can compete in the F class.
>
> Not an EOC, won't count.

You're right, somebody moved DELCOM from the courthouse cellar to Fair
Acres when I wasn't looking. I'd like to be there when the MN squad
asks the DELCOM Honcho Grande to let 'em set up an EOC FD operation in
his bunker. One of his kids got busted by the FCC for spamming the
the machines with a bogus callsign and no license. Several years after
I sent the DA up his butt over a ham radio related problem I had with
him. You think the Putz is anti-ham? Try that dude!

Won't count 'cause it ain't never gonna happen no way no how.

> > This
> > one is almst as good an idea as the Diamond Club.
>
> Remember the "mobile aggregate score" thing?

Certainly. Reinforces my dim view of the whole thing.

>
> There useta be two FDs per summer, way back in the mid 1930s. Early
> June. late August.

That would be kewl, I like it. If ya can't make it June ya still have
a shot at it.

> > Lemmee guess which event you'd jump all over . .
> >
> I'd do both.

I'd do both if the MN bunch ran a k3jv type FD.

> The picnic thing with a club, the other as a serious
> single op. Heck, the first would be a warmup/testout for the second.

The ARRL cw dx blast is this weekend, there's yer "warmup" for FD. Has a QRP entry class, go for it . . . no? Why not?

> My biggest complaint about contest exchanges is that they're too dang
> simple. Callsign, class, section, all repeated over and over, 3 pieces
> of info, whatta weenie way to make points.

Fly that one past the 200/hr dx contesters and duck. Fast.

> Lookit SS: Unique serial number, class, callsign, check, section.
> Five pieces of info, one of them unique to the QSO. Back when I
> started, there was a sixth piece of info in the SS exchange, the date
> (month and day of yer birthday).
> I say make the exchanges longer. More credit for actual messages
> handled.

What does a bloated exchange add to the event? Answer: Nothing. It slows the whole operation down is what it does for reasons which compelely escape me.

> Have W1AW send several different FD messages.

I thought w1aw sent bulletins, not messages. ??

A nocode can scarf up w1aw "messages" all day with RTTY and SSB.

> Allow multiple
> power levels at the same multi-multi.
>
> If all FD does is get some sedentary hams outa their houses and
> exposes them to some fresh air, it's a good thing. If maybe they learn
> a skill or two, all the better.

That's mostly why I'm planning on doing FD except it'll be for exercising the skills I already have which I sure as hell didn't pick up at any FD event.

> Your '897 show up yet?

It's an 847 it's been right here for a week. The 500Hz Collins and 2.1 Khz ssb xtal INRAD filters are at the post office waiting to be picked up today. I'll swap the Collins filter for one of his 400Hz xtal filters when he has 'em available again. Now all I gotta do is switch out the CPU in the LDG autotuner for the new chip which communicates with the 847 and I'll have TS-940 style 150w autotuning 160 thru 10.

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

2177. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 15:14:15 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0302140714.67c920a3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61260

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E4C5F89.6049AC04@earthlink.net>...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > In article <7xD2a.91351$be.68029@rwcrnsc53>, "Jackie"
> > <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> writes:
> >
> > >"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> > >news:20030212210738.09921.00001844@mb-md.aol.com...
> > >
> > >> Jackie, you've not been in here for a long time.

Len has been here for a very long time, under a variety of screen
names.

> > >> The Regulars
> > >> in here (nearly all PCTAs) are simply elitists who want all to
> > >> follow Their directives, Their kind of enjoyment, Their life-
> > >> style and NO back-talk from "inferiors." :-)

Len is probably the most regular poster here.
> > >
> > >I may not have "been here for a long time", but I have been reading long
> > >enough and I knows opinions when I see's 'em. Len, I'm not picking on you or
> > >singling you out, but the above is an example of your OPINIONS and nothing
> > >more.
> >
> > Absolutely! Now...what about the others?
> >
> > Do license grants now enoble the certificate holder some
> > Divine TRVTH engraved in marble? Absolutely NOT.
> >
> > Everyone has opinions. Problem with the PCTA Regulars
> > in here is that Their Opinions are the Only Truth.
>
> Would that be...ummmm...your *opinion*?

Do you really expect a serious answer, Dave?
>
> > Not only
> > that, the Words of ARRL are Sacred.
> > All that disagree with
> > such Divine Words are "mistaken," "error prone," and
> > worse.
>
> Your statement is unsupported by fact. Additionally, you are no more a

> player in the ARRL than you are in amateur radio.
>
> > >Wait! What's that I hear...? A crescendo of tiny violins in sweet refrain?
> > >C'mon Len, I don't think that many people take this all as seriously as you
> > >think they do.
> >
> > PCTA Regulars do. :-)

I don't think anybody takes Len seriously. I sure don't.
> >
> > >OTOH, I and many other hams choose to make ourselves available through ARES
> > >and RACES and Skywarn. What's wrong with that?
> >
> > Not a thing wrong with that. It's only the Believers in
> > the Sanctity of CW within those activities that are too
> > tied up with their traffic handling via CW fantasies.
>
> Unsupported by fact.

Actually, the use of CW by hams in traffic handling and emergencies
has been well documented here in the past few years. By first hand
accounts. The accounts show it to be a once-in-a-great-while sort of
thing. I for one have repeatedly stated that the idea that all hams
MUST know code because they MIGHT need it in an emergency is simply
not reasonable.
>
> > Licenses in amateur radio are NOT absolutely required to
> > help any emergency/disaster/relief group. TRAINING IS.
> > Neither you nor anyone else gets "trained in emergency
> > communications" by doing ham hobby comm or working up
> > high point scores in "radio sport" contests.

Just another opinion. Not supported by fact.

> > It takes, at
> > worst, five minutes to "train" someone to use a utility, police,
> > or fire HT, maybe another five minutes to explain beginning
> > jargon phrases and "listen first before speaking."
>
> We'll chalk this one up to just another thing of which you aren't really
> knowledgeable.

The important point is that hams do not use utility, police or fire
HTs. And amateur radio emergency and public service comms go far
beyond using an HT.
>
> > Please don't start in with this "pool of trained operators"
> > nonsense. Real emergencies don't need 1912 Save-the-
> > Titanic CW skills. Real emergency/disaster folks don't use
> > CW and haven't done so for decades.
>
> There are plenty of everyday emergencies in which radio amateurs use

> SSB, FM and packet. Your discounting of trained amateur radio operators
> is beyond silly.

Was Hurricane Floyd (1999) a "real emergency"? Ask KT4ST. How about
the ice storms of the winter of 1998?

> > Operating a radio IN land warfare without much training was
> > proven in the field in WW2 and all the minor wars (dozens by
> > many countries) following. Warfare is a true 24/7 emergency
> > environment regardless of our defunct diplomats redefinition.
>
> That'd be "diplomat's". You keep making these errors, Len. War can be
> 24/7. You've never been a participant for 24/7. Your 24/7 activities
> are pretty much limited to using oxygen and taking up space.

You missed the point, Dave.

Ham radio is not part of the military. Soldiers don't have to buy
their own radios. Hams do. End of story.
>
> > >Now,
> > >I don't know about others, but I certainly do not feel as if my
> > >participation in helping out my fellow humans qualifies me for demi-god
> > >status or even for bragging rights.
> >
> > Sorry, but the perception is that you've already chosen up
> > sides by the above.
>
> Pssst--Jackie! He means "perceived by him".

Seems pretty clear to me that Len lumps all who disagree with him on
the trivial issue of code testing into a category called "PCTA". To
him, all "PCTAs" are the identical, and deserving of nothing but his
contempt and insults.
>
> > You've not perceived that I was never
> > criticizing the ham hobby en toto, just the minority who
> > insist on the 1930s status quo at all costs.

Note that what constitutes "1930s status quo" is not defined in any
way.

> > That minority
> > assumes the God-like status repleat with nobless oblige
> > talk-downs to the peasants and infrequent Sermons on the
> > Antenna Mount.
>
> That'd be your opinion once again, Leonard?

Sounds a lot more like Len's behavior here ;-)

> It really sounds like the
> attitude of one who is frustrated that mere radio amateurs won't give

> him what he feels is his due.
>
> > >How do you define the "real world", Len? Scratch that, nevermind... I live
> > >there, so I know something about it.
> >
> > Oh? Consider that I've been IN the real world longer, seen
> > more radio, operated more radio than most hams.

Translation: Len's been around a long time, therefore he can dictate
policy.

> > I've done
> > it for half a century spanning the tube era and right into the
> > semiconductor age. The rest of the radio world is Very Big
> > and it covers a greater span of the spectrum than a few HF
> > bands allocated to hobbyists. I've been IN that Big World.
>
> Right. Do the words "assumes the God-like status repleat with nobless
> oblige
> talk-downs to the peasants and infrequent Sermons on the Antenna Mount"
> sound familiar? They should--they're yours. Try to clean up the
> errors. You misspelled "noblesse".

The important thing is that Len presents his non-amateur experience as
proof. It isn't.
>
> > I define the "real world" as the here and now, where radio is
> > a communications tool that isn't magic or supernatural. It has
> > known physical properties...known to those who take the time
> > to understand it instead of being spoon-fed little snippets of
> > factoids or emotionally bent by clever advertising.
>
> Amateur radio isn't magic or supernatural. It has known physical
> properties.
> You aren't involved in it.

The main reason hams do ham radio is because it's fun. Len wants to
dictate what we should think is fun.
>
> > >I somehow doubt that most AR ops see the ARRL as some sort of divine oracle
> > >to be obeyed and supplicated to.
> >
> > Supplicants never do. Their Belief is unshakable. They don't
> > know they are being manipulated by an even smaller minority
> > of that "church." Worse yet, most simply let that "church"
> > handle everything for them.
>
> Unsupported by fact.

Of course not. Just another opinion.
>
> > >C'mon, it's a hobby, AND a service, AND

> > >some people happen to get some pleasure out of any number of aspects that
> > >fall under those two categories. What is the problem with that?
> >
> > There's NO problem with that...except when they divorce
> > themselves from reality or USE the service aspect glow to
> > light their own personal radiance (when their pilot is nearly
> > out). It does NOT require an amateur license to be of help
> > to one's nation, community, or whatever.
>
> Then feel free to go and be of help to your nation, community or
> whatever.

The point is that Len repeatedly minimizes and dismisses the help and
public service performed by hams using ham radio.

There was a first-hand account posted here about the search efforts
for Columbia wreckage and the role hams played in supplying
communication. Factual, clear, and concise.
>
> > >You're not
> > >even an AR operator Len... so I really fail to see how this affects you
> > >personally.
> >
> > It doesn't. My original intent was to engage in debate for the
> > removal of the morse code test for any amateur radio license
> > test. Instead, it has been a sort of firefight of personally-aimed
> > pejoratives fired by amateur marksmen shooting certificates
> > and titles as if they were ICBMs. Ptui. Those were just BMs.

Most of the pejorative-hurling has been done by Len, though.
>
> A hit's a hit. Why don't you take a few minutes and describe for Jackie
> how you are an uninvited "advocate for..."
>
> > I have had an interest in radio and electronics technology for
> > over half a century. I've been IN far bigger leagues of HF comm
> > than any defunct diplomat in here, probably working closer to
> > Real high-capacity message traffic handling than the entire
> > amateur NTS put together, having to keep all circuits open and
> > running 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, without many fringe
> > benefits of just 8-hour workdays. Radio and electronics was
> > fascinating enough personally that I switched from an illustrator
> > career to engineering early on in my life, did my whole career
> > mainly in design engineering.

We have all heard that story many, many times. What has not been
explained is how it makes Len an expert on amateur radio, or amateur
radio policy. It also does not prove any of Len's arguments for or
against anyhting connected with amateur radio policy.

Suppose someone who is older than Len and more experienced than Len
shows up and says Len is all wrong in his amateur radio policy views -

simply because that 'someone' has more time-on-the-planet and
time-in-radio than Len. Does that prove Len is wrong? Of course not.
Neither does Len's time-on-the-planet and time-in-radio prove any of
his opponents to be wrong.

Does Len's time-on-the-planet and time-in-radio somehow give him the
right to hurl pejoratives the way he does, even against those who do
not reply in kind?
He thinks it does.
>
> N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
> No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
> amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
> Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
> slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."
>
You forgot the most important part:

"His hobby is wasting time. Your time."

> > The purists, the traditionalists, the twilight zoners of hamism
> > insist that professionalism is NOT the Amateur Way.

Who? Give us some quotes.

> > They
> > insist on "qualifications" by virtue of the ham license...as if
> > none of the past half century's personal experience had any
> > relevance.

Not at all. The license requirements are the same for everyone. A Ph.D
in EE doesn't get a bye on any of them. Nor does Len.

> > I am supposed to learn morse code because,
> > according to the PCTAs, that is the ultimate meaningful skill
> > of their little detached Brotherhood of Radio.

Who says that? Not me - in fact, I posted a whole long list of
desirable radio operating skills.

Give us some quotes.

> > Morsemanship
> > wasn't relevant to the needs of the rest of the radio world of
> > fifty years ago

Really? Back in 1953 there was no use of morse code in radio outside
of ham radio?

A lot of historical accounts say that's just plain wrong. Sure, the
use of Morse code by non-amateur radio services has steadily decreased
since the end of WW2. But to say it "wasn't relevant to the needs of

the rest of the radio world of fifty years ago" simply doesn't mathc
the facts.

> and it sure as hell isn't meaningful today.
>
> Quite a rant, Len old boy. I can almost see the flecks of spittle at
> the corners of your mouth. You'll still need that morse at the moment
> if you'd like to have HF access as a radio amateur.

Point is, an amateur radio license is or amateur radio, not "the rest
of the radio world". Test or no test, hams use Morse code. Len thinks
that's bad.
>
> > Ah, but I must "sit for the ham test" to "prove a committment
> > and dedication to the amateur community!"

Who said that? Give us the quotes.

> > I'm sorry, but that is
> > one of the silliest bogus-brained reasons I've ever heard. Ham
> > radio doesn't operate by "different" radio physics principles and
> > the ham radio waves don't propagate differently than other radio
> > waves.

Who said they do?

> > Ham radio does NOT need any morse code test for a
> > license or even any morse code skill at all.

Ahh, now we get to what really bothers Len. It's not just the test.
It's the idea of hams using Morse code at all.

> > It isn't some
> > magic pool of trained whatevers. That's just political hype.
> > Ham radio is a fun hobby, an interesting one, a recreation.

Notice how Len denies the help provide by hams in things like
hurricanes, ice storms, and searches for shuttle parts.

> > It doesn't need to be bogged down by beaurocracy, rigid
> > inflexible rules, and absolute adherence to correct hamspeak.
>
> Uh, the Commission seems to think you'll still need to pass the exams,
> Leonard.
> It isn't just politcal hype.
>
> > Ham radio of today has become, for some, a sort of fantasy
> > land where they can indulge in dumb little games of one-
> > upmanship through credentials, certification, callsigns, and
> > calumny directed to those "not of their 'hood." Some have
> > discarded their real names, wanting to be identified only by
> > callsigns.

Who?

I sign all my posts 'Jim, N2EY'. That's because my name is Jim and most hams know me first as N2EY. There are a lot of Jims but only one N2EY. This is an amateur radio newsgroup, so identification by callsign makes perfect sense.

Yet Len insists on calling me a whole string of names he made up. He even went to the database to find out my last name. Is that the action of a mature individual whom we hams should look to for guidance, advice, and policy?

> > Identity transferrence, achieving something better
> > than their present lives and social position.

Can't be talking about me, then. Present life and social position are pretty good.

> > I need NONE of
> > that. I certainly do not need to sit for some amateur test to
> > prove anydamnthing to anybody about commitment or
> > dedication to some mythical amateur community or ethos.
>
> No, you'll just need to do it in order to become a participant. Until
> then, the only place you can indulge in dumb little games of
> one-upmanship through frequest mention of your professional credentials
> is...here.
>
> > So, despite the insistence of the defunct diplomat in here,
> > the bus driver, the hoagie muncher, the dill sergeant wanting
> > a uniform real bad, the reverend working at an undisclosed
> > location, or anyone else, that coveted amateur ticket won't
> > be bought to radio never-neverland this week or next week.

Perfect example of Len's behavior towards those who dare to disagree with him.

Let's see:

"the defunct diplomat" - served his country for ~20 years as a key communications officer in the State Department at a variety of postings, including Dar-Es-Salaam and Helsinki. Still healthy and active despite description as 'defunct'. Long time active ham, (DX, contests, VHF/UHF) but not qualified to disagree with Len.

"the bus driver" - served his country for ~18 years in the Air Force at a variety of locations, including Germany. Earned a bachelor's degree while working fulltime. Long time active ham, (DX, contests, ragchews, digital modes) but not qualified to disagree with Len.

"the hoagie muncher" - earned BSME and MSME degrees, has worked in his field for ~40 years, including military contracts such as aircraft carrier catapults.
Long time active ham (DX, contests, ragchewing, antenna mechanical design), but not qualified to disagree with Len.

"the dill sergeant" served his country for ? years as an avionics tech in the Marine Corps. Earned the requisite degrees and licenses to be an emergency room nurse, which became a second career. Long time active ham, but not qualified to disagree with Len.

"the reverend" - earned BSEE and MSEE degrees, has worked in his field for 27 years. Long time active ham,(contests, ragchewing, homebrewing) but not qualified to disagree with Len.

> > or anyone else, that coveted amateur ticket won't
> > be bought to radio never-neverland this week or next week.
> >
> N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
> No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
> amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
> Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
> slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

"His hobby is wasting time. Your time."

73 de Jim, N2EY

2178. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 15:31:49 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030214103149.27770.00000552@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 61261

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 2/14/03 7:33 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0302140533.34052837@posting.google.com>

>> I doubt that Vipul could make the grade in the Marine Corps, and there
>is
>> no such thing as the "Tenn Militia".
>
>The militia you're a member of is not the Tennessee Militia?

(1) I am not a member of any militia. I WAS a member of the Tennessee
State Guard

(2) If there is an organization calling itself the "Tennessee Militia" ,
I am not aware of it's existence.

Lennie refers to the Tenneessee State Guard, organized under the Military
Department of the State of Tennessee, responsible to the Govenor of the State
of Tennessee, and under the command of the Adjutant General of the State of
Tennessee.

I am not a member of that organization. I AM a member of the United
States Air Force Auxilliary/Civil Air Patrol, chartered by the Congress of the
United States and headquartered at Maxwell AFB, AL.

As I said before, Brian, YOU need to have some OTHER source for your
"facts" than Lennie's rants. You are obviously ill prepared, nor are you "up
to date" on current affairs.

Please try to exceed my expectations, OK?

Steve, K4YZ

2179. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 15:35:03 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0302140735.39fc4b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61262

"Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now> wrote in message
news:<Xns9321DBCAC6FB3pookster@216.168.3.50>...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
> news:d22b54c3.0302131459.24d2601e@posting.google.com:
>
> > . . and he was right.
>
> Can't do logic...

Can't do the National Enquirer either.

>
> > All three of ya clump together and enjoy.
>
> Can't count.

I stand corrected; make it both of you.

> By any chance, were you on Governor Davis' energy advisory board last
> summer?

Hell no, and I didn't help re-elect the dim bulb either. Have you
people checked yer water recently?

> I see some similarities.

I'm the taller one.

w3rv

2180. Re: New Field Day Entry Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 16:10:33 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0302140810.30855492@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61263

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message news:<3E4C69B2.4070806@adelphia.net>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:

> > Without getting booted
> > out of my seat in the middle of a nice run on 20 CW by a couple
> > nitwits who worked a grand total of four stations in the following
> > four hours on 10 ssb. Good thing there were two of 'em . . that crap
> > is NOT gonna happen to me again.

> Now *that* I understand. I've had the same thing happen.
> My solution was
> to "give up" the day, and run the GOTA station. Then at night, I'll take
> over when the only people left are the hard-core. So it helps the
> newbies learn how to operate properly, and the other stations get
> properly worked.

Here's another idea I've seen and used effectively, long before GOTA:

Experienced ops get paired with newbies.

1) Experienced op does everything while the newbie watches.
2) Newbie takes over logging, which gives him/her something more to
do, but is backed up by the experienced op. (Paper and PENCIL logs
recommended!)
3) When the pile thins somewhat, newbie operates while experienced op
logs.
4) Newbie does the whole thing while experienced op watches.

I've done this on both 'phone and CW and it works. Of course the
newbie must have some CW skills to get past 2).

Last time I was in a multi-multi FD, a 12 year old Extra showed up on
Sunday morning. He knew 20 per but didn't have much in the contest op
skills department. So I had him sit down and watch me, then gave him
the log, and finally the key. Good experience for all concerned.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2181. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 16:37:46 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0302140837.4d842db9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61264

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:<3E4C0587.44BAC154@ix.netcom.com>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> > The real biggie was the money. I clearly
> > remember the first time I visited a Big Gun's station, stacks of
> > Collins gear. I was dumbstruck and it showed. His comment was
> > something like "Some of us have it and some just don't, that's the way
> > it is kid." With a sneer. Fortunately the dramatic changes in personal
> > and equipment economics since then have leveled that particular
> > pecking order.
> >
>
> That's more of the "established working adult" vs the "starving unemployable
> teenager" pattern than anything else. And some of the adult's demand that
> the teenager to kiss his ass.

I've seen gobs of it in the adult-to-adult sphere too, megabucks goons
dissing those who are in much lower economic income brackets. The
worst of those are the dweeb$ who simply inherited their wads, we have
several of those in the neighborhood.

> Ever notice that the more accomplished
> adults are less likely to demand "respect" than less accomplished ones?

Let me count the times . .

w3rv

2182. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 16:43:29 UTC
From: "Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now>
Message-ID: <Xns932258C12EBC0pookster@216.168.3.50>
Source record: 61265

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
news:d22b54c3.0302140735.39fc4b@posting.google.com:

>> I see some similarities.
>
> I'm the taller one.
>
>

And one difference.

--
Bill, W7TI

2183. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 16:47:52 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3E4D1DB8.2070705@psu.edu>
Source record: 61266

Janet wrote:
> in case anyone is interested in the subject:
>
> http://www.dallasnews.com/sharedcontent/dallas/latestnews/stories/021303dnricdebris.50a29.html
>
> Janet - WB9ZPH

I'm interested, but they want an awful lot of info to register. Why they need to know my yearly income is a little beyond what I want to share.

Maybe you could post some text?

- Mike KB3EIA -

2184. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 17:42:27 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b2j9po$i8e$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 61267

This contest is the ARRL DX CW. It begins this evening at 0000z or 7pm EST, 6pm CST...etc.

What you do in THIS contest is USA and Canada works DX ONLY. NO USA OR CANADA contacts.

The advice given has been good. Jump in and have fun...But be advised this is a MAJOR EVENT and is a bit cut throat. Expect to be stomped several times.

I will be entering it 40m only.

But have to take the sweetie out this evening and will get a late start.

Have fun.

Dan/W4NTI

"Jackie" <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> wrote in message news:u5_2a.105945$vm2.60334@rwcrnsc54...
> Thanks for the advice. What I am planning on doing is listening a lot a bit
> higher up in the band and just seeing who I can copy. If I can understand
> what I am hearing, then I might answer a CQ. If it's too fast, then I will
> at least concentrate on increasing my listening comprehension.
>
> Jackie KC0ODY
>
> Icom IC-718 @ 100 W.
> Crappy triband trap dipole 11' off the ground
> (that has still managed to work South America with a good deal of success)
>
>
>

2185. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 17:45:01 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b2j9uj$9q5$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 61268

Excellent advice Brian.

Brutal is for real..

Only the best survive.

Dan/W4NTI

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0302140549.5699bbe8@posting.google.com...
> "Jackie" <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> wrote in message
news:<QrX2a.101930$be.73749@rwcrnsc53>...
> > This really isn't a policy question, but I figgered that some of the
> > regulars here might know the answer to this question.
> >
> > Regarding next weekend's CW contest-- is this generally for more
experienced
> > CW ops? Or do you get a bunch of the slower code on the bands at that
time
> > as well? I don't know that I'm going to try contesting myself (since I'm
> > limited to the # of bands I can work on) but if I can be someone else's
> > contact, it would give me good practice. Do the faster coders usually
slow
> > down for a slow coder's answer to their CQ, or is this not a good place
and
> > time to be answering CQ's if you're slow on the key? Just curious.
>
> Both Steve and Dave have offered very sound advice, I've been in it
> many times and I'll offer my two cents worth too. The ARRL dx cw
> contest is a pretty brutal affair even for the experienced high-speed
> ops with big stations. And there are some really lousy operating
> practices involved. It is a highly competitive radio sporting event
> with all the connotations which go with a major competition in any
> sport.
>
> I can easily imagine a first crack at this contest being very
> discouraging. If you do jump into the thing don't let yourself become
> discouraged. None of us were born with any of the skills required to
> be competitive in any dx contest. We all started right where you are
> now in this game, ground zero and you can do it too. But ya can't
> acquire the skills if ya don't perservere. My suggestion is if you
> find yourself not being very successful at actually working the dx
> forget the paddles and turn it into a listening contest with yourself.
> The fact of the matter is that this contest is 95% a listening contest
> anyway. So see how many countries you can identify & log, push your

> code speed envelope, use it as an educational experience vs. a
> competition.
>
> If you do get into it I'd be interested in seeing a post about your
> experience after the 'test.
>
>
> > Jackie KC0ODY
>
> w3rv

2186. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 17:56:49 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0302140956.78f7927f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61269

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message news:<20030213063939.14527.00000300@mb-cc.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0302120846.196b159d@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:

>
> There were several bills and other hurdles to be surmounted after WW1, not just
> the Alexander bill.

That bill was by far the most threatening ever by a long shot, the
rest were bureaucratic shuffles in comparison.

The WW1 shutdown included receivers.

So?

> Getting transmitting
> licenses took more work.

Yeah, yeah, and we had to do more work to get our tickets than we
would now.

> >How much column space did QST give Gernsback, Fleming and Marconi (vs.
> >Hiram Percy) for their efforts?
>
> Not much! How much space did Gernsback give ARRL in his many publications?

I sure read a bunch of his Pop Science mags which got into ham radio
and in every case I recall there was a refernce to the ARRL. In fact I
think in reading one of those articles was when I discovered that ARRL
existed.

Here's a squib to ponder:

"An immigrant from Luxembourg in 1904, Hugo Gernsback played a major
role both in fostering the amateur radio movement and in creating the
American science fiction tradition. Gernsback's Electro Importing
Company imported specialized electronic equipment from Europe and
helped to supply many of those who wanted to make their own radios and
transmitters. He designed and marketed the Telimco Wireless, the first
home radio set and the first walkie-talkie. He organized the Wireless
Association of America, a major organization in the amateur radio
movement. More importantly, he was an influential promoter of radio as
a participatory medium through his popular science magazines and
through books like "Radio for All" (1922). A technological utopian,
Gernsback believed that radio would foster better communications both
within the United States and globally, enabling stronger social and
cultural communities and a true participatory democracy."

The guy was so far beyond Hiram Percy's "visions" and impact it ain't even a discussion. Maxim invented a silencer (do we have to hear about that AGAIN?) and he did a nice job of promoting the long since irrelevant art & skill of hobby message relaying via his little magazine. Not much if any more than a bit player in the 'teens & '20s.

>
> And what about the efforts of Stewart and Warner?

They were not in it representing the ARRL, they were in it as equals to the ARRL and Hiram Percy, so was the kid from Baltimore.

> What side were all of the above on when quiet hours were imposed?

On the side of Our Boys Over There of course.

> >There was never an international movement to eliminate ham radio.
> >
> Wrong. See accounts of the 1924, 1925 and 1927 conventions.
>
> There's also the game of inches. Rather than complete elimination, tie down ham
> radio with so many limitations (narrow bands, low power, etc.) that it could
> not survive.

And some countries do not allow ham ops even today. Some countries being opposed to ham radio does not constitute an international movement to eliminate ham radio.

>
> > Ham news is for hams, nobody else cares.
>
> So should we not bang our own drum?

No, as long as we understand that beating our drums is a 98% snoozer outside the ham community itself.

> >
> >
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

2187. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 18:24:42 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0302141024.1628b07d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61270

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message news:<20030213063939.14527.00000300@mb-cc.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0302120846.196b159d@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:

> What side were all of the above on when quiet hours were imposed?

Blooper on my part here. Cancel previous.

I've lost track of the details of quiet hours thing but it was no big
deal compared with the massive threat of 1919. Quiet hours are still
out there by the way.

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

2188. After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 18:48:24 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0302141048.396cda03@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61271

New thread title account getting away from Columbia recovery)

"Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now> wrote in message
news:<Xns93223A21EF9F6pookster@216.168.3.50>...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
> news:20030214063655.25403.00000379@mb-fm.aol.com:
>
> > Would you make the beginner class 10-year-renewable, or something
> > else, like the old Novice?
> >>
> >>Just having a driver's license doesn't mean you're Richard Petty. It
> >>means you know enough to not be a menace on the road. I'd like to see
> >>something similar with ham licenses.
> >
> > Understood. I presume that you would match the test requirements to
> > the privileges granted, too. Example: Beginner's license doesn't allow
> > high power, but also doesn't include a lot of RF exposure questions.
> > Am I on the right track?
> >>
> >>If I were making the rules for the FCC, I'd focus lots more on good
> >>operating techniques and less on the technical stuff. I'd rather have
> >>a new ham understand how to correctly tune an amplifier than to know
> >>Ohm's law, for example. Memorize the band edges instead of antenna
> >>patterns. How to work split instead of how to calculate impedance.
> >>
> > Interesting concept! Of course some techno stuff is needed in order to
> > understand the rules (knowing the band edge is at 7000 kHz doesn't
> > mean much unless ou know what a kHz is). But more focus on operating
> > might be worthwhile.
> >
> >>The technical stuff is fun; in fact it's my favorite part of ham
> >>radio, but I'm not convinced it should be a priority in licensing.
> >>
> > Good points, all. I don;t necessarily agree 100%. but good points.
> >
> >
>
> ---
>
> Thank you, Jim. I expected massive incineration and instead get
> reasonable, well thought out comments. How nice!

Gentlemen can disagree without being disagreeable.
>
> To answer your questions:

>
> 1. I envision the Learner's class like a driving learner's permit. You
> only have so long, then you either upgrade or take the bus. The purpose is
> to learn and qualify for the "regular" license, not to operate in
> restricted mode forever.

I disagree with that a bit, because people learn at different rates.
Plus FCC will probably not want a license with a different term. But
what could be done is to make the Learner license non-renewable, so
that if at the end of 10 years the newbie is not ready to upgrade,
just take the test again. After all, new drivers are not restricted to
just one learner's permit per lifetime in any state I know.
>
> 2. Correct about beginner's licence restrictions. A beginner doesn't need
> a KW to learn radio.

Yup. Say 100-150 W on HF/MF, maybe 25-50 W on VHF/UHF (more RF
hazard).

> Doesn't need a bunch of bands or modes (like
> satellite) or other fancy stuff. When you're learning to drive, you don't
> need a Ferrari, a Chevy will do fine. Once you show you can do it
> responsibly, enjoy the Ferrari!

But the beginner should have a useful assortment of bands and modes.
One big thing wrong with the present Novice/Tech Plus setup is that it
gives too little HF, in both bands and modes.
>
> 3. Also correct about the tech stuff overlapping the operating stuff.
> Whoever puts the actual tests and restrictions together needs to be a cut
> above the typical lazy bureaucrat.

Well, the tests these days are all createdby the QPC, who are
volunteers. FCC checks and approves, but the grunt work of writing the
things is up to ham volunteers. Which means that last part could be
done under existing rules.

Here's a question I forgot: Should Learners have distinctive calls, or
at least not be able to get any unassigned call?

How about minimum age requirements?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2189. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 19:00:52 UTC
From: Janet <janet11@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <eteq4vgcb128a0n4l8vn080b740n8fne6v@4ax.com>
Source record: 61273

On Fri, 14 Feb 2003 11:47:52 -0500, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:

>Janet wrote:
>> in case anyone is interested in the subject:
>>
>> http://www.dallasnews.com/sharedcontent/dallas/latestnews/stories/021303dnricdebris.50a
29.html
>>
>> Janet - WB9ZPH
>
> I'm interested, but they want an awful lot of info to register. Why
>they need to know my yearly income is a little beyond what I want to share.
>
> Maybe you could post some text?

I agree that the registrations are a pain. Why they think they'll get GOOD information I'll neve know. I would NEVER give my REAL info (other than a name and possibly email address) on a site like that either. And maybe not even that. Much less a valid number for income.

It's just a nice article about how the ham volunteers from the Dallas area were involved.

I wonder if anyone in this newsgroup listened to the Nagadoches net during this time? It was re-transmitted over Echolink and I know a lot of people quite a ways off were listening.

Janet

2190. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 19:08:44 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030214140844.23250.00000683@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 61272

>Well, the tests these days are all createdby the QPC, who are
>volunteers. FCC checks and approves, but the grunt work of writing the
>things is up to ham volunteers. Which means that last part could be
>done under existing rules

Why not just call it what is CB. And get rid of the Phoney Testing all together

2191. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 21:35:50 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E4D6126.A9B595B7@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61274

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E4C528A.6A0F4E3C@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >That just about sums it up.
>
> 7 x 24 = 168, not 148
>
> Did you fail remedial arithmetic too, defunct diplomat?

Shall we go over just a few of yours again, Leonard? "Immagure", "Go such an 807 plate cap", "nobless". I'll skip the N2EY quote this time. I'm sure folks know the drill on your postings. Remember the posts where you claim only to address the removal of the morse code test in civil debate. How about the one where you'll go for the "Extra right out of the box"? Want to go over your well known "Key Officers" list rant?

You just can't keep from stepping in the bucket.

Dave K8MN

2192. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 21:39:58 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0302141339.550043e2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61275

Looks like the need for hams in the recovery has ended:

http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2003/02/14/100/?nc=1

148 hams in one county, 198 in another. 80% from outside the area.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2193. Re: New Field Day Entry Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 22:12:53 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0302141412.536d8b7a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61276

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0302140706.67bc792b@posting.google.com>...
> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0302130937.73a8b506@posting.google.com>...
> > kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0302120710.6d30e862@posting.google.com>...
>
> > Ya missed the point.
> >
> > Copying a 100+ word bulletin sent at a specific time and freq with no
> > repeats or fills
>
> On CW ya need a clock, a rcvr and a pencil.

Paper helps, too.

> What's the big deal about
> that?

You ever do it? Bulletin is maybe 150-180 words, no repeats, no asking
for fills. A lot more than "one minute out of five solid copy".

> If ya do it right though ya go "File, Mode", select RTTY on yer
> logger screen and get it over with in seconds and get back to the run.

You ever do it that way?

Fact is W1AW sends the bulletin before the 'test even starts, so if
yer smart you don't have to use operating time at all.

> And for this ya get a 100 bonus points?? Beats me.

Easy 100 for me. At the ~100 W level, it takes 50 phone or 25 CW QSOs
to get those 100 points. Averaging over the entire FD period (not just
the hot times) how long does it take you to work 50 phone or 25 CW
QSOs with a ~100W setup?
>
> > requires a different skill set than running QSOs
> > where the exchange is three pieces of info like "W1ABC 4A EMA"
>
> The only difference is in the patience the individuals have for
> participation in pointless pushups which don't do anything for anybody
> and prove nothing.

Points is points. They wanna give me 100 points per mile run on FD,
I'll put on the shoes.

> > Composing and sending a coherent message
> > requires a different skill set as well.
>
> Now I'm really lost. I think you're postulating that twitching the
> paddles for a quick contest exchange requires a different skill set
> from twitching the paddles to send a "coherent message"? NOT.

I've done both many, many times. Have you?

And it's another easy 100 points for maybe 15 minutes on a traffic
net. How long did ya say those 50 phone/ 25 CW QSOs would take ya?
>
> > Ditto the pointless "Message from w1aw" thingey.
>
> > Not pointless at all. And it's a bulletin, not a message.
>
> I see. A w1aw bulletin is not a message. Or is it that a message is
> not a bulletin? WTF??!

Main point is it's an easy 100 points.
>
> > > But are you gonna take DELCOM into the ham bands during this year's
> > > FD?
> > >
> > Not my bag this year. But somebody else might. More power to 'em if
> > they do. What's wrong with an operating activity that is aimed at the
> > widest possible audience?
>
> The same thing which was wrong with some uncountable number of failed
> corporations which wandered too far from their core businesses.

Do ya see FD "failing" any time soon?

> > > Who are you kidding?? How are you gonna run in FD this year?
> >
> > Probably a CW transceiver powered by a battery. If I see a good deal
> > on a solar panel, I'll go for the natural power bonus.
>
> Enjoy.
>
I sure will.
>
> > > Are you
> > > gonna work a satellite? Are you gonna set up a GOAT station? Of course
> > > not. You're gonna toss up some antennas and churn score. Just like it
> > > "used to be." And I'm gonna do the same drill for exactly the same
> > > reasons.
> >
> > And if a couple of EOCs and GOTA stations get on, there will be that
> > many more stations for me to work and get points from.
>
> There's a noteworthy rationalization.

.....ze barracuda getz ze mozt poinz for ze leazt effort....
>
> > How many points did you score last year, compared to my operation?
>
> Pffft! That silly shot was about as lame as they come.

How many points?

> My radio blew
> up ten minutes into the event.

My Southgate Type 6 and Type 7 never had that problem. Nor my K2.

> Duh? Shouldn't happen this year, new
> reddio. Slick little boy toy, I can punch a button, jump off 15ssb and
> be all over a satellite in seconds.

With what antenna?

> If I choose to do that of course.
> Do you have those choices? Either of 'em??

I don't see any place to write down "choices" in the summary sheets.
"Points" is what they want to see.

How many points ya get for having a lot of choices available?
>
> > > > Having all the catgeories and such is meant to widen the scope of FD.
> > > > Not a bad thing.
> > >
> > > Much of it is, as a minimum, a goofy thing at best. Generates gross
> > > confusion, lotta pointless pushups, wasted manpower, general BS, yadda
> > > yadda . .
> >
> > How is it wasted? The folks who are going to do the GOTA thing or the
> > satellite thing or the EOC thing would probably just stay home
> > otherwise.
>
> I see. One of the objectives of FD is to get the couch potatos out of
> the house.

Actually, yes.

> I missed it, on which page the FD package is that objective
> mentioned?
> I need more pages. Did I miss downloading an appendix or something?
>
> > You shoulda been there when I was doing the one-man deal back in the
> > late '80s and early '90s. 866As flashing away in the tent at 3 AM,
> > working the west coast on 80 like they were locals. Best year was '95,
> > 629 CW and 11 phone QSOs in 1B-1. Just under 3000 points with the
> > bonuses. Southgate Type 7 and the homebrew antenna setup sure proved
> > themselves that year.
>

> Yeah, yeah, and you ougta been there when I was rolling EUs on 80 wih
> my ARC-5. Without any 866s.

How many FD points you make with that thing?

> > > which is why we both opted away from the annual k3mn "radio
> > > picnic".
> >
> > The reason I opted out was because there was no plan, and I wasn't
> > going to be the planner.
>
> Now wait a minnit here . . you've already stated that you're not going
> to run with the Clayton Park bunch but you have no idea what their
> planning will be like on this pass. I smell a fishy tale. A very old
> dead fish.

You think there will be any more planning than there was last year? I
don't.

> > I like the picnic idea.
>
> So do I. I've already insructed my cook to do another Saturday nite
> Cajun filet for FD.

You need a logger?

> > I think I got more FDs with that bunch than you have FDs. They weren't
> > at an EOC, anyway.
>
> > > I can see the k3mn squad moving the operation from Clayton Park to the
> > > courthouse front lawn so that they can compete in the F class.
> >
> > Not an EOC, won't count.
>
> You're right, somebody moved DELCOM from the courthouse cellar to Fair
> Acres when I wasn't looking. I'd like to be there when the MN squad
> asks the DELCOM Honcho Grande to let 'em set up an EOC FD operation in
> his bunker. One of his kids got busted by the FCC for spamming the
> the machines with a bogus callsign and no license. Several years after
> I sent the DA up his butt over a ham radio related problem I had with
> him. You think the Putz is anti-ham? Try that dude!

I'll bring the videocam when ATO does his presentation. Should be a
hoot.
>
> Won't count 'cause it ain't never gonna happen no way no how.
>
Could buy an 847 with the video sales if it did.
>
> > > This
> > > one is almst as good an idea as the Diamond Club.
> >

> > Remember the "mobile aggregate score" thing?
>
> Certainly. Reinforces my dim view of the whole thing.

Waddya mean? That aggregate thing was pure barracuda, find the smart
way and top the pack. Yer just mad ya din't think of it first.

> > There useta be two FDs per summer, way back in the mid 1930s. Early
> > June. late August.
>
> That would be kewl, I like it. If ya can't make it June ya still have
> a shot at it.

The August one never really caught on. Plus they used to have the June
one in early June, while kids were still in school. Finally wised up
and went for solstice time.

> > > Lemmee guess which event you'd jump all over . .
> > >
> > I'd do both.
>
> I'd do both if the MN bunch ran a k3jv type FD.

Sure.
>
> > The picnic thing with a club, the other as a serious
> > single op. Heck, the first would be a warmup/testout for the second.
>
> The ARRL cw dx blast is this weekend, there's yer "warmup" for FD. Has
> a QRP entry class, go for it . . . no? Why not?

There's more to ham radio than working DX on HF with CW.
>
> > My biggest complaint about contest exchanges is that they're too dang
> > simple. Callsign, class, section, all repeated over and over, 3 pieces
> > of info, whatta weenie way to make points.
>
> Fly that one past the 200/hr dx contesters and duck. Fast.

They'd have to catch me first. I'm doing about three miles almost
every morning these days.

> > Lookit SS: Unique serial number, class, callsign, check, section.
> > Five pieces of info, one of them unique to the QSO. Back when I
> > started, there was a sixth piece of info in the SS exchange, the date
> > (month and day of yer birthday).
> > I say make the exchanges longer. More credit for actual messages
> > handled.
>
> What does a bloated exchange add to the event? Answer: Nothing. It
> slows the whole operation down is what it does for reasons which
> compelely escape me.

Skill.

> > Have W1AW send several different FD messages.
>
> I thought w1aw sent bulletins, not messages. ??
>
> A nocode can scarf up w1aw "messages" all day with RTTY and SSB.

Fine. Points is points.
>
> > Allow multiple
> > power levels at the same multi-multi.
> >
> > If all FD does is get some sedentary hams outa their houses and
> > exposes them to some fresh air, it's a good thing. If maybe they learn
> > a skill or two, all the better.
>
> That's mostly why I'm planning on doing FD except it'll be for
> exercising the skills I already have which I sure as hell didn't pick
> up at any FD event.

> > Your '897 show up yet?
>
> It's an 847 it's been right here for a week. The 500Hz Collins and 2.1
> Khz ssb xtal INRAD filters are at the post office waiting to be picked
> up today. I'll swap the Collins filter for one of his 400Hz xtal
> filters when he has 'em available again. Now all I gotta do is switch
> out the CPU in the LDG autotuner for the new chip which communicates
> with the 847 and I'll have TS-940 style 150w autotuning 160 thru 10.

How many QSOs so far?
>
73 de Jim, N2EY

2194. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 22:33:13 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030214173313.25546.00000785@mb-me.aol.com>
Source record: 61278

In article <c2356669.0302140714.67c920a3@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (Mr.N2EY) writes:

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
>Date: 14 Feb 2003 07:14:15 -0800
>
>Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3E4C5F89.6049AC04@earthlink.net>...
>> Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >
>> > In article <7xD2a.91351$be.68029@rwcrnsc53>, "Jackie"
>> > <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> writes:
>> >
>> > >"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>> > >news:20030212210738.09921.00001844@mb-md.aol.com...
>> > >
>> > >> Jackie, you've not been in here for a long time.
>
>Len has been here for a very long time, under a variety of screen
>names.

ANOTHER SERMON ON THE ANTENNA MOUNT
by Right Reverend Jimmie Callsign,
the Pedantic Parson of the Newsgroup

Of course, AOL allows 7 screen names. Isn't that just a
"bad" thing, though? :-)

>Len is probably the most regular poster here.

What? No POLL? Where is Hans B. and his LIST? :-)

>Do you really expect a serious answer, Dave?

"Dave" the defunct diplomat wants openings for his sharp,
sarcastic little retorts (actually broken chemistry glass-
ware) so that he can play a Prussian Oberst issuing orders.

>I don't think anybody takes Len seriously. I sure don't.

Sure you do. According to the message header, the Parson's
Posting was done close to midnight local downtown Philly
time. Isn't that rather late for workers at an undisclosed
location who do early runs at 5 AM? :-)

All notice how the Pedantic Parson has quit responding
directly. [gosh how we all miss those long, long replies
chiding non-amateurs about minutae and not holding a
Right Attitude...:-)]

>Actually, the use of CW by hams in traffic handling and emergencies
>has been well documented here in the past few years. By first hand
>accounts. The accounts show it to be a once-in-a-great-while sort of
>thing. I for one have repeatedly stated that the idea that all hams
>MUST know code because they MIGHT need it in an emergency is simply
>not reasonable.

Morsemanship is the Prime Directive of amateur knowledge,
the ne plus ultra of radio achievement, used worldwide as
the "common language" for 599 exchanges.

>Just another opinion. Not supported by fact.

There is only Conventional Wisdom (CW) supported by The
Right Attitude, lore, mythos, and tradition.

>The important point is that hams do not use utility, police or fire
>HTs. And amateur radio emergency and public service comms go far
>beyond using an HT.

Just another opinion. Not supported by fact.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. See SHARES. It is documented.

Yes, localized community emergencies and foot race support
need DX-capability fixed stations (all of which miraculously
continue to work after all professional installations fail...).
Of course.

>Was Hurricane Floyd (1999) a "real emergency"? Ask KT4ST. How about
>the ice storms of the winter of 1998?

Yeah, how about those hurricanes of the east and the ice
storms of the north? Real emergencies, right?

How about the Loma Prieta and Northridge earthquakes?
Little local "left coast" piddly things? Of course. The only
sanctified, official emergencies are what Newington defines
on "activating a net" and sounding very public-service-like.

>You missed the point, Dave.
>
>Ham radio is not part of the military. Soldiers don't have to buy
>their own radios. Hams do. End of story.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...someone who has NEVER been IN the military
"knows all about military communications." :-)

Tsk, tsk, tsk...then all the self-aggrandizement of ARRL about
"ham radio goes to war" in WW2 was false? Can't be!

>Seems pretty clear to me that Len lumps all who disagree with him on
>the trivial issue of code testing into a category called "PCTA". To
>him, all "PCTAs" are the identical, and deserving of nothing but his
>contempt and insults.

Awwww...not getting your deserved admiration and respect?

Want to requote endless PCTA comments from this newsgroup
prior to R&O 99-412? Go ahead, make everyone's day. That's
at least a whole year's worth of contempt and pejorative tossing
by PCTAs against NCTAs while elevating morse testing to
some Olympian achievement.

Poor baby. You must have been oh, so hurt by folks who've
had to listen to the Mighty Morsemen for virtual Millenia,
finally getting Fed Up with the PCTA arrogance. Tsk, tsk.

>Note that what constitutes "1930s status quo" is not defined in any
>way.

Having trouble understanding euphamisms and aphorisms?

Try some remedial reading classes. They should be available
in night classes at your local downtown PA undisclosed location.
Some of you BDOFs need remedial arithmetic. :-)

>Sounds a lot more like Len's behavior here ;-)

Oh, oh, an EMOTICON!

>Translation: Len's been around a long time, therefore he can dictate
>policy.

Translation: Little Jimmie can't reply directly, has to attempt
sinking barbs in a roundabout way. No harpoonist he and
there is no Moby Dick...but his Ahab comes all unglued
anyway. :-)

>The important thing is that Len presents his non-amateur experience as
>proof. It isn't.

Oh! "PROOF!" Well, ham radio is DIFFERENT than all other
radio, right? HF communications is DIFFERENT if done by
non-ham equipment versus ham equipment, right?

Oh, wow...NON-ham is nothing, ham is everything! :-)

>The main reason hams do ham radio is because it's fun. Len wants to
>dictate what we should think is fun.

Oh? Can you "prove" that with Google Quotes? :-)

How does advocacy of removal of a morse code test consitute
DICTATING WHAT HAMS SHOULD DO FOR FUN?

You are getting STRANGE, Rev. Jimmie. Very strange.

>The point is that Len repeatedly minimizes and dismisses the help and
>public service performed by hams using ham radio.

Hello? Is your reading comprehension THAT bad, Jimmie?

I've been MINIMIZING the selective editing and propagandizing
of ARRL...NOT the US amateur radio service. Wake up, boy.

>There was a first-hand account posted here about the search efforts
>for Columbia wreckage and the role hams played in supplying
>communication. Factual, clear, and concise.

Yes, and...?

Thousands and thousands of unlicensed-in-amateur-radio folks
were out hunting for wreckage. Over a thousand pieces have
been found so far...and some remains of the seven astronauts
who perished. All of that has been in the newspapers for a week
and a half, "factual, clear, and concise." Newspapers aren't
mentioning amateur radio, though, so regular journalism can't
be as "factual, clear, and concise" as ARRL, huh?

>Most of the pejorative-hurling has been done by Len, though.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Go live in Google for a while, Jimmie, search
for "Putz" and "Creep" and who posted it as a "signature."
:-)

>We have all heard that story many, many times. What has not been
>explained is how it makes Len an expert on amateur radio, or amateur
>radio policy.

Oooo! Jimmie and Davie need "experts!" Only "experts" can
comment on federal regulations?

Hello? The First Amendment hasn't been waived. HF radio is
still HF radio regardless of the allocated radio service using it.

Does the periodical name "Ham Radio" magazine strike a bell?
(or beep your BFO?) About 50,000 printings every month for
22 years before sale to CQ Communications. Yup, that wasn't
about ham radio at all, was it? :-)

>It also does not prove any of Len's arguments for or
>against anyhting connected with amateur radio policy.

"Anyhting?" :-)

Of course not, in order to discuss getting IN to amateur radio
one has to ALREADY be in amateur radio and do everything
that those already IN did. Everyone understands your words.

>Suppose someone who is older than Len and more experienced than Len
>shows up and says Len is all wrong in his amateur radio policy views -
>simply because that 'someone' has more time-on-the-planet and
>time-in-radio than Len. Does that prove Len is wrong? Of course not.

>Neither does Len's time-on-the-planet and time-in-radio prove any of
>his opponents to be wrong.

...and who is this genius-level methuselah? :-)

HF radio works the same as it did a half century ago. US hams
use HF predominantly, according to these newsgroupie BDOFs.

Tsk, tsk. Ham radio HF use is rather the same as it was 50
years ago except there are far more SSB voice cuesoes now
and some more HF bands. The major difference is that ham
radios are using solid-state devices that came into the market
in the early 1960s. Old-timer Mr. N2EY got solid-stated with
his K2 at the turn of the Millennium. :-)

Poor baby. Must really get your goat to know that someone
actually worked HF comm NOT in ham radio before you were
born, ey? Worked at 1.8 GHz way back then. Lots of ham
bands above 1.8 GHz, Jimmie, you ever operate any up there?
No? We all thought you were a ham guru, old timer. Tsk, tsk,
you're only an "expert" on HF, right?

>Does Len's time-on-the-planet and time-in-radio somehow give him the
>right to hurl pejoratives the way he does, even against those who do
>not reply in kind?

Awwww...too bad, sweetums. :-)

Hmmm...the only "replies in kind" seem to be from the LICENSED
poopie-suit wearer, the ace of the TN CAP...like "Putz" and
"Creep." Or the defunct diplomat who thinks State Dept. comm
is an offshoot of ham radio. Or the guy who works at an
undisclosed location after doing 5 AM morning runs... :-)

>You forgot the most important part:
>
>"His hobby is wasting time. Your time."

Of course, always. The ELITE in ham radio shall always
rule...as they were destined to do... :-)

Everything else is "wasted time." Long-live the BDOFs!
:-)

>Who? Give us some quotes.

Sorry...couldn't get into Google...too many BDOFs in there
trying to rehash five years ago in an endless battle of the
quotes because their widdle feelings got hurt back then...

>Not at all. The license requirements are the same for everyone. A Ph.D
>in EE doesn't get a bye on any of them. Nor does Len.

No kidding, Einstein! :-)

Yes, license requirements are the same for all...and the BDOFs
damn well insist on it REMAINING THAT WAY FOREVER... :-)

>Who says that? Not me - in fact, I posted a whole long list of
>desirable radio operating skills.

Oh? Jimmie has long experience in all of radio now? Or was
that a "long list of desireable AMATEUR radio operating skills?"
Skills according to Rev. Jimmie, of course, memorized from
the psalms of the Church of St. Hiram's writings, of course.

>Give us some quotes.

"Time flies like the wind...fruit flies like bananas." - anon.

>> > Morsemanship
>> > wasn't relevant to the needs of the rest of the radio world of
>> > fifty years ago
>
>Really? Back in 1953 there was no use of morse code in radio outside
>of ham radio?

No, little Jimmie (not yet born in 1953), such skills were NOT
RELEVANT TO THE NEEDS OF THE REST OF THE RADIO
WORLD.

Hello? The REST OF THE RADIO WORLD was busy with
voice and teleprinter communications just beginning to be
the overwhelming majority of message transmission.

>A lot of historical accounts say that's just plain wrong.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Jimmie's "lot" is confined to ARRL publications.

>Sure, the
>use of Morse code by non-amateur radio services has steadily decreased
>since the end of WW2. But to say it "wasn't relevant to the needs of
>the rest of the radio world of fifty years ago" simply doesn't mathc
>the facts.

Well, little Jimmie WAS THERE, wasn't he? :-)

Duly authorized and experienced in long-distance communications
before satellites, before troposcatter, before fiber optic cable under
the sea. All through the grant of an AMATEUR license much later.

Gosh, someone who can't research the start of TV broadcasting
and TV techniques correctly shouldn't proclaim hisself some
kind of "expert" on the REST OF THE RADIO WORLD.

>Point is, an amateur radio license is or amateur radio, not "the rest
>of the radio world". Test or no test, hams use Morse code. Len thinks
>that's bad.

Hello? Len thinks the morse code TEST is a nonsense
requirement. Len doesn't think much of old, slow morse

code, either, and doesn't care if some BDOFs want to
Defend Morsemanship To The Death. BDOFs have lost
touch with both reality and the future.

>Who said that? Give us the quotes.

Here's a nice one for the times of today -

"He that would make his own liberty secure
must guard even his enemy from oppression.
for if he violates this duty, he establishes a
precedent that will reach to himself."
- Thomas Paine

>Ahh, now we get to what really bothers Len. It's not just the test.
>It's the idea of hams using Morse code at all.

No. It's the BDOFs who insist on status-quoing
everything frozen to the times of their youth so they
can act like superior BDOFs today. :-)

>Notice how Len denies the help provide by hams in things like
>hurricanes, ice storms, and searches for shuttle parts.

Bad Len, evil Len...Len go sit in the corner at Newington.
:-)

>Yet Len insists on calling me a whole string of names he made up. He
>even went to the database to find out my last name. Is that the action
>of a mature individual whom we hams should look to for guidance,
>advice, and policy?

Heavens no, Mr. Serious. Go thee and be The Model Of
Guidance for The Ham. Hold the status quo. Keep the
homefires burning for morse masters. Dictate a morse in
every pot.

>Can't be talking about me, then. Present life and social position are
>pretty good.

Relative to what? :-)

>Perfect example of Len's behavior towards those who dare to disagree
>with him.

Yes, I don't fall on my knees in supplication and awe of the
Olde Morse Masters of Amateurdom. I don't do their bidding.

>"the defunct diplomat" - served his country for ~20 years as a key
>communications officer in the State Department at a variety of
>postings, including Dar-Es-Salaam and Helsinki. Still healthy and
>active despite description as 'defunct'. Long time active ham, (DX,
>contests, VHF/UHF) but not qualified to disagree with Len.

Left out: Thin-skinned arrogance, utter lack of diplomacy
regardless of 20 years of "service to his country," overly
proud, talking down to "lesser" ham licensees in here, tries
to claim unconventional HF procedures are good even
though other radio services never did that and such
procedures aren't logical.

>"the bus driver" - served his country for ~18 years in the Air Force
>at a variety of locations, including Germany. Earned a bachelor's
>degree while working fulltime. Long time active ham, (DX, contests,
>ragchews, digital modes) but not qualified to disagree with Len.

Left out: Fanciful tales of imaginary hypothetical radio
use situations challenging others to debate pre-loaded
hypotheses, utter lack of technical knowledge
demonstration of radio, claimed summa cum laude
in college studying human resource management but
wound up a bus driver.

>"the hoagie muncher" - earned BSME and MSME degrees, has worked in his
>field for ~40 years, including military contracts such as aircraft
>carrier catapults.
>Long time active ham (DX, contests, ragchewing, antenna mechanical
>design), but not qualified to disagree with Len.

Left out: Frequent distortions of the truth such as the
famous "26 patents" which reduced to ONE on a search
of patent records, lack of knowledge of old radio equipment
primary characteristics, insulter of EEs who had done design
in radio and electronics, claimed "intelligence photography"
of USSR aircraft as "equivalents" to actual military service.

>"the dill sergeant" served his country for ? years as an avionics tech
>in the Marine Corps. Earned the requisite degrees and licenses to be
>an emergency room nurse, which became a second career. Long time
>active ham, but not qualified to disagree with Len.

Left out: Does not relate well socially to strangers, has to
use rank-status-title to show his "superiority" to those who
disagree with him, constant use of epithets and swear words
as "signatures," claims military communications experience
yet cannot name any basic comm radio, way too thin-skinned
for rational debate, can only fight older people or those he
perceives as weak. "Temper fry" is his motto.

>"the reverend" - earned BSEE and MSEE degrees, has worked in his field
>for 27 years. Long time active ham,(contests, ragchewing, homebrewing)
>but not qualified to disagree with Len.

Miccolis is out standing in his field at an undisclosed location
with the field unidentified.

Left out: Pertinatious pedantry about old time ham radio, almost
tunnel vision focus on the past, generally ignorant of the rest

of the radio world, accuses others of gross errors and mistakes yet makes them himself on factual information, thinks that only certain opinions are "true" while opinions contrary to his are "false," cannot confront an accuser directly but must work through an intermediary as in this long, long posting.

>"His hobby is wasting time. Your time."

:-) Tsk, tsk, tsk. Jimmie shouldn't make long, long, long posts near midnight.

2195. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 22:33:14 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030214173314.25546.00000786@mb-me.aol.com>
Source record: 61277

In article <f45722ac.0302140533.34052837@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> >He should try the USMC or the Tenn Militia.
>>
>> I doubt that Vipul could make the grade in the Marine Corps, and there
is
>> no such thing as the "Tenn Militia".
>
>The militia you're a member of is not the Tennessee Militia?

Brian, for your information -

Heh, it is de facto a state-sanctioned militia except those
"brigades" don't play sojer in da woods. They meet once a
month or so and play sojer, wear uniforms, look very manly
and fierce, while pretending to be some military police
auxilliary.

"Tennessee State Guard" is NOT connected with any federal
military. Strictly a state function. They are NOT, in any way,
related to any National Guard. It's a "let's pretend" sort of
"military." :-)

Their "brigades" sound fancy but the actual size is less than
a conventional US Army battalion (about a thousand, give or
take). They've got ten kinds of rationalizations about their
"importance" in the scheme of things but it really boils down
to the level of some fraternal thing with cammies and insignia.

Our Hostile Action Hero was once "commissioned" as "brigade
communications officer" with a "rank" of "first lieutenant."
(quotes used to take place of italicized words). Problem is,
the "brigade communications officer" didn't know diddly squat
about the kind of communications a REAL Army used, any
national military. Can't name them, something which any
REAL "communications officer" or non-com or signalman
would know as well as anything after 14 years of operational
use...at least 8 years in the National or Air Guard operation.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, he must have resigned his commission...

It's a case of Pretense capitalized, play-acting the "officer" for
admiration of rank and "importance." He is nervous about NVIS,
doesn't know a hop-set from Hop Sing and thought he had a
Bonanza in trying to pull a snow job on folks who DO know.

Same old story in here, fish stories.

2196. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 22:53:08 UTC
From: Lloyd <Lloyd@LloydFriendHerbie.org>
Message-ID: <b2js0bbnf0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 61279

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in :

> 148 hams in one county, 198 in another. 80% from outside the area.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

One newspaper reporter determined that although ham radio operators comprised only about 5% of the manpower involved in the recovery effort, they consumed 95% of the food and constantly complained about the port-potties not being wide enough to accommodate their obese asses. Moreover, hams comprised the geriatric portion of the manpower, the youngest ham involved in the recovery effort was reported to be 67 years old. And as usual, the rocket scientists in Newington will continue to crank out endless news releases which are of interest to no one but hams themselves who want to take all the credit for the recovery effort.

Lloyd

2197. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-14 23:00:23 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030214180023.19751.00001843@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 61280

In article <c2356669.0302141048.396cda03@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>"Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now> wrote in message
>news:<Xns93223A21EF9F6pookster@216.168.3.50>...

>> 3. Also correct about the tech stuff overlapping the operating stuff.
>> Whoever puts the actual tests and restrictions together needs to be a cut
>> above the typical lazy bureaucrat.
>
>Well, the tests these days are all createdby the QPC, who are
>volunteers. FCC checks and approves, but the grunt work of writing the
>things is up to ham volunteers. Which means that last part could be
>done under existing rules.

The FCC requires only a minimum number of TOTAL
written questions. Type and kind are determined by the
VEC QPC. Complaints about the type and kind of
questions should be sent directly to the VEC QPC.

>Here's a question I forgot: Should Learners have distinctive calls, or
>at least not be able to get any unassigned call?

Absolutely. Keep them as isolated as possible until
they learn The Amateur Way. Make them stand out
so that they are easy to identify...for whatever reason
the long-timers have... :-)

>How about minimum age requirements?

Absolutely none. ARRL is just itching to have another
"world's youngest ham" news item, hopefully to beat the
four-year-old record. They shouldn't be disappointed.
After all, ARRL is THE representative of all US hams.
:-)

2198. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-15 00:07:17 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030214190717.09063.00000550@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 61282

K4YZ wrote:
>>> "Only coder"...?!?! Please provide a reference and definition.
> No reference.

No reference because I defined the term. The term "only-coder" was based on my observations.

>Vipul is certainly NOT an engineer.
Where did this come from? Just decided to add this comment in?

> And I know DOZENS upon DOZENS of NON-CW operators who "collect
>wallpaper", like to contest, and could give a rat's kazoo about ANYTHING
>technical, INCLUDING antennas.
>
> So how does THAT fit into your "only coder" rant, Vippy?

Non-cw operators are not only coders, since they don't code.

However, your statements fits with my claim that most Hams want to contest, collect wallpaper, do CW, and do antennas (which often is highly technical).

I did not say Hams are non-technical. Antennas is highly technical, and I have seen some Hams with impressive skills in this area. Even though some Hams that are skilled with antennas do not have an EE degree, their interest makes them good with antennas.

So, with the exception of antennas, Ham radio is mostly a non-technical,operators hobby. At least among those that meet in clubs. The hooby has many potential aspects. Where most of these are actually participated in form the emphasis of the hobby, and represent "Ham" radio. The March 2003 QST is particularly lacking of technical content.

> And again you are reminded that even the code tests can be "beaten",
>ergo
>you STILL have proven nothing, Vippy. And upon whose "opinion" do you
>declare
>the written tests "very easy (even trivial) to pass"...?!?!

Having a degree, the written tests were especially easy to pass. However, the way the written test is given, most people can pass it in one or two days with one or two tries. You said the tests were easy, earlier in this thread.

You said one could copy a few characters and know the rest, but then one would have to memorize a few characters to do this. I would like to know how one can cheat (or beat) the code portion. Are the pool of sentences also available for the code test?

> "The radio art" is ALSO meant the employment of the radio in any myriad
>of
>applications, Vipul. It is the manner and the skill with which radio is
>utilized to achieve any one of hundreds of goals.

Okay, this definition is possible. I have never seen anyone reference this phrase to any other meaning than technical achievement.

For example, the Q signals could be an example of the radio art since it ensures clear communication when people need to know exactly what those phrases mean.

However, that picture of the club Homebrewing, shown to people outside the club, is wrong. It gives the apperance of wanting to homebrew, when noone in the club actually is interested in that.

If you want to lose weight, eat less:
The soul desires, the body acquires.

2199. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-15 00:28:30 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <OQf3a.4778$4y4.2460663@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 61281

And set yourself some type of "mini-goal." That will make it more fun. For example, I have always used a straight key up to this point. My goal is to succeed in using an electronic keyer to make contacts. Then, time permitting, I'll try for the 100 contacts to qualify for a pin.

Dee, N8UZE

2200. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-15 00:47:18 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302141647.28dcdf85@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61283

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0302140549.5699bbe8@posting.google.com>...
> "Jackie" <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> wrote in message
news:<QrX2a.101930$be.73749@rwcrnsc53>...
> > This really isn't a policy question, but I figgered that some of the
> > regulars here might know the answer to this question.
> >
> > Regarding next weekend's CW contest-- is this generally for more experienced
> > CW ops? Or do you get a bunch of the slower code on the bands at that time
> > as well? I don't know that I'm going to try contesting myself (since I'm
> > limited to the # of bands I can work on) but if I can be someone else's
> > contact, it would give me good practice. Do the faster coders usually slow
> > down for a slow coder's answer to their CQ, or is this not a good place and
> > time to be answering CQ's if you're slow on the key? Just curious.
>
> Both Steve and Dave have offered very sound advice, I've been in it
> many times and I'll offer my two cents worth too. The ARRL dx cw
> contest is a pretty brutal affair even for the experienced high-speed
> ops with big stations. And there are some really lousy operating
> practices involved. It is a highly competitive radio sporting event
> with all the connotations which go with a major competition in any
> sport.

Drug tests? Off-track betting?

Pete Rose has just about attained the right age to get a license.

2201. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-15 00:54:21 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302141654.495facd9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61284

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030214103149.27770.00000552@mb-mj.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 2/14/03 7:33 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0302140533.34052837@posting.google.com>
>
> >> I doubt that Vipul could make the grade in the Marine Corps, and there
> is
> >> no such thing as the "Tenn Militia".
> >
> >The militia you're a member of is not the Tennessee Militia?
>
> (1) I am not a member of any militia. I WAS a member of the Tennessee
> State Guard
>
> (2) If there is an organization calling itself the "Tennessee Militia" ,
> I am not aware of it's existence.
>
> Lennie refers to the Tenneessee State Guard, organized under the Military
> Department of the State of Tennessee, responsible to the Govenor of the State
> of Tennessee, and under the command of the Adjutant General of the State of
> Tennessee.
>
> I am not a member of that organization.

You were a member, but no longer?

You have "real" military experience in the Tennessee State Guard?

I AM a member of the United
> States Air Force Auxilliary/Civil Air Patrol, chartered by the Congress of the
> United States and headquartered at Maxwell AFB, AL.

Been to Maxwell. What kind of uniform do they have you wearing?

> As I said before, Brian, YOU need to have some OTHER source for your
> "facts" than Lennie's rants. You are obviously ill prepared, nor are you "up
> to date" on current affairs.
>
> Please try to exceed my expectations, OK?

At least when someone gets it wrong, you deny it. Unlike Mr Smug.

2202. Re: Getting old call sign back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-15 01:01:25 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0302141701.5ab47647@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61285

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0302131503.3799c537@posting.google.com>...
> "Will" <Will671@lekopetron.net> wrote in message news:<b2g31etal0@pita.alt.net>...
>
> > > Wasn't his to "give" away.
> >
> > Brilliant! I think you have a future in Communications Law.
> >
> > Will
>
> For a hamburger today I will gladly pay you Tuesday.

It wasn't "Will" Brainiac, that was Wimpy.

2203. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-15 01:42:16 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030214204216.09289.00001533@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 61286

In article <d22b54c3.0302130932.71aab0bd@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>> Very funny, Lennie. Now, back to the real issue: What's keeping you
>> from getting an amateur radio license?
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>Drop it willya Larry? Ham radio already has enough problems to deal with.
>
>w3rv

Don't sweat it, Brian -- I don't think there's too much danger of Lennie actually going out and getting his ticket!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2204. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-15 02:02:37 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <0dh3a.103388$2H6.2102@sccrnsc04>
Source record: 61287

Hello Jackie ....I am really happy to see that you are learning a skill that will bring you a lot of enjoyment over the years to come. My advice is to answer higher speed CQs during non contest times. This is a win-win situation for you as either the guy sending will slow down knowing you copy speed by xmit speed or he will ignore you. The fellow who slows down has the true ham spirit and looks to the future of the mode. The latter is a jerk and is best left unworked. Again either way you win ...never feel embarrassed or slighted. Please e-mail me if I can help in any way.

73 God Bless KI3R Tom Port Vue nr Pittsburgh

2205. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-15 04:46:44 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030214234644.23360.00000290@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 61288

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 2/14/03 6:54 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0302141654.495facd9@posting.google.com>

>> I am not a member of that organization.
>
>You were a member, but no longer?

Correct.

>You have "real" military experience in the Tennessee State Guard?

No...I had "real" experience in 18 1/2 years in the United States Marine Corps.

>Been to Maxwell. What kind of uniform do they have you wearing?

USAF regulation with distictive devices. Wing patch left sleeve, grey [as opposed to blue] epaulets, and grey name tag with last name and organization. Federal or NG awards or devices may be worn in addition to appropriate CAP devices or awards.

Also, CAP has "CAP Distinctive" uniforms that are not recognizable as USAF or "military". CAP recently authorized the wear of a navy blue field uniform with appropriate CAP insignia. Federal or NG devices may NOT be worn on that uniform.

>> As I said before, Brian, YOU need to have some OTHER source for your
>> "facts" than Lennie's rants. You are obviously ill prepared, nor are you
>"up
>> to date" on current affairs.
>>
>>Please try to exceed my expectations, OK?
>
>At least when someone gets it wrong, you deny it. Unlike Mr Smug.

There's a difference between "denying" and "correcting".

Steve, K4YZ

2206. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-15 05:04:02 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030215000402.23360.00000291@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 61289

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/14/03 4:33 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030214173314.25546.00000786@mb-me.aol.com>

>Heh, it is de facto a state-sanctioned militia except those
> "brigades" don't play sojer in da woods. They meet once a
> month or so and play sojer, wear uniforms, look very manly
> and fierce, while pretending to be some military police
> auxilliary.

We once again get to see Lennie the Lame "diss" yet another form of volunteer service.

This one predominantly staffed by the very same Veterans that Lennie claims "others" show disrespect to.

>"Tennessee State Guard" is NOT connected with any federal
> military. Strictly a state function. They are NOT, in any way,
> related to any National Guard. It's a "let's pretend" sort of
> "military."

Pretend only to you, Lennie.

I suggest that you (and anyone who cares to see that you ahve ye again stepped in your own doodoo) refer to the Adjutand General of the State of Tennessee as to the TNSG's role.

Matter of fact, 4th BDE was awarded the National Guard Meritorius Unit Citation for it's role in supporting the NG during the Gulf War.

>Their "brigades" sound fancy but the actual size is less than
> a conventional US Army battalion (about a thousand, give or
> take). They've got ten kinds of rationalizations about their
> "importance" in the scheme of things but it really boils down
> to the level of some fraternal thing with cammies and insignia.

Again, more Bravo Sierra tap-dancing by the Cowardly One.

>Same old story in here, fish stories.

Any fish story I could make up would never beat the blatant lies you spew, Lennie.

>Our Hostile Action Hero was once "commissioned" as "brigade
> communications officer" with a "rank" of "first lieutenant."

Yep. Still got the Warrant of Appointment.

Still nothing to offer, eh Lennie? Just more arrogance and loathing of those who chose to "do something", rather than sit around wallowing in "retirement"...?!?!

You're a loser, lennie. You're empty, you're ugly, and dying a lonely, painful death.

Better you than me.

2207. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-15 05:27:50 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b2kj8ivvg1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 61291

"Jackie" <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> wrote in message
news:ZC53a.111315$Ec4.92828@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net...
>
> "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030213233552.05016.00000019@mb-cv.aol.com...
>
> > Think about this for an attitude: Perusing practically any issue,
> > any year, of ham radio periodicals with pictures of hams and
> > their stations shows that they are predominantly white and
> > male. :-)
>
> My other hobby (amateur astronomy) has a higher proportion of male
> participants as well. The more I listen to the HF bands, the more YL's I
> hear. I was listening to quite a few women on the 10-10 Net yesterday. I
> don't care which gender the people are that I talk to, what counts is that
> they are nice and fun to talk to. I've never met a more helpful crew of
> people than I have in AR. I have some new friends coming over to help
shoot
> a dipole up into a tree because I didn't quite know how to do it myself
> short of renting a cherry-picker. I didn't even have to ask, they just
> offered to come over and help.
>
> Jackie

Jackie,

Well said. I get sick and tired hearing from folks that seem to want us all to think something is wrong if some aspect of life's past-times don't mirror the general population demographics. Like it or not, there just seems to be some hobbies (as well as careers) that attract more of oe gender than another, or more of one ethnic group than others. My only concern as to attracting new people to ham radio is that we try to keep that flow going.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2208. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-15 05:29:21 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030215002921.23360.00000292@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 61290

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 2/14/03 6:07 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030214190717.09063.00000550@mb-mf.aol.com>

>No reference because I defined the term. The term "only-coder" was based on
>my
>observations.

Ahhh...this is your OPINION.

Now, based upon WHAT observations did you come to this opinion?

>>Vipul is certainly NOT an engineer.

>Where did this come from? Just decided to add this comment in?

It came from an observation that you do not provide any references or
validation of your "data", and that you make obscure "assertions" without any
supporting evidence.

An engineer worth his salt wouldn't be so lame.

>> So how does THAT fit into your "only coder" rant, Vippy?
>
>Non-cw operators are not only coders, since they don't code.

But Vippy! You have labeled ME an "only coder" on several occasions, and I
would be glad to show you my log book that shows I use CW 50% or less of the
time on the air!

>However, your statements fits with my claim that most Hams want to contest,
>collect wallpaper, do CW, and do antennas (which often is highly technical).

You again assert "most" hams and claim my post "fits your claim.

I said : >And I know DOZENS upon DOZENS of NON-CW operators..

"NON-CW", Vippy. NON...as in "prefer not" or "do not" use.

>>who "collect wallpaper", like to contest...

"Dozens" does not support your claim of "most", Vippy. Unless you have
some other access to a valid polling source that proves your assertion?

>>and could give a rat's kazoo about ANYTHING technical, INCLUDING antennas.

Perhaps you are having a problem with the common American English, Vippy.
"Could give a rat's kazoo" means they DON'T care...Have NO interest in beyond

getting RF radiated in some fashion.

>I did not say Hams are non-technical.

Sure you have. You've said it repeatedly. Then you've recanted it, only
to say it again. You're like a traffic light.

> Antennas is highly technical, and I have
>seen some Hams with impressive skills in this area.

Antenna practice CAN be "highly technical", but then on the otehr hand it
can be quite simple. I have zero-point-zero experiecne with Smith Charts and
precious little time with modelling programs, yet I do have some fair
metalworking skills and have built some very effective antennas.
(Ooooops...HOMEBREWING! And ME an "only coder' ! ! Go figure!)

>The
>hooby has many potential aspects.

As I am sure many hoobies do.

>Having a degree, the written tests were especially easy to pass.

A degree in what? Newspeak?

>You said the tests were easy, earlier in this thread.

I said it was pretty easy to pass the tests. This is especially so when
one only studies a "Q&A" manual. It's a might bit tougher if you really try to
study and learn the material.

>You said one could copy a few characters and know the rest, but then one
>would
>have to memorize a few characters to do this. I would like to know how one
>can
>cheat (or beat) the code portion. Are the pool of sentences also available
>for
>the code test?

The code tests are prepared in the same context as the rest of the tests.
The material is not "confidential".

>> "The radio art" is ALSO meant the employment of the radio in any myriad
>>of
>>applications, Vipul. It is the manner and the skill with which radio is
>>utilized to achieve any one of hundreds of goals.
>
>Okay, this definition is possible. I have never seen anyone reference this
>phrase to any other meaning than technical achievement.

That's because the sphere of your experience is very minimal.

Steve, K4YZ

2209. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-15 06:08:10 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E4DD937.D0C42CC5@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61292

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <f45722ac.0302140533.34052837@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >> >He should try the USMC or the Tenn Militia.
> >>
> >> I doubt that Vipul could make the grade in the Marine Corps, and there
> is
> >> no such thing as the "Tenn Militia".
> >
> >The militia you're a member of is not the Tennessee Militia?
>
> Brian, for your information -
>
> Heh, it is de facto a state-sanctioned militia except those
> "brigades" don't play sojer in da woods. They meet once a
> month or so and play sojer, wear uniforms, look very manly
> and fierce, while pretending to be some military police
> auxilliary.
>
> "Tennessee State Guard" is NOT connected with any federal
> military. Strictly a state function. They are NOT, in any way,
> related to any National Guard. It's a "let's pretend" sort of
> "military." :-)
>
> Their "brigades" sound fancy but the actual size is less than
> a conventional US Army battalion (about a thousand, give or
> take). They've got ten kinds of rationalizations about their
> "importance" in the scheme of things but it really boils down
> to the level of some fraternal thing with cammies and insignia.
>
> Our Hostile Action Hero was once "commissioned" as "brigade
> communications officer" with a "rank" of "first lieutenant."
> (quotes used to take place of italicized words). Problem is,
> the "brigade communications officer" didn't know diddly squat
> about the kind of communications a REAL Army used, any
> national military. Can't name them, something which any
> REAL "communications officer" or non-com or signalman
> would know as well as anything after 14 years of operational
> use...at least 8 years in the National or Air Guard operation.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk, he must have resigned his commission...
>

> It's a case of Pretense capitalized, play-acting the "officer" for
> admiration of rank and "importance." He is nervous about NVIS,
> doesn't know a hop-set from Hop Sing and thought he had a
> Bonanza in trying to pull a snow job on folks who DO know.
>
> Same old story in here, fish stories.

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

Dave K8MN

2210. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-15 06:16:23 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E4DDB24.4FC4017@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61293

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <c2356669.0302140714.67c920a3@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> (Mr.N2EY) writes:
>
> >Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
> >From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
> >Date: 14 Feb 2003 07:14:15 -0800
> >
> >Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >news:<3E4C5F89.6049AC04@earthlink.net>...
> >> Len Over 21 wrote:

> >Can't be talking about me, then. Present life and social position are
> >pretty good.
>
> Relative to what? :-)
>
> >Perfect example of Len's behavior towards those who dare to disagree
> >with him.
>
> Yes, I don't fall on my knees in supplication and awe of the
> Olde Morse Masters of Amateurdom. I don't do their bidding.
>
> >"the defunct diplomat" - served his country for ~20 years as a key
> >communications officer in the State Department at a variety of
> >postings, including Dar-Es-Salaam and Helsinki. Still healthy and
> >active despite description as 'defunct'. Long time active ham, (DX,
> >contests, VHF/UHF) but not qualified to disagree with Len.
>
> Left out: Thin-skinned arrogance, utter lack of diplomacy
> regardless of 20 years of "service to his country," overly
> proud, talking down to "lesser" ham licensees in here, tries
> to claim unconventional HF procedures are good even
> though other radio services never did that and such
> procedures aren't logical.

You aren't a lesser ham, Len. You aren't a ham at all.

You certainly aren't one to be writing of diplomacy. How many converts
to your way of thinking have shown up to voice their support here?
Let's see....there's Brian and Vipul...hmmmm...I can't come up with any
others.

> >"the bus driver" - served his country for ~18 years in the Air Force
> >at a variety of locations, including Germany. Earned a bachelor's
> >degree while working fulltime. Long time active ham, (DX, contests,
> >ragchews, digital modes) but not qualified to disagree with Len.
>
> Left out: Fanciful tales of imaginary hypothetical radio
> use situations challenging others to debate pre-loaded
> hypotheses, utter lack of technical knowledge
> demonstration of radio, claimed summa cum laude
> in college studying human resource management but
> wound up a bus driver.
>
> >"the hoagie muncher" - earned BSME and MSME degrees, has worked in his
> >field for ~40 years, including military contracts such as aircraft
> >carrier catapults.
> >Long time active ham (DX, contests, ragchewing, antenna mechanical
> >design), but not qualified to disagree with Len.
>
> Left out: Frequent distortions of the truth such as the
> famous "26 patents" which reduced to ONE on a search
> of patent records, lack of knowledge of old radio equipment
> primary characteristics, insulter of EEs who had done design
> in radio and electronics, claimed "intelligence photography"
> of USSR aircraft as "equivalents" to actual military service.
>
> >"the dill sergeant" served his country for ? years as an avionics tech
> >in the Marine Corps. Earned the requisite degrees and licenses to be
> >an emergency room nurse, which became a second career. Long time
> >active ham, but not qualified to disagree with Len.
>
> Left out: Does not relate well socially to strangers, has to
> use rank-status-title to show his "superiority" to those who
> disagree with him, constant use of epithets and swear words
> as "signatures," claims military communications experience
> yet cannot name any basic comm radio, way too thin-skinned
> for rational debate, can only fight older people or those he
> perceives as weak. "Temper fry" is his motto.
>
> >"the reverend" - earned BSEE and MSEE degrees, has worked in his field
> >for 27 years. Long time active ham,(contests, ragchewing, homebrewing)
> >but not qualified to disagree with Len.
>
> Miccolis is out standing in his field at an undisclosed location
> with the field unidentified.
>
> Left out: Pertinatious pedantry about old time ham radio, almost
> tunnel vision focus on the past, generally ignorant of the rest
> of the radio world, accuses others of gross errors and mistakes
> yet makes them himself on factual information, thinks that only
> certain opinions are "true" while opinions contrary to his are
> "false," cannot confront an accuser directly but must work

> through an intermediary as in this long, long posting.
>
> >"His hobby is wasting time. Your time."
>
> :-) Tsk, tsk, tsk. Jimmie shouldn't make long, long, long
> posts near midnight.

It'd be difficult to improve on the accurate quote below:

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

Dave K8MN

2211. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-15 10:49:03 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BA73854E.EB4A%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 61294

"Bill, W7TI" wrote:
>
> (snip) 1. I envision the Learner's class like a driving
> learner's permit. You only have so long, then you either
> upgrade or take the bus. (snip)
>
> 2. Correct about beginner's license restrictions. A
> beginner doesn't need a KW to learn radio. Doesn't need a
> bunch of bands or modes (like satellite) or other fancy
> stuff.

In every state I've lived in, a learner's permit can be renewed indefinitely until a full driver's license is obtained.

However, getting back to the federal government (not state driver's licenses), I'm not aware of any federal license with a learner's permit that expires within a fixed time period without upgrade. What incentive would the FCC have go against that trend in licensing?

Furthermore, how does a learner's permit further the stated goals of ham radio (experimentation, pool of trained operators, and so on)? For example, your learner's permit idea, with it sharp limitations, seems to actually restrain experimentation with other modes, bands, power, technology, home brewing, and so on. As such, it goes directly against one of the stated goals of ham radio.

The existing license structure does not conflict with the stated goals. A Technician, for example, can remain one for life and still fulfill the goals of ham radio.

Given the above facts, why would the FCC even consider your learner's permit idea over the existing licensing structure?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2212. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-15 14:44:35 UTC
From: Randy <rchapman8@houston.rr.REMOVEcom>
Message-ID: <nns3a.20162$Lm5.465434@twister.austin.rr.com>
Source record: 61295

"Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
news:BA73854E.EB4A%stewart@say.net...
> "Bill, W7TI" wrote:
> >
> > (snip) 1. I envision the Learner's class like a driving
> > learner's permit. You only have so long, then you either
> > upgrade or take the bus. (snip)
> >
> > 2. Correct about beginner's license restrictions. A
> > beginner doesn't need a KW to learn radio. Doesn't need a
> > bunch of bands or modes (like satellite) or other fancy
> > stuff.
>
>
> In every state I've lived in, a learner's permit can be renewed
> indefinitely until a full driver's license is obtained.
>
> However, getting back to the federal government (not state driver's
> licenses), I'm not aware of any federal license with a learner's permit
that
> expires within a fixed time period without upgrade. What incentive would
the
> FCC have go against that trend in licensing?
>
> Furthermore, how does a learner's permit further the stated goals of ham
> radio (experimentation, pool of trained operators, and so on)? For
example,
> your learner's permit idea, with it sharp limitations, seems to actually
> restrain experimentation with other modes, bands, power, technology, home
> brewing, and so on. As such, it goes directly against one of the stated
> goals of ham radio.
>
> The existing license structure does not conflict with the stated goals.
A
> Technician, for example, can remain one for life and still fulfill the
goals
> of ham radio.
>
> Given the above facts, why would the FCC even consider your learner's
> permit idea over the existing licensing structure?
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>

> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

Hi, Aaron! <g>

2213. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-15 15:04:02 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <31D8D71D731D29B3.367F568F33237309.54F4DAA978F40A43@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 61207

"Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
news:BA73854E.EB4A%stewart@say.net...
> "Bill, W7TI" wrote:
> >
> > (snip) 1. I envision the Learner's class like a driving
> > learner's permit. You only have so long, then you either
> > upgrade or take the bus. (snip)
> >
> > 2. Correct about beginner's license restrictions. A
> > beginner doesn't need a KW to learn radio. Doesn't need a
> > bunch of bands or modes (like satellite) or other fancy
> > stuff.
>
> In every state I've lived in, a learner's permit can be renewed
> indefinitely until a full driver's license is obtained.
>
> However, getting back to the federal government (not state driver's
> licenses), I'm not aware of any federal license with a learner's permit
that
> expires within a fixed time period without upgrade. What incentive would
the
> FCC have go against that trend in licensing?
>
> Furthermore, how does a learner's permit further the stated goals of ham
> radio (experimentation, pool of trained operators, and so on)? For
example,
> your learner's permit idea, with it sharp limitations, seems to actually
> restrain experimentation with other modes, bands, power, technology, home
> brewing, and so on. As such, it goes directly against one of the stated
> goals of ham radio.
>
> The existing license structure does not conflict with the stated goals.
A
> Technician, for example, can remain one for life and still fulfill the
goals
> of ham radio.
>
> Given the above facts, why would the FCC even consider your learner's
> permit idea over the existing licensing structure?
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

>

The attractiveness of administrative reductions? Budgetary constraints/reductions? Wouldn't less licenses and less testing make it easier and less expensive (or "taxing" to the public...heh heh) to regulate?

Kim W5TIT

2214. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-15 15:15:13 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E4E5974.DC5E05E8@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61296

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <oMM2a.97310$be.72203@rwcrnsc53>, "Jackie"
> <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> writes:

> >No, but that would not have stopped someone from helping out by using their
> >other skills.
>
> Amateur radio was conspicuously missing in the 1994 damage
> area during the week following that earthquake.

Your statement is simply not true.

> FEMA put in
> its fly-away sat terminals featuring video message boards for
> relatives of the victims. That was on TV news.

That is what FEMA should have done. The presence of elements of
professional emergency management people in no why minimizes the
contribution of amateur radio volunteers.

> Others think that professional public safety communications
> "always goes down in an emergency and hams rush in to
> help save the day." [that's been said, in different words, but
> with the same obvious meaning, for years]

Professional public safety communications *can* stop operating depending
upon the nature of the emergency. Radio amateurs have often assisted
overwhelmed public safety communicators. That is not to say that any
ham with an HT will be a boon to those public safety professionals.
ARES groups which train on a regular basis can be a very valueable asset
to those public safety professionals.

> If that were the case, why are those morse/minutemen allowing
> their local governments to waste so much of their tax dollars on
> professional equipment that "always breaks down in an
> emergency?"

Straw man alert! Professional systems do not always break down. Neither
are emergencies always of a nature which overwhelm professional systems.

> >Another illustration that proves the point that others have made here. You
> >think that SOME hams think they're superior because of this and that
> >attitude they display and you apparently don't bother to look at some of the
> >stuff you type. Seems pretty haughty to me!
>
> Now, now, you are showing irritation. :-)

>
> Some amateurs DO consider themselves "superior" and have
> done so for years in here. They seem to want and need a
> fantasy concept of their apparent lifestyle devotional activity
> and talk down to all who don't agree with them. I just point
> that out...and that enrages them no end. :-)

You have a superior
"I've-been-a-professional-in-radio-for-half-a-century" attitude and you
talk down to those who don't agree with you. I'm just pointing that
out.

> >Okay, so you won't take the requirements to get the license, you won't get
> >one.
>
> Slight correction. I haven't taken the trouble to take an amateur
> radio license test. That wasn't my intention five years ago and
> it still isn't a personal goal. Why is that license, that
> certificate, so "meaningful" just to TALK about requirements?

The record shows differently. Just a few years ago, you told us that
you were going for an Extra "right out of the box". Hasn't happened
yet. What changed your personal goal? No one has denied your
opportunity for talking. You've talked the talk. You just haven't
walked the walk. One would think that, after a declared interest in
amateur radio which has spanned a number of decades, you'd have taken
"the trouble" to take a license exam.

> I took a REAL test (commercial First 'Phone) in an FCC field
> office in Chicago in 1956. I've taken real tests since on other
> things, things like college finals rather scattered in the time
> domain of night classes.

Why the caps, Len? All of my license exams were administered by FCC
staffers.
They were real tests. I've been part of a VE team which administered
real tests. Was your implication that the only real tests were
administered by the FCC? were only given in 1956? were only available in
Chicago?

> >What makes you think the rules should be changed just because you think
> >you know more than the average person that sits for an AR test?
>
> That isn't, never was "my argument." I'm just arguing against
> the morse code test for an amateur radio license.

No, you are not "just" doing any thing of the kind. You frequently take
shots at the ARRL (to which you do not belong) and at amateur radio (in
which you are not a participant). You attempt to define the exams which
potential radio amateurs would take and you advocate a minimum age for
amateur radio.

> Others,
> nearly all of them self-centered brain-dead old farts (thanks
> again, Jim) keep harping on "personal this" or "personal that."
> To them, the "personal" aspect is all they can argue about.

Your rant smacks of personal envy.

Dave K8MN

2215. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-15 15:28:04 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E4E5C77.38F1B5E4@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61297

Len Over 21 wrote:

>
> Think about this for an attitude: Perusing practically any issue,
> any year, of ham radio periodicals with pictures of hams and
> their stations shows that they are predominantly white and
> male. :-)

Yup. I've thought about it. White, male radio amateurs must begin to
offer contrition for their unfeeling choices of gender, race and choice
of avocation.
How selfish we've been!

I have noted that, while you are both white and male, I've not seen your
a photo of you in any amateur radio magazine. Did I overlook it?

2216. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-15 15:31:38 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E4E5D4E.CA2F1625@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61298

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E4C696F.8715FCB4@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >I go along with Steve's advice, Jackie. Most ops participating in the
> >DX 'test have some experience under their belts.
>
> ...and a lot more fat... :-)

You won't have to worry about whether to participate or not, Leonard.
1) The mode is cw. 2) It is amateur radio. :-)

Dave K8MN

2217. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-15 15:33:17 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E4E5DBE.EC7C77A5@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61299

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E4C7104.9A44D21D@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Vshah101 wrote:
>
> >I have to admit that I don't take your postings very seriously since
> >they don't seem to be based in reality.
>
> No problem, is there Herr Robust. Are any of yours? :-)

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

Dave K8MN

2218. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-15 15:51:24 UTC
From: "Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now>
Message-ID: <Xns93234FEC13C4Cpookster@216.168.3.50>
Source record: 61300

Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net> wrote in
news:BA73854E.EB4A%stewart@say.net:

> In every state I've lived in, a learner's permit can be renewed
> indefinitely until a full driver's license is obtained.

Is there actually anyone who's still on their learner's permit after years of driving? I would suggest that someone who can not progress beyond that point may have insufficient driving skills and should be put on the bus. Would you like to be on the same road as that guy? Not me. Would you like to be on the same band as someone who can not acquire the skills needed to get a "regular" ham license? Not me.

> However, getting back to the federal government (not state driver's
> licenses), I'm not aware of any federal license with a learner's
> permit that expires within a fixed time period without upgrade.

I'm not aware either. Breaking new ground here.

> What incentive would the FCC have go against that trend in licensing?

The FCC's incentives are often murky. Bureaucratic inertia is often involved in their actions (or lack of actions).

> Furthermore, how does a learner's permit further the stated goals of
> ham radio (experimentation, pool of trained operators, and so on)? For
> example, your learner's permit idea, with it sharp limitations, seems
> to actually restrain experimentation with other modes, bands, power,
> technology, home brewing, and so on. As such, it goes directly against
> one of the stated goals of ham radio.

Absolutely correct. As with a driver's learner's permit, the purpose is not to allow you to go to the store for groceries, it's to allow you to learn to drive. As soon as you have mastered the basics enough to not be a menace on the road, you may drive across the continent by yourself at night in your Ferrari. Until then it's daytime only, no passengers except the instructor, stay off the freeways and go slow. (I don't know if those are the *actual* regulations, but you get the idea).

> The existing license structure does not conflict with the stated
> goals. A Technician, for example, can remain one for life and still
> fulfill the goals of ham radio.

That's quite correct. I am proposing that it be changed. See the next response.

> Given the above facts, why would the FCC even consider your
> learner's

> permit idea over the existing licensing structure?

Because the existing licensing structure is flawed, IMHO. The difference between an Amateur Radio Operator and an equally talented electronics hobbyist is that the ARO is allowed to transmit RF over the air. Having this authority carries with it the responsibility to do so, well, responsibly. I believe the FCC should focus more on that and less on other things. Yes, some technical knowledge is required, but the emphasis should be on:

1. Proper operating techniques (ID'ing, working split, knowing band limits, etc)

2. Not causing interference (listen before transmitting, avoiding splatter, etc)

3. Safety (RF exposure, high voltage precautions, etc)

4. Neighborhood relations (TVI, etc)

The other, more advanced stuff (driving the Ferrari) can come after the basics have been mastered.

Please don't ask me how this all fits into the current FCC rules; it doesn't. What I'm proposing is a revamping of the rules. I think it's overdue. You may not. It's ok to disagree.

--
Bill, W7TI

2219. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-15 16:12:31 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v4spnfj2lsambf@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 61201

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030214190717.09063.00000550@mb-mf.aol.com...

<SNIP>

> You said one could copy a few characters and know the rest, but then one
would
> have to memorize a few characters to do this. I would like to know how one
can
> cheat (or beat) the code portion.

That's easy V just learn the code and you'll "Beat" the test, or if
you feel you have to cheat it just learn the letters and pro signs.
If you pass you'll have cheated the test. If I can do it any one
can do it, if they're willing to just put in a little effort.

>Are the pool of sentences also available for
> the code test?
>

Check out the ARRL web site they have the code practice
sound files on line to be played or downloaded. That's where
I got all of my practice from before I went for the test.
http://www.arrl.org/w1aw/morse.html

BTW it's just names, places, radio types, antenna types,
weather, and power levels. Just like a normal contact
using code would be. But you can't memorize your way
through that test, except for the code characters.

<SNIP>

> However, that picture of the club Homebrewing, shown to people outside the
> club, is wrong. It gives the apperance of wanting to homebrew, when noone
in
> the club actually is interested in that.
>

I have a picture on my wall from the newspaper that shows our first
club meeting with me as the president. We had it at a local resturant
but none of us were eating at the time. Does that show that our club
doesn't like food? When you do things like that it isn't to make people
think your something you that you aren't, it's to get people to know
that you are there, period!

> ---
> ---------------------

> --
> ---------------------
> If you want to lose weight, eat less:
> The soul desires, the body acquires.

Do you have a fixation on peoples weight?

I'll bet your one of those skinny runts that
can eat a ton of food and never gain an ounce!
--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx

2220. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-15 16:21:13 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E4E68EA.8FC821B7@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61202

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E4C5F89.6049AC04@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >> Everyone has opinions. Problem with the PCTA Regulars
> >> in here is that Their Opinions are the Only Truth.
> > >
> > >Would that be...ummmm...your *opinion*?
> >
> > No. It's supported by Google as well as on everyone's
> > screen.

That simply isn't the case. If you disagree, how about providing some
evidence?

> > >Your statement is unsupported by fact. Additionally, you are no more a
> > >player in the ARRL than you are in amateur radio.
> >
> > Ah, true. Do you still play in ham radio, colonel?

Yes. I have a license and am permitted to do so by regulation. If you
obtain a license, you can do so too.

> [broadcasting music isn't allowed by the rules...]

I don't recall mentioning anything about broadcasting music.

> > >Unsupported by fact.
> >
> > Supported by observation. You need a supporter.

What is supported by observation? Snipping the relevant quotes isn't
very bright.

> > >We'll chalk this one up to just another thing of which you aren't really
> > >knowledgeable.
> >
> > More knowledgeable than the defunct diplomat is about
> > working HF comms according to procedure.

More knowledgeable about what? Snipping the relevant quotes isn't very
bright.

> > >There are plenty of everyday emergencies in which radio amateurs use
> > >SSB, FM and packet. Your discounting of trained amateur radio operators
> > >is beyond silly.

>
> What, that "everyday" emergency action was written up
> in MAD magazine? :-)

You're only here to advocate removal of morse code testing. You never denigrate radio amateurs and their accomplishments. Heh, heh, heh.

> >That'd be "diplomat's". You keep making these errors, Len. War can be
> >24/7. You've never been a participant for 24/7. Your 24/7 activities
> >are pretty much limited to using oxygen and taking up space.
>
> Oh? You "know" about "war," defunct diplomat?
>
> Did you participate in Hostile Action like the Hero in the
> poopie-suit?

I spent a year of my active duty military time in Vietnam, 1970-71. Where my military experience differs from yours is that I was actually in the country where the conflict was taking place. Shall I trot out the N2EY quote predicting your likely behavior again? Naw, you'll see it below.

> Wow, the diplomat-that-never-was is really milking his own
> little definition of a common euphamism, isn't he? :-)

What is the phrase "diplomat-that-never-was" supposed to mean, Leonard? Oh--and the word is "euphemism".

> >Pssst--Jackie! He means "perceived by him".
>
> Don't let the cashew brandy go to your head, diplomat.

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr. Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

> Jackie can understand. Poor baby, you can't...
>
> >That'd be your opinion once again, Leonard? It really sounds like the
> >attitude of one who is frustrated that mere radio amateurs won't give
> >him what he feels is his due.
>
> Nothing is "due" me, colonel.

Hey! You're finally getting the picture!

> Problem is your chains got
> pulled a long time ago when you innovated order-wires at
> State in some truly third-world posting. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

Any of us can make a mistake, Len. But after you've been corrected a number of times on this, you continue to repeat it. Just recently, I reposted my original statements, archived by Google. They don't bear out your accusation.
You've never offered anything in the way of proof. I'm afraid that makes you a liar.

> >Try to clean up the
> >errors. You misspelled "noblesse".
>
> Yes, your haughtiness. As soon as you complete your
> Remedial Arithmetic. Remember? 7 x 24 = 168.

"Euphamism", Mr. Nobless.

> "24/7" is a common American phrase that includes being
> on call and having to work at any time when directed.

Being on call isn't "working 24/7". Having to work at any time is not "working 24/7". At no time in your working life did you ever work 24/7.

> It
> isn't your peculiar redefinition. Sure, I typoed "noblesse,"
> now you "oblige" by trying to be a civil human instead of
> a hammy version of Ugly American to Americans.
>
> >Amateur radio isn't magic or supernatural. It has known physical
> >properties.
>
> Amazing! An ex-government employee who actually
> LEARNED something!

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr. Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

> >You aren't involved in it.
>
> With all you Nobles obleging yourselves as Ham Gods,
> it's unlikely I would be. It wasn't on my agenda for
> Things to Do Today. Or tomorrow.

It was several years ago when you stated that you were going for the Extra "right out of the box". Never happened. Not likely to happen.

> >Then feel free to go and be of help to your nation, community or
> >whatever.

> >Quite a rant, Len old boy. I can almost see the flecks of spittle at
> >the corners of your mouth.
>

> Wild imagination.

I agree that your imagination is wild. You really get carried away at
times.

> Having bad dreams about "hostile action,"
> diplomat-that-never-was? Or was that your poopie-suited
> buddy? Have him give you one of his tranks. You need it.

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

> >You'll still need that morse at the moment
> >if you'd like to have HF access as a radio amateur.
>
> I'm not after a license, colonel.

So, what you told us here just a few years ago was an untruth?

> I'm just here advocating
> elimination of a morse code test...and to watch you
> up-tight anal-retentives get all upset when your thin,
> thin skin gets bruised. :-)

Now you and I know that "just" advocating elimination of the morse code
test isn't all you're here for. That'd be another untruth.

> >Uh, the Commission seems to think you'll still need to pass the exams,
> >Leonard.
> >It isn't just politcal hype.
>
> Oh, my. The "teacher" speaking or the poor ex-diplomat-
> that-never-was and continues-to-be?
>
> 7 x 24 = 168, not 148.

"Euphamism", Mr. Nobless. You're quite "immagure". Why don't you "Go
such an 807 plate cap"?

> >No, you'll just need to do it in order to become a participant. Until
> >then, the only place you can indulge in dumb little games of
> >one-upmanship through frequest mention of your professional credentials
> >is...here.
>
> Poor baby. Still upset are you? The diplomat-that-never-was
> is the one indulging in dumb little games in here.

Let's go over a couple of your recent shenanigans, Leonard old boy:

1. Repeated statement that I originated the use of a CW order wire
despite Google quotes showing that I never claimed such originality.

2. Claim that I never appeared on any Dept. of State "Key Officers"
lists. When urls of Key Officers lists were provided, you declared them
lists of all embassy staff.

Let's ask ourselves about the reason for these statements of yours. Do
they relate to the elimination of morse code in amateur radio testing?
Are they simply an attempt to belittle the accomplishments of another
who disagrees with your position? Are they based in truth? Why would you
make them in the first place?

> >N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
> >
> >No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> >government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
> >amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
> >Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
> >slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."
>
> Yes, another overly-proud BDOF who can't take return
> fire. No doubt because he wants to hide in his
> "undisclosed location" where he works, waving all his
> certificates around over his collection of chassis punches.
> :-)

I've asked before but you didn't respond, what is "overly proud"? Why
does it bother you that Jim chooses not to tell you where he is
employed? Why the silly names like "Reverend Jimmie"? Why the comments
about "undisclosed location"? What are we to make of your comment about
certificates and chassis punches? Why would you refer to Jim as a
brain-dead old fart? It looks as if what you have done is simply
provide proof of his statement about your behavior.

Dave K8MN

2221. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-15 17:32:06 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0302150932.287bf519@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61203

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<b2j9uj$9q5$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>...
> Excellent advice Brian.
>
> Brutal is for real..
>
> Only the best survive.

. . we be the only federally licensed cannibals, Extras get to be
first in the chow line . .

>
> Dan/W4NTI

w3rv

2222. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-15 17:32:39 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030215123239.04085.00000370@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 61204

>> Think about this for an attitude: Perusing practically any issue,
>> any year, of ham radio periodicals with pictures of hams and
>> their stations shows that they are predominantly white and
>> male. :-)
>
>Yup. I've thought about it. White, male radio amateurs must begin to
>offer contrition for their unfeeling choices of gender, race and choice
>of avocation.
>How selfish we've been!
>

The periodicals represent the current demographics of Hams. I don't believe being a minority is a problem in Ham radio. As long as you follow the Ham traditions, its not an issue. If you disagree, you may be called a CBer, not your minority. At the many Hamfests and club meetings I've been to, I have found Hams want to increase their membership and do not care about which gender or race you belong to.

2223. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-15 18:00:44 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302151000.688f109e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61205

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030214234644.23360.00000290@mb-da.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 2/14/03 6:54 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0302141654.495facd9@posting.google.com>
>
> >> I am not a member of that organization.
> >
> >You were a member, but no longer?
>
> Correct.
>
> >You have "real" military experience in the Tennessee State Guard?
>
> No...I had "real" experience in 18 1/2 years in the United States Marine
> Corps.

What happened to the other 1.5 years?

> >Been to Maxwell. What kind of uniform do they have you wearing?
>
> USAF regulation with distictive devices. Wing patch left sleeve, grey [as
> opposed to blue] epaulets, and grey name tag with last name and organization.
> Federal or NG awards or devices may be worn in addition to appropriate CAP
> devices or awards.

MAke sure you leave the ones you didn't earn in the box.

> Also, CAP has "CAP Distinctive" uniforms that are not recognizable as USAF
> or "military". CAP recently authorized the wear of a navy blue field uniform
> with appropriate CAP insignia. Federal or NG devices may NOT be worn on that
> uniform.
>
> >> As I said before, Brian, YOU need to have some OTHER source for your
> >> "facts" than Lennie's rants. You are obviously ill prepared, nor are you
> "up
> >> to date" on current affairs.
> >>
> >>Please try to exceed my expectations, OK?
> >
> >At least when someone gets it wrong, you deny it. Unlike Mr Smug.
>
> There's a difference between "denying" and "correcting".

And remaining silent.

2224. Re: Getting old call sign back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-15 18:02:07 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302151002.3be5ad83@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61206

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0302141701.5ab47647@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0302131503.3799c537@posting.google.com>...
> > "Will" <Will671@lekopetron.net> wrote in message news:<b2g31etal0@pita.alt.net>...
> >
> > > > Wasn't his to "give" away.
> > >
> > > Brilliant! I think you have a future in Communications Law.
> > >
> > > Will
> >
> > For a hamburger today I will gladly pay you Tuesday.
>
> It wasn't "Will" Brainiac, that was Wimpy.

Wasn't Wimpy a barrister?

2225. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-15 18:54:49 UTC
From: tiffanyanderson2u@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <fa32d4fb.0302151054.48b360b8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61208

http://lacipeterson.20m.com/Laci.htm

> >Yes you are and yes they will. Do a good job, be useful, smile, and the
> >word will get around. One word from another person is worth a hundred of
> >your own.
>
> No I won't and they won't either.
>
> The present day media is living proof that unless it involves sex, drugs,
> violence or scandal, they don't have any room for it.
>
> The Laci Peterson story is a prime example.

http://lacipeterson.20m.com/Laci.htm

2226. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-15 19:18:51 UTC
From: Jackie <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com>
Message-ID: <vow3a.125471$Ec4.101999@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 61209

Hi Group...

Plenty of FAST CW signals coming down on 20 meters. Guess a lot of people have keyboard-type or autokeyers out there... so far all the signals are too fast for me to hear. However, I'm going to keep listening and see if I can occasionally pick something legible (to me) out of the pileups. I heard my first instance of aurorae when I was listening to a Swedish op (my friend was here at the time, he can understand fast Morse and told me the op was in Sweden) and the hollow, eerie quality of the signal was most interesting to listen to.

I learn something everytime I turn the dial... have fun in the contest if you are working it.

Jackie

2227. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-15 19:29:56 UTC
From: Jackie <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com>
Message-ID: <Uyw3a.122933$HN5.450391@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 61211

Hi Dee

> See if you can pick out the "CQ TEST" that the calling stations use.
That's
> kind of stage 1 so to speak. Then see if you can pick out a letter here
or
> there. Don't try for everything at once. I have to listen through their
> calls several times to finally get all the letters in their call.

I did manage to catch a few "CQs" here and there... I'll keep my ear to the
receiver. Practice in listening will no doubt help.

Jackie

2228. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-15 19:44:26 UTC
From: Jackie <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com>
Message-ID: <uMw3a.125792$Ec4.101505@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 61212

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030213223631.29016.00000308@mb-fy.aol.com...
> Choose a time and frequency and I'll have a CW QSO with you, no problem.

Thanks Jim. This might work out well later this coming week. I can work 10, 15 and 20 with the dipole I have... got it to tune on 12 and 17 today too. Let me know when and the band. Be easy on me, though, because I am S-L-O-W! :-)

Jackie

2229. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-15 20:20:30 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <iix3a.5177$4y4.2569307@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 61210

"Jackie" <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> wrote in message
news:vow3a.125471$Ec4.101999@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net...
> Hi Group...
>
> Plenty of FAST CW signals coming down on 20 meters. Guess a lot of people
> have keyboard-type or autokeyers out there... so far all the signals are
too
> fast for me to hear. However, I'm going to keep listening and see if I can
> occasionally pick something legible (to me) out of the pileups. I heard my
> first instance of aurorae when I was listening to a Swedish op (my friend
> was here at the time, he can understand fast Morse and told me the op was
in
> Sweden) and the hollow, eerie quality of the signal was most interesting
to
> listen to.
>
> I learn something everytime I turn the dial... have fun in the contest if
> you are working it.
>
> Jackie
>
>

See if you can pick out the "CQ TEST" that the calling stations use. That's kind of stage 1 so to speak. Then see if you can pick out a letter here or there. Don't try for everything at once. I have to listen through their calls several times to finally get all the letters in their call.

Dee Flint, N8UZE (who's only managed eight contacts because they're too fast for me too!)

2230. ARNewsline 1331 - Feb 14 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-15 20:41:03 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030215154103.09096.00000571@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 61213

Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1331 - February 14, 2003

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1331 with a release date of Friday, February 14 2003 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T.

The terrorism warning level goes up in the United States and ham radio operators should be prepared. The details on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1331 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

THE WAR ON TERROR: NATION GOES COLOR ORANGE: HAMS SHOULD BE ALERT

Homeland Security Secretary Tom Ridge says every American must be vigilant. This as the Bush administration raises the nations terror alert from Code Yellow to Code Orange and says this represents the most significant warning since the Sept. 11, 2001 attacks. Among those best equipped to assist the nation in fighting terror are its ham radio operators. Amateur Radio Newsline's David Black, KB4KCH takes a look at how hams can prepare themselves and how they can help:

--
The government isn't minimizing the threat. Officials expects more attacks against the United States and its allies in coming days. The only thing they can't do is predict when and where an attack will occur.

Federal officials recommended that Americans should take basic disaster preparation steps. This includes maintaining a three day stockpile of food and water. They also recommended obtaining duct tape and plastic sheeting to seal a house in the event of a chemical or biological attack or disaster. They also say to have some sort of emergency radio receiver. One that can operate for days without being plugged into a power outlet is best. This will be the primary way the government talks to you should the unthinkable happen.

How can ham radio operators help? Start by making sure that your ham gear works. Especially your hand held and mobile radios. If you only have one battery pack for your H-T, go out and buy one or two more. Or even better, get a case that lets you use alkaline batteries that are widely available. If the power goes out, you can't recharge Ni-Cads or NiM-H cells. But you can operate for a number of hours with Alkaline batteries. So have several sets of these on hand -- at least enough to get you through 72 hours of non-stop operation.

If you are a trained communicator active with an ARES or other emergency communications group, be sure to let the chain of command know where you will be. Give them a list of phone numbers where you can be reached 24 hours a day -- 7 days a week. Better yet, get a pager and give its number only to the person who will be calling you. That way if that pager goes
off, you know it's for real.

What about looking out for terrorism in your own community? Do it. Observe and report.

If you see something that looks out of the ordinary or suspicious, call the police. Remember that old adage about better to be safe than sorry. While it's not likely you'll encounter a real live terrorist cell, it's not out of the question, either. And that's where your radio, your local repeater and its autopatch come in.

Even if you don't own a cellular telephone, your hand held or mobile radio is your emergency lifeline. If you have access to an autopatch equipped repeater its a lot better than a cell phone. Cellular phones are known for not being reliable in many areas. With a ham repeater, if you can hear it, the chances are it will hear you. And even if there's no autopatch, another amateur can relay your message to authorities.

What about on the air? What are the chances that a terrorist cell might take to the airwaves on your favorite band? Not very likely but again not impossible, either. Terrorists tend to try to blend in with the background. Setting up a communications network on even an underutilized band like 6 meters would be like waiving a red flag in front of a bull. Hams are very protective of their spectrum and are not afraid to go after those on a band illegally.

It's far more likely that a terror group would set up shop on license free public frequencies than on 2 meter F-M or 20 meter sideband. And it's a pretty good guess that government monitors are keeping a close ear on F-R-S, MURS, Class D CB and the frequencies nearby to each service.

What if you hear something that seems suspicious? There are three letters to remember: F-B-I. The agency set up a website and dial-in tip line immediately following the September 11th attacks. Both are still in service.

The website U-R-L is www1.ifccfbi.gov and it puts you only a link away from filing a report. Just click on the words "Report Terrorist Activity."

And this word to hams who have never handled emergency communications. If you hear a net going on, don't break in to ask if you can help. The chances are that you cannot. You can do more good by listening and learning procedures. Better yet, go to the ARRL's website and sign up for one of their Emergency Communications Training Classes. With the stark new reality of terrorism on our homeland soil, it should be incumbent on every ham regardless of age or license class to become

skilled in emergency communications techniques. It might be you who's called on to save a life.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm David Black, KB4KCH, in Birmingham, Alabama.

--

The bottom line. As the Office of Homeland Security has said, every American must be vigilant. In retrospect, all of our lives could depend on it. Hams can sign up for emergency communications training at the ARRL website -- www.arrl.org. (ARNewsline™)

**

ENFORCEMENT: HAM FINED $12000 FOR MULTIPLE VIOLATIONS

A ham has been fined $12,000 for violation of the Amateur Service Rules. We have this report:.

--

Its one of the largest fines ever assessed for ham radio rules violations and its been handed to Scott E. Kamm, the license holder of amateur radio station N0UGN. And it comes after the Federal Communications Commission finds Kamm apparently responsible for causing intentional interference, broadcasting music and failing to identify with his station by its FCC assigned call.

Kamm's story goes back to December 9, 2002. In response to complaints of continuing interference on 146 point 31 MHz, an agent of the Commission's Kansas City Field Office began monitoring. At approximately 7:00 P.M., the agent observed a very strong signal on the frequency. It was reportedly made up of music, sound effects and unmodulated carriers. No station identification was transmitted. More important. These transmissions were interfering with existing communications that were in progress between other amateur stations.

Using radio direction finding the agent determined the source of these interfering signal to be Kamm's residence in near-by Waterbury, Nebraska. The FCC says that Kamm has two addresses that they know of. One in Sioux City, Iowa and the other in Waterbury where they traced the interference as coming from.

The scenario repeated itself a day later on December 10th. This time the agent entered the premises and inspected Kamm's station. The agent found an amateur radio transmitter capable of operating on 146.31 MHz but Kamm stated that no transmissions were made from his station. That he used the radio to receive only. Kamm also asserted that no one else operated the station.

But the FCC is not buying that story. It says that the Amateur Service Rules state that no ham shall willfully or maliciously interfere with -- or cause interference to -- any other radio communication or signal.

Also amateur stations are prohibited from transmitting music using and that they must identify at the end of each communication or at least every 10 minutes.

And, based on the evidence before it, the FCC says that it finds that Scott E. Kamm did willfully and repeatedly violate the Amateur Service Rules by causing intentional interference, broadcasting music and failing to identify. He is being fined $7000 for the interference, $4000 for transmitting the music and $1000 for failing to identify.

In Blair Alper, KA9SEQ, reporting for the Amateur Radio Newsline.

--

Kamm was given the customary thirty days to pay up or file an appeal. (FCC)

**

Break 1

With studios in Los Angeles California, the United States of America, and with reporters around the globe, we are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations worldwide, including the Ole Virginia Hams Amateur Radio Club net serving Manassas Va.

(5 sec pause here)

**

ENFORCEMENT: UNLICENSED RADIO BROADCASTER SENTENCED TO 18 MONTHS PROBATION

The FCC has announced that Benjamin Leroy Carter has been sentenced to 18 months probation. This, following his conviction on seven counts of unlicensed radio operation.

The conviction and subsequent sentencing is the result of an investigation that began in February of 1999. The Commission's Tampa Florida Office says that it received complaints from residents and broadcasters in the Orlando, Florida area of interference to the reception of licensed radio broadcast stations. Carter, who also went by the name of Malik Copafeel Abdul, pled guilty to seven counts of unlicensed radio operation in November of 2002. He also agreed to forfeit all equipment used in connection with the station.

The FCC says that 4 months of the sentence will be served as home confinement. In addition, Carter will be required to perform 50 hours of community service. Its all in cyberspace at http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/DOC-231068A1.doc (FCC, CGC Communicator)

**

RESCUE RADIO: NEW CLASS OF FIELD DAY STATION

Amateur Radio's premiere emergency preparedness operating event is changing. This with word that the annual ARRL Field Day will gain another entry class for 2003.

Called Class F, these will be Amateur Radio stations which are set up and operate from emergency operations centers, or EOC's. ARRL says that the change renews the emphasis of Field Day's 1933 origins as an emergency preparedness exercise as opposed to a routine contest. (ARRL)

**

RESCUE RADIO: A NEW CB SIDEBAND EMERGENCY CHANNEL

Doug Schwinn N0LAY, reports over the QRZ.com website that the Michiana Emergency Monitoring Group is promoting an iniative to have C-B channel 39 designated as an additional frequency to be used and monitored during emergencies. This in addition to the existing C-B channel 9.

The reason? Schwinn, who also holds the call KDZ0430 says that he joined in the effort because of the mountainous region of Colorado where he lives. He says that he would likely be heard using lower sideband on C-B Channel 39 than A-M on Channel 9 during an emergency situation. He also notes that a spokesperson for the group stated in an article in Popular Communications that this is part of an effort to restore and legitimize the Citizen Band Service. (N0LAY via Internet)

**

RESCUE RADIO: HAM RADIO ASSISTANCE IN COLUMBIA DEBRIS RECOVERY ENDS

Ham radio communications assistance in finding parts from the fallen space shuttle Columbia has wound down. According to several Internet reports, February 12th was the last day hams were to be called out to provide communications in the recovery effort.

During the height of the recovery, activities being conducted over the W5NAC repeater in Nacogdoches Texas could be monitored using Echolink's EDU_NET conference. Rick Hambly, W2GPS, says that there was a very active effort by RACES and SKYWARN to aid NASA and government agencies like the FBI with the identification, G-P-S location, cataloging and recovery of space shuttle Columbia components.

As previously reported, the Columbia was at 203,000 feet when it disintegrated plummeted back to Earth. All seven Astronauts on board were killed. Three of the 7 were licensed radio amateurs but no ham radio gear was carried on that ill-fated flight. (VHF Reflector, W2GPS, others)

**

REMEMBERING COLUMBIA: HAM CREATES ON-LINE MEMORIAL

A former Amateur Radio Newsline Young Ham of the Year ward recipient has created a lasting Internet tribute to the space shuttle Columbia.

The memorial website was created by Kevin Boudreaux, N5XMH, of Orlando Florida. Boudreaux, who grew up just outside New Orleans was the recipient of our 1993 "Young Ham of the Year Award" for his organizing Amateur Radio emergency communications following a devastating hurricane.

Today Boudreaux is a Manager with the Hilton Hotels and a professional website designer. He tells Amateur Radio Newsline that he was so personally touched by the Columbia tragedy that he created this memorial website to the shuttle and its crew.

The webpages he has created are filled with facts about the orbiter and its mission along with photos and short biographies of its STS-107 crew. Kevin also provides links to other Columbia memorial websites along with the complete statement of President George W. Bush when he sadly went on the air to let the world know that the Columbia was lost.

Kevin was only 14 when he went out to help his community in time of disaster. He was 15 when he received the "Young Ham of the Year Award" and his dedication has never stopped.

You can view his web tribute to the fallen Columbia and its crew at www.sscolumbiamemorial.com or www.columbia7memorial.com (ARNewsline™)

**

RADIO LAW: ALLEGED PAY TV INFO THIEF PLEADS NOT GUILTY

A 19-year-old University of Chicago student has pleaded not guuilty to federal charges of stealing plans for security systems used by satellite broadcaster Direc TV and distributing them freely on the Internet. Igor Serebryany is accused of stealing information related to Direc TV's latest access cards and then posting the priporotity information to websites dedicated to the hacking of the companys security systems

As previously reported, the theft allegedly took place while Serebryany was working at the Los Angeles office of a law firm that represents Direc TV. He was indicted by a federal grand jury last month on three felony counts of theft of trade secrets and faces a maximum sentence of 10 years in prison if convicted on all charges. (Published news reports)

**

CONVENTIONS AND HAMNFESTS: CHARLOTTE NC IN MARCH

March 8th and 9th are the dates of this years Charlotte North Carolina Hamfest and Computer Fair. The venue is the Charlotte Merchandise Mart on Independence Blvd. Doors open 8:30 a.m. both days with talk in on the 145.29 Mhz repeater. This years featured forum speaker is FCC chief rules enforcer Riley Hollingsworth, K4ZDH. More information is in cyberspace at www.w4bfb.org/Hamfest.html (Press release)

**
RESCUE RADIO: HAM RADIO IN TV DOCUMENTARY

Ham radio is part of a soon to be shown documentary produced for the Discovery Channel. Joe Moell, K0OV, has the details:

--
Members of the Hospital Disaster Support Communications System of Orange County, California have been included in tapeings for a new documentary series on the Discovery Channel. "Critical Rescue," a series of programs featuring rescue workers and those who support them, made its debut on February 6.

A team from New Dominion Pictures spent a half-day with HDSCS last August. They interviewed founder and leader April Moell, WA6OPS, and taped reenactments of ham communications that took place on April 23, 2002. On that day, hams were awaiting their assignments for one of the four large-scale disaster drills in Orange County each year. At 8:10 AM, a 6000-ton mile-long freight train struck a standing Metrolink double-decker commuter train at a crossing in Placentia, causing three deaths and over 200 injuries. The drill was immediately cancelled, and as rescuers converged on the train crash scene, area hospitals braced for the wounded passengers.

As Net Control, WA6OPS quickly deployed hams to the 14 hospitals most likely to receive victims. There they handled countless messages, verifying victim dispatch and patient counts, providing information for inquiring victim families, and communicating with hams supporting the Red Cross. Within some hospitals, HDSCS provided direct links to handle messages between triage areas, Emergency Departments, and Command Posts.

Additional HDSCS operators participating in the reenactments were Sam Creason K6EW, Cheryl Simpson KD6MWZ, Ralph Swanson WB6JBI, and David Mofford W7KTS. It is not known how much of the HDSCS footage will appear in the edited program.

From southern California, this is Joe Moell K-zero-Oscar-Victor for Amateur Radio Newsline.

--

Again, "Fateful Journey" will air 8 and 11 PM Eastern and Pacific times on Thursday February 20th, and again at 2 PM Eastern and Pacific on Saturday February 22nd. (ARNewsline™, K0OV)

**

BREAK 2

This is ham radio news for today's radio amateur. From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org and being relayed by the volunteer services of the following radio amateur:

(5 sec pause here)

**

ARRL PACIFIC DIVISION DIRECTOR JIM MAXWELL, W6CF, SK

ARRL Pacific Division Director Jim Maxwell, W6CF, has died. The 69 year old Maxewll passed away on Thursday February 6th at his home in Redwood Estates, California. The cause of his death has not been announced.

Maxwell, who became a Director in January 2000, joined the ARRL Board in 1994 after being elected Pacific Division Vice Director. He also served as an ARRL Emergency Coordinator from October 1991 to March 1999.

An avid DXer, Jim Maxwell belonged to mumerous DX clubs, contest clubs and organizations. This included the famed Northern California Contest Club. He also served as a member of the ARRL DX Advisory Committee from April 1988 through 1994 and was an accredited Volunteer Examiner.

Professionally, Maxwell held doctoral degrees in aeronautical engineering and biomechanics. He retired from the Lockheed Missiles and Space Corporation as a technical consultant in 1992 and from Scitor Corporation in 1998.

Pacific Division Vice Director Bob Vallio, W6RGG, takes over immediately as Director. ARRL President Jim Haynie, W5JBP, will appoint a new Vice Director in the coming days. Maxwell previously held the call W6CUF. (ARRL)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: ISS PACKET RETURN DELAYED FURTHER

When will the packet system on the International space station come back on? Nobody is quite sure but ARISS International Chairman Frank Bauer, KA3HDO says that his group has been working with its colleagues in NASA and Russia's Energia to get it operational again. Unfortunately, so far they have only been successful in getting it turned on for about one orbit.

Bauer says that several factors are impeding the packet startup. First, the progress vehicle docked with ISS and the crew is currently unpacking and stowing about a ton of supplies and equipment. Also, the crew is working with their mission control counterparts on schedule changes that have occurred due to the Columbia accident.

Given these items its apparent that this crew is not as engaged in ham radio the way the last ISS Expedition crew was. And because of this the packet system may be off for a bit longer. (ANS)

**

CONTESTING: ARRL SAYS BEACONET IS OK

ARRL Contest Branch Manager Dan Henderson, N1ND, says that BEACONet does not violate any contesting rules. According to Henderson, after additional review the ARRL has come to believe that BEACONet is similar to an automated CQ'ing system. That it only facilitates the

solicitation of contacts and as such it seems to comply with the letter and spirit of the contest rules. (VHF Reflector)

**

DX

In DX we take to the sky this week. This with word that Wayne Estes, W9AE, plans to operate the Amsat Oscar 40 satellite as FG slash W9AE from the island of Guadeloupe. The tentative plan is for Wayne to start operation at 2300 U-T-C on February 21, 22, 25, and 26 for windows to the Americas and the Pacific. Also listen for him on Sunday February 23 from 1500 to 2000 UTC for a satellite window to Europe and central Asia. Exact operating times will depend on the RUDAK schedule and Wayne's vacation activities. If you work him, QSL to Wayne Estes, 18673 W. Meadow Lane, Mundelein IL 60060, U.S.A. (ANS)

And Hagal International reports that Israeli amateur operator Dov Gavish, 4Z4DX is the first ham in the world to completely confirm DXCC using electronic QSL's. Although still not recognised by the DXCC, electronic QSL'ing is gaining ground in the DX community. (Hagal International)

Also, the ARRL's new Logbook of the World secure electronic contact-confirmation system took a major leap toward public release in January. This, with several weeks of limited tesrting of the concept. (ARRL)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: TURN AROUND IS FAIR PLAY

And finally this week, we have all heard the expression "turn around is fair play. And one person who has just found that out is former computer hacker turned on-line security expert Kevin Mitnick, N6NHG. That's because Mitnick's new company website has been -- well -- hacked. Amateur Radio Newsline's Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, has the rest of the story:

--

The ham who holds the honor of being the world's best-known computer hacker suffered the indignity of having hackers break into his new security consulting company's Web site -- twice. But news reports say that Kevin Mitnick, N6NHG, simply shrugged off the incidents as amusing and not serious enough for him to call authorities to investigate.

As I said, two electronic break-in's have taken place. The first was on January 30th. In that one a hacker calling himself "BugBear" added a page to Mitnick's corporate website that read "Welcome back to freedom, Mr. Kevin." This is probably a reference to Mitnick's probation which ended ten days earlier on January 20th. During his probation Mitnick was barred from accessing the Internet and this hack may have been more of a welcome home -- in this case -- home being the World Wide Web.

The latest incident took place over the weekend of February 8th and 9th and was more of an on-line job application than a hack. In this case a hacker in Texas broke in and asked Mitnick to hire him as the company's security officer.

Mitnick says that the hackers apparently exploited separate flaws in Microsoft's Internet server software. He says that the person responsible for the company's Web site failed to install patches available from Microsoft.

In neither instance did hackers vandalize the Website. One said in e-mail that he didn't do damage out of respect for Mitnick.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, in Los Angeles.

--

Mitnick's new organization is called Defensive Thinking and is located in Los Angeles. A company spokesman said that no customer information was released nor was there any danger of information being compromised. (Published news stories)

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, Amateur News Weekly, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline @arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I'm Mert Garlick, N6AWE, saying 73 and we thank you for listening." Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2002. All rights reserved.

**

Newscast Ends

**

Pause

**

RAIN Promo

2231. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-15 21:59:53 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302151359.7d29e885@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61214

"Randy" <rchapman8@houston.rr.REMOVEcom> wrote in message
news:<nns3a.20162$Lm5.465434@twister.austin.rr.com>...
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
> news:BA73854E.EB4A%stewart@say.net...

> Hi, Aaron! <g>

Jones?

2232. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-15 22:12:53 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302151412.2dc3b3f3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61215

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030215000402.23360.00000291@mb-da.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >Date: 2/14/03 4:33 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20030214173314.25546.00000786@mb-me.aol.com>
>
> >Heh, it is de facto a state-sanctioned militia except those
> > "brigades" don't play sojer in da woods. They meet once a
> > month or so and play sojer, wear uniforms, look very manly
> > and fierce, while pretending to be some military police
> > auxilliary.
>
> We once again get to see Lennie the Lame "diss" yet another form of
> volunteer service.
>
> This one predominantly staffed by the very same Veterans that Lennie
> claims "others" show disrespect to.

Dave said that he's never seen a bigger group of people with their
hands out than veterans.

Do you agree? Is it just a fact, or did he insult someone when he
said that?

2233. Re: New Field Day Entry Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-15 22:28:40 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302151428.37592b64@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61216

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0302141412.536d8b7a@posting.google.com>...
>
> You ever do it? Bulletin is maybe 150-180 words, no repeats, no asking
> for fills. A lot more than "one minute out of five solid copy".

> You ever do it that way?
>
> I've done both many, many times. Have you?
>
> How many points?
>
> With what antenna?
>
> How many points ya get for having a lot of choices available?
>
> How many FD points you make with that thing?

> You need a logger?
>
> Waddya mean? That aggregate thing was pure barracuda, find the smart
> way and top the pack. Yer just mad ya din't think of it first.

> How many QSOs so far?
> >
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Jim seems a little testy lately, turns on Crony.

2234. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-15 23:00:21 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E4EC688.113723CA@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61217

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> >> Think about this for an attitude: Perusing practically any issue,
> >> any year, of ham radio periodicals with pictures of hams and
> >> their stations shows that they are predominantly white and
> >> male. :-)
> >
> >Yup. I've thought about it. White, male radio amateurs must begin to
> >offer contrition for their unfeeling choices of gender, race and choice
> >of avocation.
> >How selfish we've been!
> >
>
> The periodicals represent the current demographics of Hams. I don't believe
> being a minority is a problem in Ham radio. As long as you follow the Ham
> traditions, its not an issue. If you disagree, you may be called a CBer, not
> your minority. At the many Hamfests and club meetings I've been to, I have
> found Hams want to increase their membership and do not care about which gender
> or race you belong to.

Great discovery! Please pass that information along to Mr. Anderson.
He doesn't seem to know much about hams.

Dave K8MN

2235. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-15 23:05:15 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E4EC7AE.D79650D5@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61218

Brian wrote:
>
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030215000402.23360.00000291@mb-da.aol.com>...
> > >Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
> > >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> > >Date: 2/14/03 4:33 PM Central Standard Time
> > >Message-id: <20030214173314.25546.00000786@mb-me.aol.com>
> >
> > >Heh, it is de facto a state-sanctioned militia except those
> > > "brigades" don't play sojer in da woods. They meet once a
> > > month or so and play sojer, wear uniforms, look very manly
> > > and fierce, while pretending to be some military police
> > > auxilliary.
> >
> > We once again get to see Lennie the Lame "diss" yet another form of
> > volunteer service.
> >
> > This one predominantly staffed by the very same Veterans that Lennie
> > claims "others" show disrespect to.
>
> Dave said that he's never seen a bigger group of people with their
> hands out than veterans.

He did? Under what circumstances was such a statement ever made by me?
Maybe you read it between a couple of lines somewhere.

> Do you agree? Is it just a fact, or did he insult someone when he
> said that?

Specifics, if you please.

Dave K8MN

2236. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-15 23:06:00 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b2mh7q$61d$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 61219

There are certainly some keyboards and whatnots on...but you will find that most of the signals are usings electronic keyers.

Most of the big guns run from their computer keyboard. BUT.....this works on Transmit only. CW is still done by ear for receive.

And thats the tuff part. Keep at it.

Dan/W4NTI

"Jackie" <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> wrote in message news:vow3a.125471$Ec4.101999@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net...
> Hi Group...
>
> Plenty of FAST CW signals coming down on 20 meters. Guess a lot of people
> have keyboard-type or autokeyers out there... so far all the signals are too
> fast for me to hear. However, I'm going to keep listening and see if I can
> occasionally pick something legible (to me) out of the pileups. I heard my
> first instance of aurorae when I was listening to a Swedish op (my friend
> was here at the time, he can understand fast Morse and told me the op was in
> Sweden) and the hollow, eerie quality of the signal was most interesting to
> listen to.
>
> I learn something everytime I turn the dial... have fun in the contest if
> you are working it.
>
> Jackie
>
>

2237. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-15 23:15:22 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030215181522.09808.00000849@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 61227

In article <20030215002921.23360.00000292@mb-da.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>>Date: 2/14/03 6:07 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20030214190717.09063.00000550@mb-mf.aol.com>
>
>>No reference because I defined the term. The term "only-coder" was based on
>>my observations.
>
> Ahhh...this is your OPINION.

Opinions are not allowed?!? Tsk, tsk, tsk. :-)

> Now, based upon WHAT observations did you come to this opinion?

heh heh heh heh...Steamy HAD to ask! :-)

>>>Vipul is certainly NOT an engineer.
>
>>Where did this come from? Just decided to add this comment in?
>
> It came from an observation that you do not provide any references or
>validation of your "data", and that you make obscure "assertions" without any
>supporting evidence.

...in other words, Sgt Putz won't accept anything that disagrees
with his testosterone pill induced mood. :-)

> An engineer worth his salt wouldn't be so lame.

Ah, macho morseman, engineers are paid in money these
days. Salt may have been paid to Roman Legionaires in
the old days, but that was "the old days." Before radio and
testosterone pills.

Another certificate-waving amateur extra in here refuses to
identify his employer. Imagine that, spending one-third of
24 hours and not having pride in work or employer! :-)

>>> So how does THAT fit into your "only coder" rant, Vippy?
>>
>>Non-cw operators are not only coders, since they don't code.
>
> But Vippy! You have labeled ME an "only coder" on several occasions, and
>I would be glad to show you my log book that shows I use CW 50% or less of the

>time on the air!

Oh, wow! "P-51 time" as an expression must have gone out of
style in the TN CAP. ["P-51 time" refers to writing in more
flight hours in a personal log than actual flight hours...as done
with a Parker 51 pen]

>>However, your statements fits with my claim that most Hams want to contest,
>>collect wallpaper, do CW, and do antennas (which often is highly technical).
>
> You again assert "most" hams and claim my post "fits your claim.

Doesn't the Immortal Amateur represent all the US ARS?!?

> I said : >And I know DOZENS upon DOZENS of NON-CW operators..

No doubt all 670-plus thousand. They all assemble on his TN
street every morning and he calls the roll...in proper uniform
with "distinctive unit insigna," of course...

> "NON-CW", Vippy. NON...as in "prefer not" or "do not" use.

Is that on the Orders For Today posted on the bulletin board
in front of your house headquarters?

>>>who "collect wallpaper", like to contest...
>
> "Dozens" does not support your claim of "most", Vippy. Unless you have
>some other access to a valid polling source that proves your assertion?

:-) [tsk, tsk, tsk, Sgt Putz should have told him to Get Down
and Give Him Twenty like a good Dill sergeant...]

>>>and could give a rat's kazoo about ANYTHING technical, INCLUDING antennas.
>
> Perhaps you are having a problem with the common American English,
>Vippy.
>"Could give a rat's kazoo" means they DON'T care...Have NO interest in beyond
>getting RF radiated in some fashion.

Is the Immortal Amateur giving away free kazoos to rats? :-)

Incomprehensible correction from the amateur language
"doctor" who frequently typos in rage in here... :-)

>>I did not say Hams are non-technical.
>
> Sure you have. You've said it repeatedly. Then you've recanted it,
>only to say it again. You're like a traffic light.

? Are there traffic lights in Tennessee? I thought they only
had Chatanooga choo-choos...

>> Antennas is highly technical, and I have
>>seen some Hams with impressive skills in this area.

>
> Antenna practice CAN be "highly technical", but then on the otehr hand it
>can be quite simple. I have zero-point-zero experiecne with Smith Charts and
>precious little time with modelling programs, yet I do have some fair
>metalworking skills and have built some very effective antennas.
>(Ooooops...HOMEBREWING! And ME an "only coder' ! ! Go figure!)

Tsk, tsk, tsk. "...otehr..." "...experiecne..."

Note: Beer fermenting is not RADIO homebrewing, your
macho morse immortalness.

>>The
>>hooby has many potential aspects.
>
> As I am sure many hoobies do.

Of course, the mighty morseman has much "experiecne" in
his hoobies.

>>Having a degree, the written tests were especially easy to pass.
>
> A degree in what? Newspeak?

:-) Here we go on certification, folks... :-)

Another small rollercoaster of sheepskin slapping from the
mighty macho morseman who is NOT a real doctor, NOT a
regular military commissioned or warrant officer, NOT even
a purchasing agent any more...

>>You said the tests were easy, earlier in this thread.
>
> I said it was pretty easy to pass the tests. This is especially so when
>one only studies a "Q&A" manual. It's a might bit tougher if you really try
>to study and learn the material.

:-) Wow, those testosterone supplements affect the Putzman's
brain, too. Well, logically, that shouldn't be too difficult
considering the few neurons...

> The code tests are prepared in the same context as the rest of the
>tests. The material is not "confidential".

No?!? I AM disappointed. Gosh, all along I thought this
virtual radio post-doctorate examination was oh, so secret
and mysterious (even metaphysical) and one had to be
"cleared" by the ARS community for the "right attitude!"

>>Okay, this definition is possible. I have never seen anyone reference this
>>phrase to any other meaning than technical achievement.
>
> That's because the sphere of your experience is very minimal.

Oh! V. Shah's "experience is very minimal!" This coming from the "immortal one" who is an EX purchasing agent who changed avionics boxes once in the corpse...and can't name a single radio used there or the Fighting 4th as "communications officer!"

I forgot "seven hostile action heroism" episodes... :-)

Temper fry

2238. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-15 23:15:24 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030215181524.09808.00000850@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 61228

In article <20030215000402.23360.00000291@mb-da.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Heh, it is de facto a state-sanctioned militia except those
>> "brigades" don't play sojer in da woods. They meet once a
>> month or so and play sojer, wear uniforms, look very manly
>> and fierce, while pretending to be some military police
>> auxilliary.
>
> We once again get to see Lennie the Lame "diss" yet another form of
>volunteer service.

Poor baby...all that volunteer "work" and no one cares to
erect anything in his honor...

> This one predominantly staffed by the very same Veterans that Lennie
>claims "others" show disrespect to.

They all fall out for reveille in the morning and chant "we hate
that disrespectful, rear-area radio clerk" under the command
of Sgt. Putz? :-) :-) :-) :-)

>>"Tennessee State Guard" is NOT connected with any federal
>> military. Strictly a state function. They are NOT, in any way,
>> related to any National Guard. It's a "let's pretend" sort of
>> "military."
>
> Pretend only to you, Lennie.
>
> I suggest that you (and anyone who cares to see that you ahve ye again
>stepped in your own doodoo) refer to the Adjutand General of the State of
>Tennessee as to the TNSG's role.

Oh, wow, color us all "officially impressed!!!" :-)

"Adjutand?" "...ahve ye...?"

"Official!" [sounds rather the same as 'offal,' donut? :-)]

> Matter of fact, 4th BDE was awarded the National Guard Meritorius Unit
>Citation for it's role in supporting the NG during the Gulf War.

WOW! "National Guard 'Meritorius' Unit Citation!!!"

During the Gulf War!!! Hmmm...Sgt Putz was "commissioned"
in the Fighting 4th BDE (soldierly abreviation for 'brigade') during
the Gulf War? One of those Seven Hostile Action heroism
events was the Gulf War.

Gosh, we are all so impressed! The Far East Command Signal Service Battalion (larger than a TN "brigade" in size), 8235th Army Unit, only got two Presidential Unit Citations - while I was assigned to it - and we wore that distinctive insignia (with a "2" in the laurel wreath). Wasn't near the heroic hostile action stuff taking place in TN during the Gulf War! I guess all us Army veterans should all hang our heads in shame for doing rear-area "radio clerking," huh? Yup, yup, nothing like the Glory and Honor of a non-federally-affiliated Official TN state guard!

Well, all of that is Officially Important HAM RADIO info, ain't it? State Guard units are all about radio, ain't they? Real Army radio communications units serving an area head-quarters with the only long-distance method at the time (HF) are just "rear area clerking." Yup, yup, we were all slackers, clerks, cowards, good-for-nothings, not even worthy of contempt, your mighty macho morseman sir?

>>Their "brigades" sound fancy but the actual size is less than
>> a conventional US Army battalion (about a thousand, give or
>> take). They've got ten kinds of rationalizations about their
>> "importance" in the scheme of things but it really boils down
>> to the level of some fraternal thing with cammies and insignia.
>
> Again, more Bravo Sierra tap-dancing by the Cowardly One.

Forgive me, mighty macho morseman, for having the temerity to state facts of the Real Army. It is obvious that the Real US Army cannot match the glory and honor of a state guard not part of the National Guard. The Confederacy has risen once again...

<all sing "Dixie" at this point...>

>>Same old story in here, fish stories.
>
> Any fish story I could make up would never beat the blatant lies you
>spew, Lennie.

Carefull, carefull, Sgt Putz, you'll pop the "distinctive unit insignia" off your poopie-suit.

>>Our Hostile Action Hero was once "commissioned" as "brigade
>> communications officer" with a "rank" of "first lieutenant."
>
> Yep. Still got the Warrant of Appointment.

"Warrant?!?" Tsk, tsk, tsk, not a "commission" as once stated?

Oh, my, mighty macho morseman is now a Warran Officer!

ooops...not present tense, past tense. he no longer "member" of state guard. lose his club card, but not his "warrant?"

> Still nothing to offer, eh Lennie? Just more arrogance and loathing of
>those who chose to "do something", rather than sit around wallowing in
>"retirement"...?!?!

"Wallowing in retirement?!?" Oh, my, now retirement is a sin!

:-) :-) :-) :-)

Just having too much fun poking at puffy little neanderthal
mighty macho morsemen who think the hobby of amateur
radio is "for the Corps, God, and Country" (in that order).

Hint: US amateur radio isn't the USMC, despite your daily
overdose of testosterone supplements. Really.

> You're a loser, lennie. You're empty, you're ugly, and dying a lonely,
>painful death.

Awwww. The ARS' answer to Efren Saldivar seems preoccupied
with death, desiring death to all who don't obey his "official"
commands. Not really a good attitude for a professional health
care provider.

Oddly, there seems to be some dispute with this Dr. Kildare
wanna-be (or is it a George Clooney wanna-be?). My real MD
(young fella, lots of certificates and practice, works in one
place rather than moving around a lot) disagrees with the
Steamy...but he isn't on testosterone supplements... :-)

> Better you than me.

Steamy will never die. He is immortal for he is an Extra
Amateur with lots of uniforms, medals, ranks, and
distinctive unit insignias! :-)

All stand at attention and salute the Amateur Immortal!

Temper fry

2239. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-15 23:15:25 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030215181525.09808.00000851@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 61222

In article <20030214234644.23360.00000290@mb-da.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>>Date: 2/14/03 6:54 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <f45722ac.0302141654.495facd9@posting.google.com>
>
>>> I am not a member of that organization.
>>
>>You were a member, but no longer?
>
> Correct.
>
>>You have "real" military experience in the Tennessee State Guard?
>
> No...I had "real" experience in 18 1/2 years in the United States Marine
>Corps.

Didn't do "the twenty?" Oh, yes, a medical discharge...

>
>>Been to Maxwell. What kind of uniform do they have you wearing?
>
> USAF regulation with distictive devices. Wing patch left sleeve, grey
>[as opposed to blue] epaulets, and grey name tag with last name and
organization.
>
>Federal or NG awards or devices may be worn in addition to appropriate CAP
>devices or awards.
>
> Also, CAP has "CAP Distinctive" uniforms that are not recognizable as
>USAF or "military". CAP recently authorized the wear of a navy blue field
uniform
>with appropriate CAP insignia. Federal or NG devices may NOT be worn on that
>uniform.

Wow! More important RADIO info, right?

Flight suits, one-piece coveralls, commonly called "poopie-suits"
by those who wear them. [I've worn one a few times as a
civilian] But, it's a UNIFORM! Important! "Distinctive Unit
Insignia," too! Hot damn!

Ham Radio info! Ham Radio Policy! :-)

>>> As I said before, Brian, YOU need to have some OTHER source for your
>>> "facts" than Lennie's rants. You are obviously ill prepared, nor are you
>>>"up to date" on current affairs.
>>>
>>>Please try to exceed my expectations, OK?
>>
>>At least when someone gets it wrong, you deny it. Unlike Mr Smug.
>
> There's a difference between "denying" and "correcting".

ACHTUNG...attention to orders! The Immortal Amateur has
commanded!

Temper fry

2240. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-15 23:15:26 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030215181526.09808.00000852@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 61223

In article <3E4D6126.A9B595B7@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <3E4C528A.6A0F4E3C@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >That just about sums it up.
>>
>> 7 x 24 = 168, not 148
>>
>> Did you fail remedial arithmetic too, defunct diplomat?
>
>Shall we go over just a few of yours again, Leonard? "Immagure", "Go
>such an 807 plate cap", "nobless".

Not a problem, Herr Editor! I don't give a snit. :-)

>I'll skip the N2EY quote this time.

Why? Don't you have that as a macro? You should. It would
make it easier to look down on inferiors... :-)

>I'm sure folks know the drill on your postings.

Oh? Do they need novacaine? :-)

>Remember the posts
>where you claim only to address the removal of the morse code test in
>civil debate.

I used to be an optimist. :-)

I remember KH2D setting the style of the mighty macho morsemen
in here five years ago. Jim is not doing so well now, moved from
Guam to Florida(?) or someplace. Does the colonel wish to
take his place?

>How about the one where you'll go for the "Extra right out
>of the box"?

Yeah, how about that? :-)

>Want to go over your well known "Key Officers" list rant?

Nah. It would highlight your mighty and important "service to the nation" or something, swell your ego (or 'swill it,' hard to tell). You are free to copy certain mastheads from HR magazine...those were in service to Communications Technology Incorporated...same as those "key lists" of yours. That was for Ham Radio magazine on ham radio topics. Did state department key officer lists have anything to do with ham radio?

Hey, I've got an idea! Why don't we all go into a discussion of the technical importance of using CW as an order-wire for an RTTY circuit! You can explain how CW is so beneficial, logical, and etc. and why other HF communications doesn't do that marvelous innovation! Yeah! Real RADIO talk! :-)

Watch the gangplank when boarding that Horst Wessel...

2241. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-15 23:15:27 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030215181527.09808.00000853@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 61224

In article <20030214103149.27770.00000552@mb-mj.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>>Date: 2/14/03 7:33 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <f45722ac.0302140533.34052837@posting.google.com>
>
>>> I doubt that Vipul could make the grade in the Marine Corps, and
>there is no such thing as the "Tenn Militia".
>>
>>The militia you're a member of is not the Tennessee Militia?
>
> (1) I am not a member of any militia. I WAS a member of the Tennessee
>State Guard

Oh? Resigned the commission? Got a medical discharge?

> (2) If there is an organization calling itself the "Tennessee Militia",
>I am not aware of it's existence.

As the brain goes, so goes the perception of existance. :-)

> Lennie refers to the Tenneessee State Guard, organized under the
Military
>Department of the State of Tennessee, responsible to the Govenor of the State
>of Tennessee, and under the command of the Adjutant General of the State of
>Tennessee.

Beware...the Confederacy is RISING! :-)

> I am not a member of that organization. I AM a member of the United
>States Air Force Auxilliary/Civil Air Patrol, chartered by the Congress of
>the United States and headquartered at Maxwell AFB, AL.

Wow! Important stuff! Lots of HAM RADIO POLICY info!

Does everyone have to get T-6 time for an Immortal Amateur
license? Wear uniforms? Salute all Immortals? Wear
"distinctive unit insignias" in amateur radio?

> As I said before, Brian, YOU need to have some OTHER source for your
>"facts" than Lennie's rants. You are obviously ill prepared, nor are you "up
>to date" on current affairs.

Yeah, pity that, Brian Burke as a veteran of the REAL USAF
isn't any damn good on knowing about Real USAF things...
but a CAP member does. How about that, hostile action

hero (seven times)?

Sort of like a former corpseman thinks US Army HF comm
back before satellites was "radio clerking in rear areas." :-)

Damn, those testosterone supplements are powerful mind-
benders. Quit taking them, Steamy.

Temper fry

2242. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-15 23:15:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030215181530.09808.00000855@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 61221

In article <c2356669.0302141339.550043e2@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>Looks like the need for hams in the recovery has ended:
>
>http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2003/02/14/100/?nc=1

Yes, ARRL has informed NASA that the search has ended.....:-)

2243. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-15 23:15:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030215181530.09808.00000854@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 61229

In article <20030214033937.29328.00000335@mb-fy.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 2/13/03 10:35 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20030213233550.05016.00000017@mb-cv.aol.com>
>
>>>>Others think that professional public safety communications
>>>> "always goes down in an emergency and hams rush in to
>>>> help save the day." [that's been said, in different words, but
>>>> with the same obvious meaning, for years]
>>>
>>> Quotes, please, Lennie.
>>
>> Go get your own from Google. Hundreds of them there
>
> Oh no, Lennie, it is YOUR assertion that "others" say public service
>communications "always" go down and that 'hams" rush in to save the day.

Nah. It's a common theme. Standard boilerplate mythos.
:-)

> I'd like to see YOUR evidence to support YOUR assertion.

No you wouldn't. "You can't stand the truth!" :-)

>>Such a pity that the Loose Cannon can only talk-down others
>> who've done more in radio than he
>
> Are we talking about "others" or you, Lennie. If it's "others", I'd like
>to see who it is you think I've talked down to. If it's you, your three years
>in the Army are STILL not anywhere NEAR the years I have spent on HF or
>anyother band OPERATING radios.

Wow! Were you "OPERATING radios" in those "seven hostile
actions! Hot damn! Quick, everyone erect something to
honor his machoness!

What kind radios mighty morseman manipulate as marine
corpseman? WS 31? BC-1000? :-)

Did those radios have "distinctive unit insignia?" :-)

>>You need a place to vent, taking out your frustrations on senior citizens
>
> You spelled "senile" wrong, Lennie.

Nah. I spelled "corpseman" wrong...should have been brain-
dead or brainwashed.

But, the testosterone-taking Clooney wannabe DID admit to
liking to beat up on old folks. :-)

>>I'm just advocating the removal of the morse code test for any
>> amateur radio license.
>
> No, you're lying.

Nope. "You can't handle the truth!"

[famous line from motion picture "A Few Good Men" about
USMC under courts-martial trial, spoken by a colonel]

> I think the "fire" is well aimed, Your Putziness. And with the exception
>of Brain (who doesn't know the difference between "authority" and a
>"butterbar') and Vippy (who doesn't know anything), I'd say it's all aimed at
>you, Oh Sleazy One.

What "fire," obsessed one? Your Bic quit flicking long ago.

>>How was that purchasing agent job in that "big" cable TV company?
>
> Enjoyed it while I was there. Anyone should have the benefit of leaving
a
>healthcare profession for some period if they so desire...especially after the
>death of a loved one.

Of course. YOU are the only such victim, right? Nobody else
has had it as bad as you. Nobody else has "loved ones," do
they? Of course not.

So, when did you get fired from that company?

> Please notice I AM back in the SAME job as before...As a nurse.

Who cares? Nursing isn't about HAM RADIO POLICY, is it?

You aren't as good as a Real MD?!?!? How can that be?

Pre-med entrance too tough for you? Take some more
testosterone supplements and work up the courage...

>>Get to do any real engineering design?
>
> Nope.

NO?!?! Gosh, you said once you knew all about radio design
because you were buddy-buddy with those real engineers in
there!

>>Get any patents awarded for that?
>
> They issue patents for not doing anything? BUT OF COURSE! You have

>one, don't you...?!?!?

Yes, I do, and the number and discussion was done on it in
here some time ago. It is a RADIO circuit, something that
your Immortalness might understand in a couple centuries.

You can access the US government site for patents and get
a description with enough particulars...if you know how to
operate a computer-modem. Do it quick because it will
probably expire around 2008 (if GE had it renewed it in 1991,
unknown). When it expires you can hop up and down, laff,
point fingers and should DEFUNCT! DEFUNCT! That will
make you happy, you poor soul, because you like, I mean
REALLY like to talk down to others.

>>Did you write articles in radio and electronics magazines?
>
> Nope. I hear you did, but that magazine went belly-up.

Communications Technology, Inc., was the parent of two
amateur radio periodicals and that corporation along with
all properties were sold to CQ Communications in 1990.

You can still view all 22 years of HAM RADIO magazine
on three CDs for sale by CQ for $150. ARRL resells the
same thing. You will no doubt view a pirate copy.

>>Been a design engineer longer than the Loose
>> Cannon was licensed as an amateur.
>
> Speaking of which, let's consider what happened to "American
>Engineering" while His Putziness was "on watch" as an "engineer":

That's not an AMATEUR RADIO POLICY issue but let's grab
this "knowledgeable astronaut-wannabe" statements and go
with them -

> The Soviets beat us into space with an unmanned probe.

Yes, Sputnik. 1957. Little infant Steamy was just beginning
to articulate sounds.

> The Soviets beat us into orbit with a manned craft.

Yes, in 1961 by a month. Little Steamy was going through
toilet training.

> The Soviets beat us into space with a manned space station.

Yes, MIR. MIR fell to earth in blazing pieces. The International
Space Station is still up. Little Steamy still hasn't finished his
toilet training...

> The Japanese put practical consumer electronics into every American home,
>causing the collapse of countless American firms.

Yes, Hallicrafters, National, Hammarlund, Collins all quit making
amateur radio equipment. Little Steamy tries to talk like some
kind of Alan Greenspan but winds up articulating only adjectives.

> The Red Chinese managed to not only get "the bomb" while Lennie was an
>engineer, but developed technology to deliver it to the United States, all the
>while stealing it from American "engineers" who were more intent on their
>401K's and retirement homes in Southern California.

Now Little Steamy is fantasizing he is Erich von Daniken while
In Search of Ancient Insults. :-)

Little Steamy has lost his Script! He is supposed to say niceties
like "stupid bench-tech" instead of "engineer." Poor baby...

> Nice job, Lennie. Hope you're comfortable.

Yes, quite so. Comfortable income. Comfortable house (we have
two). Honorable discharge from the US Army (no conditions).
Amusing characters in a newsgroup, a bunch of brain-dead old
farts pretending to be mighty macho morsemen. Easy target
shooting for recreation.

> Obviously you are eithr lying now, or you were lying when you made the
>assertion to get "an extra lite".
>
> Which was it?

I never wrote anything about "getting an extra lite."

> Now, WHAT was it you had to offer US that is pertinent to Amateur Radio,
>Lennie? OTHER THAN, of course, the usual "back in 1953" war stories about how
>the unit you were in in JAPAN suffered all those KIA's in KOREA, three years
>before YOU got tehre?

Now, now, little Steamy, use a different tissue to wipe your
chin after a toilet session. ["...tehre..."]

I've never claimed any "heroism" in Korea. I stated what was
known fact through third party references, mainly US military
information. It was Little Steamy who tried to add 2 + 2 and
got 22 instead of 4. :-)

Arithmetic problems seem to be endemic to PCTAs... :-)

> And PLEASE, tell us how any of that is germane to your CLAIMED intent of
>changing the Morse Code requirements in Amateur Radio.

Army radio station ADA (third largest in Army network at the time)
relayed 220 thousand messages a month in 1955 and never used
manual telegraphy for any of them. It had NOT used manual
telegraphy for any trans-Pacific radio circuits since 1948. The
only reliable long-distance communications medium at the time
was HF radio. ADA operated 24 hours a day, 7 days a week,
contrary to the "facts" of some defunct diplomats in here who

were never there.

HF radio. Also used by some radio amateurs. Ever hear of HF
radio, Little Steamy? Was done as primary long-distance
communications medium over a half century ago. Did you
think hams just discovered it last year or something? :-)

> Yes, I did "military communications" while on ACTIVE duty, Lennie, and
>as an enlisted.

"...as an enlisted..." WHAT? :-)

Of course you did, mighty macho morseman marnine person.
You pushed the PTT on an SCR-300's handset and sounded real
military marine like, I'll bet! Arf! Arf! Arf!

> Your sole claim to "have done more in "radio" is, by current evidence,
>limited to military duties in 1953-56. If you are the senior you are
>refering to, then your claim is hollow.

Nope, you whining little baby. I can type in the very short form of
my resume again, but then you have another temper tantrum and
yell and carry on so about a "CV!" :-) :-) :-)

>>The few, the proud, the hams?
>
> Yep. Leaves you out.

A valid, correct definition of the word "ham" is "butchered meat
of swine." Try NOT being on display in the shop window some
time. Your "meat" has long since spoiled in here.

2244. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-15 23:15:32 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030215181532.09808.00000857@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 61220

In article <3E4E5C77.38F1B5E4@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>> Think about this for an attitude: Perusing practically any issue,
>> any year, of ham radio periodicals with pictures of hams and
>> their stations shows that they are predominantly white and
>> male. :-)
>
>Yup. I've thought about it. White, male radio amateurs must begin to
>offer contrition for their unfeeling choices of gender, race and choice
>of avocation.
>How selfish we've been!

Yes. Can you spell C-H-A-U-V-I-N-I-S-T or B-I-G-O-T ?

:-)

>I have noted that, while you are both white and male, I've not seen your
>a photo of you in any amateur radio magazine. Did I overlook it?

Yes. :-)

2245. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-15 23:15:32 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030215181532.09808.00000856@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 61226

In article <BA73854E.EB4A%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
writes:

>"Bill, W7TI" wrote:
>>
>> (snip) 1. I envision the Learner's class like a driving
>> learner's permit. You only have so long, then you either
>> upgrade or take the bus. (snip)
>>
>> 2. Correct about beginner's license restrictions. A
>> beginner doesn't need a KW to learn radio. Doesn't need a
>> bunch of bands or modes (like satellite) or other fancy
>> stuff.
>
>
> In every state I've lived in, a learner's permit can be renewed
>indefinitely until a full driver's license is obtained.
>
> However, getting back to the federal government (not state driver's
>licenses), I'm not aware of any federal license with a learner's permit that
>expires within a fixed time period without upgrade. What incentive would the
>FCC have go against that trend in licensing?

?

> Furthermore, how does a learner's permit further the stated goals of ham
>radio (experimentation, pool of trained operators, and so on)? For example,
>your learner's permit idea, with it sharp limitations, seems to actually
>restrain experimentation with other modes, bands, power, technology, home
>brewing, and so on. As such, it goes directly against one of the stated
>goals of ham radio.

Speaking seriously (if that is possible in this venue), there is no
consensus among a wide variety of the licensed ones on that
subject. What seems to be the case with some long-timers is
simply "turf" or the human territorial imperative...they seem to
think of their personal activity as the model for all others to
emulate. Most of that group profess to have become interested
as teen-agers, a time when they did not know much of
anything and thought they had discovered some wondrous
technology! They also seem to be a mind of guild or union
plateaus of expertise as if amateur radio (by definition not of
pecuniary interest) is also some kind of guild or union.

Those whose only knowledge of radio anything is limited to
official membership publications don't realize that there are

a large number of non-amateurs who have operated radios
for a long time, maintained them, calibrated them, designed
them. Many of that non-amateur group have done all that
in several different radio services.

The FCC does not sponsor or encourage amateur radio any
more than any other US radio service. It's not their legal
job. They just regulate US civil radio. The FCC does respond
to US citizens in regards to regulations on radio...all radio
services. They don't limit regulation communications only to
those who belong to one particular radio service.

> The existing license structure does not conflict with the stated goals. A
>Technician, for example, can remain one for life and still fulfill the goals
>of ham radio.

There is no consensus on those "goals." Amateur radio is an
activity engaged in without pecuniary interest. The opposite of
professional which, by definition, is for pecuniary interest. That
is basically a hobby or avocation activity. Are there some
national "goals" for hobbies?!?

Everyone needs to be careful about using the word "goals."
Personal goals are not necessarily those that govern national
goals. The FCC sets regulations for all civil radio in the USA
and all citizens.

> Given the above facts, why would the FCC even consider your learner's
>permit idea over the existing licensing structure?

Amateur radio does not involve moving vehicle safety or any
direct danger to human life. Automobile and aircraft piloting
does and that is much different than any hobby activity
involving radio, using radio for recreation.

The so-called need for an apprenticeship in radio operating is
an artificial construct of those conservative long-timers who
seem to be involved in "turf" thinking.

2246. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-15 23:15:33 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030215181533.09808.00000858@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 61225

In article <3E4E5974.DC5E05E8@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <oMM2a.97310$be.72203@rwcrnsc53>, "Jackie"
>> <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> writes:
>

>> Amateur radio was conspicuously missing in the 1994 damage
>> area during the week following that earthquake.
>
>Your statement is simply not true.

Let me correct that. Radio amateurs WERE THERE, but they
were not engaged in amateur distress/emergency
communications for any general public. At least two such
amateurs were too busy working their regular job restoring
damaged utility lines to engage in ARRL-approved
emergency/disaster/distress communications.

>> FEMA put in
>> its fly-away sat terminals featuring video message boards for
>> relatives of the victims. That was on TV news.
>
>That is what FEMA should have done. The presence of elements of
>professional emergency management people in no why minimizes the
>contribution of amateur radio volunteers.

FEMA did it. The beginnings of SHARES did it. The Professionals
did the overwhelming brunt of it.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, you want to demean the pros just so that you can
shine noble light on amateurs. Boo hoo, you cry when your
bulb burns out...

>Professional public safety communications *can* stop operating depending
>upon the nature of the emergency. Radio amateurs have often assisted
>overwhelmed public safety communicators. That is not to say that any
>ham with an HT will be a boon to those public safety professionals.
>ARES groups which train on a regular basis can be a very valueable asset
>to those public safety professionals.

"ARES" isn't the only or even the prime grouping. The Auxilliary
Communications Service of the State of California was not
fully formed in 1994 (compared to two years ago) but they are
large and do not discriminate on what sort of certificate anyone

got years ago.

This newsgroup is NOT some auxilliary of ARRL so try to thicken
your skin to bear up under commentary that is not overwhelmingly
in favor of amateurs.

>Straw man alert! Professional systems do not always break down. Neither
>are emergencies always of a nature which overwhelm professional systems.

Not a strawman of any sort. A MYTH. Urban legend among
some amateurs.

>You have a superior
>"I've-been-a-professional-in-radio-for-half-a-century" attitude and you
>talk down to those who don't agree with you. I'm just pointing that out.

Live with it, colonel, I have. Gruss gott. <clik>

2247. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-15 23:36:44 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030215183644.25154.00000424@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 61230

As of May 14, 2000:

Novice - 49,329
Tech - 205,394
Tech Plus - 128,860
General - 112,677
Advanced - 99,782
Extra - 78,750
Total - 674,792

As of February 14, 2003:

Novice - 35,446 (decrease of 13,883)
Tech - 250,120 (increase of 44,726)
Tech Plus - 71,924 (decrease of 56,936)
General - 140,120 (increase of 27,443)
Advanced - 84,099 (decrease of 15,683)
Extra - 103,503 (increase of 24,753)
Total - 685,212 (increase of 10,420)

73 de Jim, N2EY

2248. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-16 01:36:15 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030215203615.12173.00000572@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 61231

In article <BA73854E.EB4A%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
writes:

>"Bill, W7TI" wrote:
>>
>> (snip) 1. I envision the Learner's class like a driving
>> learner's permit. You only have so long, then you either
>> upgrade or take the bus. (snip)
>>
>> 2. Correct about beginner's license restrictions. A
>> beginner doesn't need a KW to learn radio. Doesn't need a
>> bunch of bands or modes (like satellite) or other fancy
>> stuff.
>
>In every state I've lived in, a learner's permit can be renewed
>indefinitely until a full driver's license is obtained.
>
Last time I looked, PA required that you do some paperwork beyond a simple
renewal.

> However, getting back to the federal government (not state driver's
>licenses), I'm not aware of any federal license with a learner's permit that
>expires within a fixed time period without upgrade. What incentive would the
>FCC have go against that trend in licensing?

Bill (W7TI)'s main idea is the reduction in the number of license levels. The
learner's permit idea derives from the old Novice, which was only good for a
year (1951-1967) then two years (1967-~1975). It was not renewable until the
mid 1970s.
>
> Furthermore, how does a learner's permit further the stated goals of ham
>radio (experimentation, pool of trained operators, and so on)?

The idea is to have an easy-to-get license that gets a new ham started. Full
privileges require a more comprehensive test.

>For example,
>your learner's permit idea, with it sharp limitations, seems to actually
>restrain experimentation with other modes, bands, power, technology, home
>brewing, and so on. As such, it goes directly against one of the stated
>goals of ham radio.

For the past 34+ years, getting full amateur privs in the USA has required the
Extra license, and all the written exams connected with that license. I don't
think Bill wants the level of knowledge required for full privs to decrease. I
know I don't! So if the number of license classes decreases, the full-privs

exam must get bigger and cover more areas.
>
> The existing license structure does not conflict with the stated goals. A
>Technician, for example, can remain one for life and still fulfill the goals
>of ham radio.

Of course. The main thing is that Bill does not think the incentive licensing structure (or what's left of it these days) is a good thing. So we are discussing alternatives.
>
> Given the above facts, why would the FCC even consider your learner's
>permit idea over the existing licensing structure?
>
Less work for them, if it's done right.

But - is the current Tech/Gen/Extra system optimum for the ARS? Particularly considering how Techs get so little amateur HF but all of amateur VHF/UHF?

Let me ask you the same questions I asked Bill:

If/when S25.5 goes away and FCC dumps Element 1, what should the US license classes, requirements and privs be?

Obviously FCC isn't going to go for a more-complex system than we have now, but maybe a better system can be developed that will have wide ranging support in the amateur radio community.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2249. Re: New Field Day Entry Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-16 01:56:20 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0302151756.24421a10@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61232

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0302141412.536d8b7a@posting.google.com>...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0302140706.67bc792b@posting.google.com>...

>
> You ever do it? Bulletin is maybe 150-180 words, no repeats, no asking
> for fills. A lot more than "one minute out of five solid copy".

Pfft again. I've copied well over 18wpm on the air solid for a helluva
lot more than just 150-180 words worth of time simply for the
practice.

> > If ya do it right though ya go "File, Mode", select RTTY on yer
> > logger screen and get it over with in seconds and get back to the run.
>
> You ever do it that way?

No, which is exactly why I'm planning to take a whack at it.

> Fact is W1AW sends the bulletin before the 'test even starts, so if
> yer smart you don't have to use operating time at all.

I'll look into that. Tnx.

> Points is points. They wanna give me 100 points per mile run on FD,
> I'll put on the shoes.

Prostitution is illegal.

> > Now I'm really lost. I think you're postulating that twitching the
> > paddles for a quick contest exchange requires a different skill set
> > from twitching the paddles to send a "coherent message"? NOT.
>
> I've done both many, many times. Have you?

Keyed a "coherent msg"?? ME?? WTF kinda goofy question izzat?? If
perchance ya mean did I ever actually ship a msg thru NTS the answer
is emphatically no. NTS is 1915 ham radio epitomized. This is 2003.
You must have yer weekends mixed up, FD is not the ARRL Portable
Museums Weekend.

> And it's another easy 100 points for maybe 15 minutes on a traffic
> net. How long did ya say those 50 phone/ 25 CW QSOs would take ya?

Yeah, right, you're gonna pump out ten on 90 second centers outta
nowhere. Baloney.

> > My radio blew
> > up ten minutes into the event.
>
> My Southgate Type 6 and Type 7 never had that problem. Nor my K2.

Point please??

> > Duh? Shouldn't happen this year, new
> > reddio. Slick little boy toy, I can punch a button, jump off 15ssb and
> > be all over a satellite in seconds.
>
> With what antenna?

Antennae actually. If I actually do it prolly a cross-polarized Arrow
146/437-10 for UO-14. Up 145.975 down 435.070. Can be done with just
whips but I'd druther have ten elements worth of gain on .070 and nail
the sucker quick after it pops over the horizon and get back to the
run on 40. Should be a lotta FD stations looking for q's, maybe I get
to do a FD pileup for once. I'd have to build a tripod for it outta
2x3s and check it all out before the event. Hunnert points. You can do
it too, all ya hafta do is pop for the 2m & 430 band boards for yer
K2.

>
> How many points ya get for having a lot of choices available?

Hmmmm . . OK. Verus the band/mode options you have?

The UO-14 thing for one, any phone mode is another. 160/6/2/430 all
modes is another. Plus a couple other tricks I could pull @ 100 points
each if I actually gave a hoot about any of it. Which I don't. I'm a
helluva lot more interested in running some antenna tests than I am in
FD scores.

> > Yeah, yeah, and you ougta been there when I was rolling EUs on 80 wih
> > my ARC-5. Without any 866s.
>
> How many FD points you make with that thing?

How many do you have confirmed on 80 with any rig? I have my 100+++.

> > > I like the picnic idea.
> >
> > So do I. I've already insructed my cook to do another Saturday nite
> > Cajun filet for FD.
>
> You need a logger?

Get away from my chow bowl!

> > Certainly. Reinforces my dim view of the whole thing.
>
> Waddya mean? That aggregate thing was pure barracuda, find the smart
> way and top the pack. Yer just mad ya din't think of it first.

I'm not above a bit of slimery but that was outrageous.

> > > The picnic thing with a club, the other as a serious
> > > single op. Heck, the first would be a warmup/testout for the second.
> >
> > The ARRL cw dx blast is this weekend, there's yer "warmup" for FD. Has
> > a QRP entry class, go for it . . . no? Why not?
>
> There's more to ham radio than working DX on HF with CW.

Ya ducked the bullet, try again. I do FD and chase DX, bofum. What's
yer problem? FD is a lousy 24 hrs/yr. DXing is 24/7/365.

> > What does a bloated exchange add to the event? Answer: Nothing. It
> > slows the whole operation down is what it does for reasons which
> > compelely escape me.
>
> Skill.

At WHAT??!

. . .
> > with the 847 and I'll have TS-940 style 150w autotuning 160 thru 10.
>
> How many QSOs so far?

Zip.

> >
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

2250. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-16 03:23:43 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030215222343.00111.00001868@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 61233

In article <f45722ac.0302140531.64d24ff7@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> I'm still unclear on this alleged "claim" I made, and you haven't
>> seen fit to quote any of them. However, I now have a Job that I
>> enjoy a whole lot more than I would sitting in a cubicle, and due to
>> being a union member, I have great benefits and bullet-proof
>> job security -- which I wouldn't have had in 99% of the HR jobs
>> I could have taken for about 2/3's of what I'm making now!
>
>In Ohio, the only ones to get layed off are the ones with union cards.
> The exempt employees have been safe.

Brian:

To the best of my knowledge, there has never been a layoff in the history of my union (Amalgamated Transit Union, Local #842). I'm not saying there haven't been any, just none that I know of or ever heard of. I'll axe my shop steward about this next time I see him. The service I provide is federally mandated under the ADA, so it is unlikely that the Paratransit Operators in my company would be laid off (except for the part-timers). There is literally a building full of supernumerary admin types who would hit the street long before any drivers got laid off. On the contrary, a reduction in force in my company would more than likely result in our losing our part-time drivers, who don't have full union job protection -- and full-timers like myself would end up getting a bunch of overtime.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2251. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-16 04:51:51 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E4F18D5.52F07412@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61234

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E4E5C77.38F1B5E4@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> >> Think about this for an attitude: Perusing practically any issue,
> >> any year, of ham radio periodicals with pictures of hams and
> >> their stations shows that they are predominantly white and
> >> male. :-)
> >
> >Yup. I've thought about it. White, male radio amateurs must begin to
> >offer contrition for their unfeeling choices of gender, race and choice
> >of avocation.
> >How selfish we've been!
>
> Yes. Can you spell C-H-A-U-V-I-N-I-S-T or B-I-G-O-T ?
>
> :-)

Yes. Neither one has any dashes in it. The fact that white men enter
amateur radio does not indicate that they are chauvinists or bigots.
That being the case, why'd you bring those words up or even bother with
your rant about white men being predominant in amateur radio?

> >I have noted that, while you are both white and male, I've not seen your
> >a photo of you in any amateur radio magazine. Did I overlook it?
>
> Yes. :-)

I guess the smiley means that there was no photo.

Dave K8MN

2252. Re: New Field Day Entry Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-16 06:43:16 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0302152243.21cb0b66@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61235

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0302151428.37592b64@posting.google.com>...
> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0302141412.536d8b7a@posting.google.com>...
> >
> > You ever do it? Bulletin is maybe 150-180 words, no repeats, no asking
> > for fills. A lot more than "one minute out of five solid copy".
>
> > You ever do it that way?
> >
> > I've done both many, many times. Have you?
> >
> > How many points?
> >
> > With what antenna?
> >
> > How many points ya get for having a lot of choices available?
> >
> > How many FD points you make with that thing?
>
> > You need a logger?
> >
> > Waddya mean? That aggregate thing was pure barracuda, find the smart
> > way and top the pack. Yer just mad ya din't think of it first.
>
> > How many QSOs so far?
> > >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Jim seems a little testy lately, turns on Crony.

We're natural borned contesters with thick skins. Which comes with our breed.

2253. Re: After S25.5 Goes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-16 13:45:35 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <3CM3a.408$hj.424769@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 61236

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030215203615.12173.00000572@mb-mr.aol.com...
> Let me ask you the same questions I asked Bill:
>
> If/when S25.5 goes away and FCC dumps Element 1, what should the US
license
> classes, requirements and privs be?
>
> Obviously FCC isn't going to go for a more-complex system than we have
now, but
> maybe a better system can be developed that will have wide ranging support
in
> the amateur radio community.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Jim,

My *personal* view would be as follows:

1) fix the disconnect between power levels and technical knowledge required
for the tech license (either make the test a bit more comprehensive or limit
the
power to more reasonable levels ... the first option would make entry
harder,
so I prefer the second approach, so as not to make the bar discouragingly
high
for newbies)
2) add limited power HF access to the tech license (same bands as General?)
3) improve the General and Extra tests a bit ... not necessarily to make
them
"harder" but to make them more up-to-date and comprehensive ... if this
requires
a reasonable increase in the number of questions on the test, so be it.
4) fix outmoded bandwidth/baud_rate/modulation_type and any other technical
rules that limit innovation
5) pretty much leave the rest as is (if it ain't broke, don't fix it ....)

Just to be PERFECTLY clear, these are my *personal* views, NOT "NCI's
position."

Carl - wk3c

2254. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-16 15:09:30 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0302160709.7dc14c97@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61237

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message news:<20030215203615.12173.00000572@mb-mr.aol.com>...

> If/when S25.5 goes away and FCC dumps Element 1, what should the US license
> classes, requirements and privs be?

Bet: The FCC is not about to put themselves thru another
"restructuring" of ham radio for years. We've only had three major
overhauls in last 52 years, that's one every 17+ years. History does
repeat itself, yes?

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

2255. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-16 15:23:15 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030216102315.03444.00000169@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 61238

>Subject: Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/14/03 5:00 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030214180023.19751.00001843@mb-cu.aol.com>

>Absolutely. Keep them as isolated as possible until
> they learn The Amateur Way. Make them stand out
> so that they are easy to identify...for whatever reason
> the long-timers have

Stupid answer.

When I was a Novice, that "WN" call "bought" me some help when I made
mistakes on the air, and offers of assistance and advice at club meetings.

Never once did I take any "flak" over BEING a "Novice".

Stupid, Anderscum...really stupid.

Steve, K4YZ

2256. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-16 15:27:10 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030216102710.03444.00000170@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 61239

>Subject: Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)
>From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
>Date: 2/14/03 6:28 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <OQf3a.4778$4y4.2460663@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
>
>And set yourself some type of "mini-goal." That will make it more fun.

Definitely. I got into the 2000 ARRL Sweepstakes with the sole goal of working a "Clean Sweep".

I did it in both modes with no more than 155 contacts in either contest! I hunted multipliers only, and threw in extra contaacts for one's I was unsure of or to throw some points to other friends I heard on.

Got the mugs!

73

Steve, K4YZ

2257. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-16 15:31:48 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030216103148.03444.00000171@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 61240

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 2/15/03 4:12 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0302151412.2dc3b3f3@posting.google.com>

>> This one predominantly staffed by the very same Veterans that Lennie
>> claims "others" show disrespect to.
>
>Dave said that he's never seen a bigger group of people with their
>hands out than veterans.

Hey MinnieLennie....This is a group of Veterans who's hand is out to offer
a helping hand.

Not that YOU or Anderscum would know anything about that...

Steve, K4YZ

2258. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-16 15:42:43 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030216104243.23397.00000293@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 61241

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/15/03 5:15 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030215181524.09808.00000850@mb-fk.aol.com>

>Poor baby...all that volunteer "work" and no one cares to
> erect anything in his honor

Please cite the quote where I asked, Your Putziness.

>During the Gulf War!!! Hmmm...Sgt Putz was "commissioned"
> in the Fighting 4th BDE (soldierly abreviation for 'brigade') during
> the Gulf War? One of those Seven Hostile Action heroism
> events was the Gulf War

Nope. I was in the USMC then.

>I guess all us
> Army veterans should all hang our heads in shame for doing
> rear-area "radio clerking," huh?

Only you, Leonard Anderson, for embellishing YOUR Army service on the memory of combat KIA's who died IN combat 3 years before you were ever in the unit.

>Just having too much fun poking at puffy little neanderthal
> mighty macho morsemen who think the hobby of amateur
> radio is "for the Corps, God, and Country" (in that order).

The "fun" you are poking, Lennie, lands in your own lap. You've lied so often and misrepresented the truth that NO ONE believes or trusts you. (Except Vipul and BB, and I think we've been able to establish what kind of peanut gallery THEY are...)

Pitiful, Lennie...You're just pitiful.

(Rest of anti-volunteerism and anti-veteran tripe snipped...Sam Anderscumisms we've heard before)

Putz.

2259. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-16 15:50:21 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030216105021.23397.00000294@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 61242

>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/15/03 5:15 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030215181524.09808.00000850@mb-fk.aol.com>

>The Far East Command Signal
> Service Battalion (larger than a TN "brigade" in size), 8235th Army
> Unit, only got two Presidential Unit Citations - while I was
> assigned to it - and we wore that distinctive insignia (with a "2"
> in the laurel wreath).

What were the effective dates of those awards, Lennie? I got a nickle says
neithr one was awarded for periods of service WHILE you were a member of it.

2260. Re: New Field Day Entry Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-16 17:01:03 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302160901.59dd188c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61243

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0302152243.21cb0b66@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0302151428.37592b64@posting.google.com>...
> > N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0302141412.536d8b7a@posting.google.com>...
> > >
> > > You ever do it? Bulletin is maybe 150-180 words, no repeats, no asking
> > > for fills. A lot more than "one minute out of five solid copy".
>
> > > You ever do it that way?
> > >
> > > I've done both many, many times. Have you?
> > >
> > > How many points?
> > >
> > > With what antenna?
> > >
> > > How many points ya get for having a lot of choices available?
> > >
> > > How many FD points you make with that thing?
>
> > > You need a logger?
> > >
> > > Waddya mean? That aggregate thing was pure barracuda, find the smart
> > > way and top the pack. Yer just mad ya din't think of it first.
>
> > > How many QSOs so far?
> > > >
> > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> > Jim seems a little testy lately, turns on Crony.
>
> We're natural borned contesters with thick skins. Which comes with our breed.

No you're not. You just had this to say on CW DX? OT:

"I can easily imagine a first crack at this contest being very
discouraging. If you do jump into the thing don't let yourself become
discouraged. None of us were born with any of the skills required to
be competitive in any dx contest. We all started right where you are
now in this game, ground zero and you can do it too."

2261. Re: New Field Day Entry Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-16 17:03:26 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302160903.32876da8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61244

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0302151756.24421a10@posting.google.com>...

> Keyed a "coherent msg"?? ME?? WTF kinda goofy question izzat?? If
> perchance ya mean did I ever actually ship a msg thru NTS the answer
> is emphatically no. NTS is 1915 ham radio epitomized. This is 2003.
> You must have yer weekends mixed up, FD is not the ARRL Portable
> Museums Weekend.

Ha!

2262. Re: New Field Day Entry Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-16 18:31:50 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030216133150.29016.00000361@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 61246

In article <d22b54c3.0302151756.24421a10@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<c2356669.0302141412.536d8b7a@posting.google.com>...
>> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
>news:<d22b54c3.0302140706.67bc792b@posting.google.com>...

>> You ever do it? Bulletin is maybe 150-180 words, no repeats, no asking
>> for fills. A lot more than "one minute out of five solid copy".
>
>Pfft again. I've copied well over 18wpm on the air solid for a helluva
>lot more than just 150-180 words worth of time simply for the
>practice.
>
Then it's 100 easy points for ya.
>
>> > If ya do it right though ya go "File, Mode", select RTTY on yer
>> > logger screen and get it over with in seconds and get back to the run.
>>
>> You ever do it that way?
>
>No, which is exactly why I'm planning to take a whack at it.
>
Like I said, 100 easy points.

>> Fact is W1AW sends the bulletin before the 'test even starts, so if
>> yer smart you don't have to use operating time at all.
>
>I'll look into that. Tnx.

Us natural borned thick skinned contesters do give out the tips to those smart enough to pick up on 'em.
>
>> Points is points. They wanna give me 100 points per mile run on FD,
>> I'll put on the shoes.
>
>Prostitution is illegal.
>
I didn't see any bonus points for it, anyway.
>
>> > Now I'm really lost. I think you're postulating that twitching the
>> > paddles for a quick contest exchange requires a different skill set
>> > from twitching the paddles to send a "coherent message"? NOT.
>>

>> I've done both many, many times. Have you?
>
>Keyed a "coherent msg"?? ME?? WTF kinda goofy question izzat?? If
>perchance ya mean did I ever actually ship a msg thru NTS the answer
>is emphatically no. NTS is 1915 ham radio epitomized.

Not at all. Back then they used the trunk line system. NTS is post WW2.

>This is 2003.

So what's your solution? Where's the all-digital high speed UHF relay system
that we were told was just around the corner, as soon as the code test went
away?

>You must have yer weekends mixed up, FD is not the ARRL Portable
>Museums Weekend.

Points is points. Besides, the Southgate Type 7 is a decade newer than your
TS-940.
>
>> And it's another easy 100 points for maybe 15 minutes on a traffic
>> net. How long did ya say those 50 phone/ 25 CW QSOs would take ya?
>
>Yeah, right, you're gonna pump out ten on 90 second centers outta
>nowhere. Baloney.

What are you talking about?

The message to the SM - one little message, maybe 20 words, made up ahead of
time - is worth 100 points. Show up at net time, tell NCS ya got one for the
SM, stand by while savoring dinner, then pass the thing when he calls ya. Maybe
ya hafta QSY down 5 to pass it to another check in, whatever. Once it's gone,
NCS will let ay go toot sweet because he knows you're a contest station and
eager to get back. 15 minutes tops. I've been doing it for decades. Last year I
let the other op do it on SSB and it took him 20+ minutes 'cause he had to wait
in line and the SSB boys don't often do the up 5, down 10 thing.

How long will it take ya to make 50 phone or 25 CW QSOs to earn the equivalent
100 points?
>
>> > My radio blew
>> > up ten minutes into the event.
>>
>> My Southgate Type 6 and Type 7 never had that problem. Nor my K2.
>
>Point please??
>
The point is points. A rig that makes points is a good rig, a rig that doesn't,
isn't.

>> > Duh? Shouldn't happen this year, new
>> > reddio. Slick little boy toy, I can punch a button, jump off 15ssb and
>> > be all over a satellite in seconds.

>>
>> With what antenna?
>
>Antennae actually. If I actually do it prolly a cross-polarized Arrow
>146/437-10 for UO-14. Up 145.975 down 435.070. Can be done with just
>whips but I'd druther have ten elements worth of gain on .070 and nail
>the sucker quick after it pops over the horizon and get back to the
>run on 40.

Sweet! Point the thing at the azimuth where the sat is expected to rise and
fire away.

>Should be a lotta FD stations looking for q's, maybe I get
>to do a FD pileup for once. I'd have to build a tripod for it outta
>2x3s and check it all out before the event. Hunnert points. You can do
>it too, all ya hafta do is pop for the 2m & 430 band boards for yer
>K2.

Lessee, you need to bring two antennas, tripod mount and hardware, associated
coax and other goodies. Plus set it up and take it down. Have fun!
>>
>> How many points ya get for having a lot of choices available?
>
>Hmmmm . . OK. Verus the band/mode options you have?

Points is points.
>
>The UO-14 thing for one, any phone mode is another. 160/6/2/430 all
>modes is another. Plus a couple other tricks I could pull @ 100 points
>each if I actually gave a hoot about any of it. Which I don't. I'm a
>helluva lot more interested in running some antenna tests than I am in
>FD scores.

2980 points, 629 CW/11 phone QSOs, class 1B-1. No help at all, FD site 73 miles
from home. No computer, not even a memory keyer. No usable trees, put up a 41
foot mast single handed. Gas engine generator for power.
>
>> > Yeah, yeah, and you ougta been there when I was rolling EUs on 80 wih
>> > my ARC-5. Without any 866s.
>>
>> How many FD points you make with that thing?
>
>How many do you have confirmed on 80 with any rig? I have my 100+++.

Not worth any points on FD.

>> > > I like the picnic idea.
>> >
>> > So do I. I've already insructed my cook to do another Saturday nite
>> > Cajun filet for FD.
>>
>> You need a logger?

>
>Get away from my chow bowl!

bwaahaahaa!
>
>> > Certainly. Reinforces my dim view of the whole thing.
>>
>> Waddya mean? That aggregate thing was pure barracuda, find the smart
>> way and top the pack. Yer just mad ya din't think of it first.
>
>I'm not above a bit of slimery but that was outrageous.

It worked, though. And actually met the goal of the whole thing, which was to
promote mobile installations back when they were a big deal to do.
>
>. . .
>> > with the 847 and I'll have TS-940 style 150w autotuning 160 thru 10.
>>
>> How many QSOs so far?
>
>Zip.

No points for that!

Good to be thinking about FD when the snow is piling up outside, anyway.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2263. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-16 18:31:51 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030216133151.29016.00000362@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 61245

In article <d22b54c3.0302160709.7dc14c97@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20030215203615.12173.00000572@mb-mr.aol.com>...
>
>> If/when S25.5 goes away and FCC dumps Element 1, what should the US license
>> classes, requirements and privs be?
>
>Bet: The FCC is not about to put themselves thru another
>"restructuring" of ham radio for years.

Probably true. The most likely scenario is they just dump Element 1 and do nothing else.

>We've only had three major
>overhauls in last 52 years, that's one every 17+ years.

Depends on what you call a major overhaul...

1951 gave us the basis of the scheme we have now.
1952-3 gave Generals and above all operating privs.
1968-9 gave us subbands on top of subbands
1990-1 gave us code waivers and a license with no code test
2000 simplified things somewhat, dropping two code test speeds and closing three license classes to new issues.

If ya lump 51-2-3 into one pile, it's about 16 years to the next redo. Then about twenty years to serious code test changes, and another decade to the last restructuring. Which was 3 years ago.

> History does
>repeat itself, yes?

Sure - lookit how things were before 1951. Three classes of license, one code test speed.....

>
Only way I can see FCC doing anything besides just dumping Element 1 is if there's a simple, well-thought-out restructure proposal put before them that gathers widespread support AND simplifies FCC's life.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2264. Re: After S25.5 Goes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-16 18:31:52 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030216133152.29016.00000363@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 61247

In article <3CM3a.408$hj.424769@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030215203615.12173.00000572@mb-mr.aol.com...
>> Let me ask you the same questions I asked Bill:
>>
>> If/when S25.5 goes away and FCC dumps Element 1, what should the US
>license
>> classes, requirements and privs be?
>>
>> Obviously FCC isn't going to go for a more-complex system than we have
>now, but
>> maybe a better system can be developed that will have wide ranging support
>in
>> the amateur radio community.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>Jim,
>
>My *personal* view would be as follows:
>
>1) fix the disconnect between power levels and technical knowledge required
>for the tech license (either make the test a bit more comprehensive or limit
>the power to more reasonable levels ... the first option would make entry
>harder, so I prefer the second approach, so as not to make the bar
>discouragingly high for newbies)

As we discussed before, RF safety at VHF/UHF is a big concern. To avoid taking
privs away from anybody, existing Techs could be allowed to run full power,
keeping their old license docs to show they really are "old" Techs.

>2) add limited power HF access to the tech license (same bands as General?)

If Techs get the same HF/MF as Generals, then the only reason to upgrade to
General will be to get more power. Is that really the most desirable incentive?

But Techs should definitely have a lot more HF/MF spectrum and modes than just
the old Novice bands.

>3) improve the General and Extra tests a bit ... not necessarily to make
>them "harder" but to make them more up-to-date and comprehensive ... if this
>requires a reasonable increase in the number of questions on the test, so be
it.

Yup. In fact, I think the idea should be to make the Tech written more focused on operational and theory fundamentals.

>4) fix outmoded bandwidth/baud_rate/modulation_type and any other technical
>rules that limit innovation

Gotta give us more detail than that.

I'd say the HF/MF bands should be divided by occupied bandwidth of mode, and forget about the baud rate or modulation type. What we now call the "CW/digital" parts of the band would be open to any documented mode that has less than, say, 900 Hz bandwidth. What we now call the "phone" parts of the bands would be open to any documented mode that has less than, say, 7000 Hz bandwidth. And the old "Novice" subbands would be open to any documented mode that will fit inside the subband.

>5) pretty much leave the rest as is (if it ain't broke, don't fix it ....)

Three classes of license, 10 year term, no age requirement, etc.
>
I forgot one question: What happens to existing Advanceds and Novices? Just leave 'em alone?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2265. Re: After S25.5 Goes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-16 22:18:25 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.haf1gt2.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 61248

On 16 Feb 2003 18:31:52 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>As we discussed before, RF safety at VHF/UHF is a big concern. To
>avoid taking privs away from anybody, existing Techs could be allowed
>to run full power, keeping their old license docs to show they really
>are "old" Techs.

>> 2) add limited power HF access to the tech license (same bands as
>> General?)

>If Techs get the same HF/MF as Generals, then the only reason to
>upgrade to General will be to get more power. Is that really the most
>desirable incentive?

To some of the "unititated" (i.e. those amongst us who have never
done compliance enforcement) power levels by class may appear to be
a good incentive.

For enforcement purposes, it is a bloody nightmare.

Best to find another incentive, and meanwhile make knowledge of RF
safety at all power levels up to the maximum authorized power a
basic testing requirement for ALL classes. Anyone who can't or
won't exhibit that knowledge is not qualified to be permitted to
operate a radio transmitter, whether six years old or sixty years
old.

To misquote an old Gil cartoon from the early 50s -

"Here lies old Jack McStencil, who drew arcs with a lead pencil"

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2266. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-16 22:37:02 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030216173702.14527.00000382@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 61249

In article <wXv1a.210618$HG.35249296@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>, "Bert Craig"
<wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> writes:

>"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
>news:6rZ0a.169945$HG.28632745@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
>> Imagine that...a young person
>> actually having Morse code!
>
>Oops, that was supposed to read "Imagine that...a young person actually
>having <fun with> Morse code!"
>
Not hard to imagine at all. Seen it in reality many times. Also experienced it
myself.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2267. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-16 22:37:03 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030216173703.14527.00000383@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 61250

In article <BA71E89A.EADE%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
writes:

>"Bill, W7TI" wrote:
>>
>> IOW, the discussion will go away when the
>> problem goes away. Clinton didn't consider
>> the blue dress a problem; you don't consider
>> incentive licensing a problem. Others do.
>
> But neither of those problems are going to go away.

I don't think an incentive licensing system is a problem. The blue dress is a
different story.

>The blue dress is a
>past that cannot be changed, and there is no move towards removing incentive
>licensing. Therefore, I think the point is that to continue to dwell on
>either is somewhat useless.

The thing that really bugged me about the blue dress incident was the bald
faced lying connected with it.

As for removing incentive licensing, FCC seems to have moved from the idea that
amateur radio needs 5 or 6 levels of license to the idea that 3 levels are
adequate. Seems like a form of removal to me.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2268. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-16 22:37:04 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030216173704.14527.00000384@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 61351

In article <20030213203849.23875.00000438@mb-fz.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>Subject: Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
>Date: 14 Feb 2003 01:38:49 GMT
>
>>Subject: CW DX? (somewhat OT)
>>From: "Jackie" buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com
>>Date: 2/13/03 7:16 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <QrX2a.101930$be.73749@rwcrnsc53>
>
>>Regarding next weekend's CW contest-- is this generally for more experienced
>>CW ops?
>
> To tell you the truth, I wonder how many of the high speed CW sgnals you
>will hear are really "experienced ops" or "experienced programs"...!

Experienced, highly skilled ops.
>
> Most of the higher speed ops will go lower in the band, Jackie. Work
>upwards from .040 up early in the contest. (ie: 14.040). You might also try
>the "Novice" sub bands, although I don't think folks go that "high" in the
>band
>anymore.

>>Do the faster coders usually slow
>>down for a slow coder's answer to their CQ, or is this not a good place and
>>time to be answering CQ's if you're slow on the key? Just curious.
>
> Unless they think you are in a multiplier they need they will probably
>skip past you anyway.

All depends how many others are answering their CQ. When the pickings get slim, they'll take the time to work anybody who calls.

--

Think about how many stations you've heard on the air this weekend, all using CW. Consider that there are lots more out there you can't hear due to propagation, antenna limitations, etc. Also those you won't hear because they're mostly in hunt'n'pounce mode rather than calling CQ.

Remember all those stations next time somebody says or writes that CW has no relevance in ham radio today, or that nobody uses it anymore.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2269. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-16 22:46:53 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E5014C3.C133E0A7@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61352

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E4D6126.A9B595B7@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <3E4C528A.6A0F4E3C@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >That just about sums it up.
> >>
> >> 7 x 24 = 168, not 148
> >>
> >> Did you fail remedial arithmetic too, defunct diplomat?
> >
> >Shall we go over just a few of yours again, Leonard? "Immagure", "Go
> >such an 807 plate cap", "nobless".
>
> Not a problem, Herr Editor! I don't give a snit. :-)

You've given any number right here in r.r.a.p.

> >I'll skip the N2EY quote this time.
>
> Why? Don't you have that as a macro? You should. It would
> make it easier to look down on inferiors... :-)

Are you now a group rather than a unit? N2EY's quote referred to nobody
but you.

> >I'm sure folks know the drill on your postings.
>
> Oh? Do they need novacaine? :-)

The repetitive litany sung by you is mind numbing enough.

> >Remember the posts
> >where you claim only to address the removal of the morse code test in
> >civil debate.
>
> I used to be an optimist. :-)

There is no evidence of that claim.

> I remember KH2D setting the style of the mighty macho morsemen
> in here five years ago. Jim is not doing so well now, moved from
> Guam to Florida(?) or someplace. Does the colonel wish to
> take his place?

How is a move from Guam to Florida indicative of someone's not doing
well?

> >How about the one where you'll go for the "Extra right out
> >of the box"?
>
> Yeah, how about that? :-)

Right there for everyone to see in the archives.

> >Want to go over your well known "Key Officers" list rant?
>
> Nah. It would highlight your mighty and important "service to
> the nation" or something, swell your ego (or 'swill it,' hard to
> tell). You are free to copy certain mastheads from HR
> magazine...those were in service to Communications Technology
> Incorporated...same as those "key lists" of yours. That was
> for Ham Radio magazine on ham radio topics. Did state
> department key officer lists have anything to do with ham radio?

You don't get any wiggle room, Leonard. It was YOU who brought up the
listing.
It had nothing at all to do with amateur radio. It was simply another
attempt at a slam by you. It backfired and you ended up eating your
words yet again.

> Hey, I've got an idea! Why don't we all go into a discussion of
> the technical importance of using CW as an order-wire for an
> RTTY circuit! You can explain how CW is so beneficial, logical,
> and etc. and why other HF communications doesn't do that
> marvelous innovation! Yeah! Real RADIO talk! :-)

Been there. Done that. Sent you the T-shirt.

Dave K8MN

2270. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-16 22:58:00 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E50175F.73EF25EA@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61353

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E4E5974.DC5E05E8@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <oMM2a.97310$be.72203@rwcrnsc53>, "Jackie"
> >> <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> writes:
> > >
>
> >> Amateur radio was conspicuously missing in the 1994 damage
> >> area during the week following that earthquake.
> > >
> >Your statement is simply not true.
>
> Let me correct that. Radio amateurs WERE THERE, but they
> were not engaged in amateur distress/emergency
> communications for any general public. At least two such
> amateurs were too busy working their regular job restoring
> damaged utility lines to engage in ARRL-approved
> emergency/disaster/distress communications.

So basically you have no idea what radio amateurs did or did not do.

> >> FEMA put in
> >> its fly-away sat terminals featuring video message boards for
> >> relatives of the victims. That was on TV news.
> > >
> >That is what FEMA should have done. The presence of elements of
> >professional emergency management people in no why minimizes the
> >contribution of amateur radio volunteers.
>
> FEMA did it. The beginnings of SHARES did it. The Professionals
> did the overwhelming brunt of it.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk, you want to demean the pros just so that you can
> shine noble light on amateurs. Boo hoo, you cry when your
> bulb burns out...

It is totally beyond me how you could have read anything like that into
what I wrote.

> >Professional public safety communications *can* stop operating depending
> >upon the nature of the emergency. Radio amateurs have often assisted

> >overwhelmed public safety communicators. That is not to say that any
> >ham with an HT will be a boon to those public safety professionals.
> >ARES groups which train on a regular basis can be a very valueable asset
> >to those public safety professionals.
>
> "ARES" isn't the only or even the prime grouping. The Auxilliary
> Communications Service of the State of California was not
> fully formed in 1994 (compared to two years ago) but they are
> large and do not discriminate on what sort of certificate anyone
> got years ago.

Who wrote anything about a "prime grouping" or anything specific to
California?
Where was there any mention of certificates?

> This newsgroup is NOT some auxilliary of ARRL so try to thicken
> your skin to bear up under commentary that is not overwhelmingly
> in favor of amateurs.

I wrote nothing about r.r.a.p. being an "auxilliary" (the word has one
"L").
of the ARRL.

> >Straw man alert! Professional systems do not always break down. Neither
> >are emergencies always of a nature which overwhelm professional systems.
>
> Not a strawman of any sort. A MYTH. Urban legend among
> some amateurs.

Commercial or governmental communications may break down or may be
overwhelmed.
That is not myth or an urban legend. Having assistance from radio
amateurs available is a good thing.

> >You have a superior
> >"I've-been-a-professional-in-radio-for-half-a-century" attitude and you
> >talk down to those who don't agree with you. I'm just pointing that out.
>
> Live with it, colonel, I have. Gruss gott. <clik>

Ditto your statement regarding radio amateurs from which I copied the
gist of my statement.

Dave K8MN

2271. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-16 23:17:37 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030216181737.10587.00000314@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 61354

From K4YZ:
>>Okay, this definition is possible. I have never seen anyone reference this
>>phrase to any other meaning than technical achievement.
>
> That's because the sphere of your experience is very minimal.
>
>Steve, K4YZ

Please list one example of where your definition is used, in a sentense. I cannot find an example of "radio art" other than technical achievement.

>(Except Vipul and BB, and I think we've been able to establish what kind of peanut gallery THEY are...)

The only thing you established is your hostile attitude.

> Only you, Leonard Anderson, for embellishing YOUR Army service on the
>memory of combat KIA's who died IN combat 3 years before you were ever in the
>unit.

Not related to amateur radio. If someone disagree's with you, you try to attack the person's background.

> The "fun" you are poking, Lennie, lands in your own lap. You've lied so
>often and misrepresented the truth that NO ONE believes or trusts you.

He seems to put forth some credible points, and they are well backed up.

Let's rewrite N2EY's paragraph:
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes K5YZ's views,

K4YZ will always find some fault with someone's background to use it to claim the person has no credibility in Ham radio.

However, he will go to great lenghts to defend a club's action for a club he has never been to just to prove the club did not use hype.

> he/she will be the target of
>K4YZ's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

K4YZ insults, ridicules wherever he can. He has insulted alot in this thread. General infantile behavior is also pretty common. Name calling often includes "putz".

2272. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-16 23:50:49 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030216185049.10587.00000315@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 61355

From: "KB9TMP"
>That's easy V just learn the code and you'll "Beat" the test, or if
>you feel you have to cheat it just learn the letters and pro signs.
>If you pass you'll have cheated the test.

I don't want to learn the code, okay? I have a BSEE and am just interested in the technical portion. Learning the code is a waste of time.

Having the code license actually works against me, since it shows one wasted time learning code. This takes away from other (legitimate) skills. I agree with that opinion. Also I just don't find code fun and I resent the higher license class being tied to the code.

>> However, that picture of the club Homebrewing, shown to people outside the
>> club, is wrong. It gives the apperance of wanting to homebrew, when noone
>in
>> the club actually is interested in that.

>I have a picture on my wall from the newspaper that shows our first
>club meeting with me as the president. We had it at a local resturant
>but none of us were eating at the time. Does that show that our club
>doesn't like food?

If they had their picture taken, they probably posed for the picture. So, they had to put their utensils down.

The homebrewing photo is placed to show the club likes to Homebrew. However, noone in the club likes to homebrew. I see a contradiction.

2273. After S25.5 goes : restructuring US hams minds

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 00:17:32 UTC
From: Anonymous <cripto@ecn.org>
Message-ID: <002906a32b858a3f8b8774d30104f2a6@ecn.org>
Source record: 61356

The urgent thing to do is to restructure US hams minds. They always talk about "classes" for ham-radio.
Cool guys ! This is a hobby ... One class is sufficient, same power, same bands. No more privileges.
What is your problem ? You have a complex about the length of your dick ?

Its the same with oil, use smaller engines in your cars and less power in your ham stations, you will need less oil and you will not bother all the planet with the Iraq war to get its oil.

Think that you are only human beeings like others on the planet, not superior clones. You must understand that. Without the others you are nothing on Earth ... If all the guys on this planet made so much pollution than USA, you will be yet dead.

So, its time to change your mind ...

Terminator

2274. Re: New Field Day Entry Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 00:34:19 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302161634.2ac3534f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61357

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0302141412.536d8b7a@posting.google.com>...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0302140706.67bc792b@posting.google.com>...
> > N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0302130937.73a8b506@posting.google.com>...
> > > kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0302120710.6d30e862@posting.google.com>...
>
> > > Ya missed the point.
> > >
> > > Copying a 100+ word bulletin sent at a specific time and freq with no
> > > repeats or fills
> >
> > On CW ya need a clock, a rcvr and a pencil.
>
> Paper helps, too.
>
> > What's the big deal about
> > that?
>
> You ever do it? Bulletin is maybe 150-180 words, no repeats, no asking
> for fills. A lot more than "one minute out of five solid copy".
>
> > If ya do it right though ya go "File, Mode", select RTTY on yer
> > logger screen and get it over with in seconds and get back to the run.
>
> You ever do it that way?
>
> Fact is W1AW sends the bulletin before the 'test even starts, so if
> yer smart you don't have to use operating time at all.

Jim, sounds like you're outside the legal time period. Go copy it again.

2275. Re: After S25.5 Goes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 00:49:16 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <gkW3a.478$hj.476661@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 61358

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030216133152.29016.00000363@mb-fy.aol.com...
> In article <3CM3a.408$hj.424769@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20030215203615.12173.00000572@mb-mr.aol.com...
> >> Let me ask you the same questions I asked Bill:
> >>
> >> If/when S25.5 goes away and FCC dumps Element 1, what should the US
> >license
> >> classes, requirements and privs be?
> >>
> >> Obviously FCC isn't going to go for a more-complex system than we have
> >now, but
> >> maybe a better system can be developed that will have wide ranging
support
> >in
> >> the amateur radio community.
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >Jim,
> >
> >My *personal* view would be as follows:
> >
> >1) fix the disconnect between power levels and technical knowledge
required
> >for the tech license (either make the test a bit more comprehensive or
limit
> >the power to more reasonable levels ... the first option would make entry
> >harder, so I prefer the second approach, so as not to make the bar
> >discouragingly high for newbies)
>
> As we discussed before, RF safety at VHF/UHF is a big concern. To avoid
taking
> privs away from anybody, existing Techs could be allowed to run full
power,
> keeping their old license docs to show they really are "old" Techs.

If it's broke, it ought to be fixed ... but I doubt that you'd really be
taking away
something that's actually used by the vast majority of techs if you imposed
a limit

akin to what most "higher powered" mobiles put out ... say about 50W ...
Also, I think that most of the "old" techs who would likely be doing
something
more than just FM/packet/APRS with commercially built radios have probably
already upgraded to General or Extra already.
>
> >2) add limited power HF access to the tech license (same bands as
General?)
>
> If Techs get the same HF/MF as Generals, then the only reason to upgrade
to
> General will be to get more power. Is that really the most desirable
incentive?

Maybe not ... but they need to get "mainstreamed" so that they get a
(decent)
taste of HF ... to be honest, I'm hard pressed to think of a better "carrot"
than
giving them access but limiting their power (seems to be the way in the UK
and
when I worked from 4U1ITU, I gave preference to the new foundation class
guys from the UK, to give them "a rare one" and build some enthusiasm for
their
new privs ...)

> But Techs should definitely have a lot more HF/MF spectrum and modes than
just
> the old Novice bands.
>
> >3) improve the General and Extra tests a bit ... not necessarily to make
> >them "harder" but to make them more up-to-date and comprehensive ... if
this
> >requires a reasonable increase in the number of questions on the test, so
be
> it.
>
> Yup. In fact, I think the idea should be to make the Tech written more
focused
> on operational and theory fundamentals.
>
> >4) fix outmoded bandwidth/baud_rate/modulation_type and any other
technical
> >rules that limit innovation
>
> Gotta give us more detail than that.

Needs more thought to be detailed in a really coherent manner, but current
rules
tend to stifle innovation (and before folks start flaming, I'm not talking
about doing
spread spectrum all over HF at high powers ... if at all ... the HF bands

aren't wide
enough for SS except at rather low data rates, though there could be some
applications
for that ... but those applications could use low power ... much less than 1
W)

> I'd say the HF/MF bands should be divided by occupied bandwidth of mode,
and
> forget about the baud rate or modulation type. What we now call the
> "CW/digital" parts of the band would be open to any documented mode that
has
> less than, say, 900 Hz bandwidth. What we now call the "phone" parts of
the
> bands would be open to any documented mode that has less than, say, 7000
Hz
> bandwidth. And the old "Novice" subbands would be open to any documented
mode
> that will fit inside the subband.

Sounds heavily slanted towards low data rate stuff ... and why would you
allow the
entire old novice bands to be consumed by one signal while restricting to
much lower
bandwidths elsewhere?

> >5) pretty much leave the rest as is (if it ain't broke, don't fix it
....)
>
> Three classes of license, 10 year term, no age requirement, etc.
> >
> I forgot one question: What happens to existing Advanceds and Novices?
Just
> leave 'em alone?

Seems to be the approach ... though why someone who's actually
interested/active
in ham radio and already has lifetime credit for the 5 wpm Morse test would
remain
a novice really stumps me ... as for the advanceds, I suspect that
eventually all of them
will either upgrade or go SK (not that I'm eager for the latter in any way
...).

Once the numbers in those classes drop to zero, they can simply be ignored.

73,
Carl - wk3c

2276. ARRL DX CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 00:50:40 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b2pbks$7vf$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 61359

Anyone play in the contest? I managed 651q and nearly half a mil points.

SO HP all bands.

Dan/W4NTI

2277. Net Tonight

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 00:56:30 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <37F9B23ACCE4012D.EE81E1F48E620A99.F7A9C13475ED77D1@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 61360

For anyone who is interested, there will be a net tonight, in Dallas, pertaining to the activities of amateur radio operators during the Shuttle Recovery operations.

I am not real familiar with how this works, but I've been told the net will be "broadcast" (may be wrong terminology) over EchoLink. I do know the software for this can be had at http://www.echolink.org/el/ as well as other web locations. In fact, once the software is installed, with a computer microphone, you may ragchew with other hams all 'cross the world. How to "connect" for the net here in Dallas I haven't a clue. My guess would be the K5JD icon, near the bottom. Maybe there are some savvy enough with EchoLink to figure this out.

Thought you all might be interested in at least listening. Via EchoLink, it is my presumption that you could enter the net with recognition from NCS, whom I believe will be AA5QX, Jim Lawyer.

Kim W5TIT

2278. Re: Net Tonight

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 01:32:27 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <94156280A0E135EB.F2C2544EEFA617A3.97A80AFDEE37F592@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 61361

Whoops--forgot to tell you all the time! It will be at 8:30 Central Time.
Also, if you tune in and hear the RACES net, don't worry, there will be a
general net immediately following the RACES net.

"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:37F9B23ACCE4012D.EE81E1F48E620A99.F7A9C13475ED77D1@lp.airnews.net...
> For anyone who is interested, there will be a net tonight, in Dallas,
> pertaining to the activities of amateur radio operators during the Shuttle
> Recovery operations.
>
> I am not real familiar with how this works, but I've been told the net
will
> be "broadcast" (may be wrong terminology) over EchoLink. I do know the
> software for this can be had at http://www.echolink.org/el/ as well as
other
> web locations. In fact, once the software is installed, with a computer
> microphone, you may ragchew with other hams all 'cross the world. How to
> "connect" for the net here in Dallas I haven't a clue. My guess would be
> the K5JD icon, near the bottom. Maybe there are some savvy enough with
> EchoLink to figure this out.
>
> Thought you all might be interested in at least listening. Via EchoLink,
it
> is my presumption that you could enter the net with recognition from NCS,
> whom I believe will be AA5QX, Jim Lawyer.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

2279. Re: Net Tonight

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 01:53:11 UTC
From: Jackie <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com>
Message-ID: <bgX3a.144940$Ec4.144845@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 61362

EchoLink is very cool. Too bad the mic input to my soundcard's shot or I would've been using it. Having tried it out (and then determining that my mic input is shot), I was still able to "connect" to different repeaters and "talk" via the computer chat interface (if the stations had themselves hooked up on a PC). The interface is very easy to use; I didn't even need a tutorial to guide me. Do check it out, it might be very interesting listening to what the Shuttle recovery group has to say.

Jackie
KC0ODY

"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:37F9B23ACCE4012D.EE81E1F48E620A99.F7A9C13475ED77D1@lp.airnews.net...
> For anyone who is interested, there will be a net tonight, in Dallas,
> pertaining to the activities of amateur radio operators during the Shuttle
> Recovery operations.
>
> I am not real familiar with how this works, but I've been told the net
will
> be "broadcast" (may be wrong terminology) over EchoLink. I do know the
> software for this can be had at http://www.echolink.org/el/ as well as
other
> web locations. In fact, once the software is installed, with a computer
> microphone, you may ragchew with other hams all 'cross the world. How to
> "connect" for the net here in Dallas I haven't a clue. My guess would be
> the K5JD icon, near the bottom. Maybe there are some savvy enough with
> EchoLink to figure this out.
>
> Thought you all might be interested in at least listening. Via EchoLink,
it
> is my presumption that you could enter the net with recognition from NCS,
> whom I believe will be AA5QX, Jim Lawyer.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

2280. Re: After S25.5 Goes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 01:53:14 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030216205314.23598.00000329@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 61363

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.haf1gt2.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 16 Feb 2003 18:31:52 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
>>As we discussed before, RF safety at VHF/UHF is a big concern. To
>>avoid taking privs away from anybody, existing Techs could be allowed
>>to run full power, keeping their old license docs to show they really
>>are "old" Techs.
>
>>> 2) add limited power HF access to the tech license (same bands as
>>> General?)
>
>>If Techs get the same HF/MF as Generals, then the only reason to
>>upgrade to General will be to get more power. Is that really the most
>>desirable incentive?
>
> To some of the "unititated" (i.e. those amongst us who have never
> done compliance enforcement) power levels by class may appear to be
> a good incentive.
>
> For enforcement purposes, it is a bloody nightmare.

I hear ya, Phil! It's my understanding that one of the big reasons the
incentive licensing changes of the '60s involved loss of spectrum rather than
power was that it is much easier to enforce a violation for frequency privs...

And of course it's an uphill go to get The Comission to add restrictions that
don't exist today.

But let me play devil's advocate and ask this question....

Once upon a time, Novices were only allowed 75 watts input - was there ever a
serious enforcement problem with QRO Novices? How about today, with the
low-power limits on the Novice subbands and 30 meters?

>
> Best to find another incentive, and meanwhile make knowledge of RF
> safety at all power levels up to the maximum authorized power a
> basic testing requirement for ALL classes.

Kinda like the "core course" requirements for a degree.

> Anyone who can't or
> won't exhibit that knowledge is not qualified to be permitted to
> operate a radio transmitter, whether six years old or sixty years
> old.

Do you think today's test questions and methods are an adequate determination
of that knowledge?
>
> To misquote an old Gil cartoon from the early 50s -
>
> "Here lies old Jack McStencil, who drew arcs with a lead pencil"
>
HAW!! But yes, a serious message. Like the one with the caption:

"It will cause you to remove your hand VERY rapidly"...

73 de Jim, N2EY

2281. Re: After S25.5 goes : restructuring US hams minds

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 02:03:58 UTC
From: me <me@here.com>
Message-ID: <b2pftnjek1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 61364

Next Idiot, go ahead.

"Anonymous" <cripto@ecn.org> wrote in message
news:002906a32b858a3f8b8774d30104f2a6@ecn.org...
>
> The urgent thing to do is to restructure US hams
> minds. They always talk about "classes" for
> ham-radio.
> Cool guys ! This is a hobby ... One class is
> sufficient, same power, same bands. No more
> privileges.
> What is your problem ? You have a complex
> about the length of your dick ?
>
> Its the same with oil, use smaller engines in your
> cars and less power in your ham stations, you will
> need less oil and you will not bother all the planet
> with the Iraq war to get its oil.
>
> Think that you are only human beeings like others
> on the planet, not superior clones. You must
> understand that. Without the others you are
> nothing on Earth ... If all the guys on this planet
> made so much pollution than USA, you will be
> yet dead.
>
> So, its time to change your mind ...
>
> Terminator
>
>
>
>
>
>

2282. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 02:04:47 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030216210447.19751.00001967@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 61365

In article <c2356669.0302141048.396cda03@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>Well, the tests these days are all createdby the QPC, who are
>volunteers. FCC checks and approves, but the grunt work of writing the
>things is up to ham volunteers. Which means that last part could be
>done under existing rules.
>
>Here's a question I forgot: Should Learners have distinctive calls, or
>at least not be able to get any unassigned call?
>
>How about minimum age requirements?
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

I agree with Carl Stevenson's idea that entry-level hams should have reduced power limits on VHF/UHF.

I don't think that entry-level hams should have the option of requesing Vanity Call signs. In fact, I would like to change the Vanity call sign program to eliminate the ability to request out-of-district call signs, with the retroactive cancellation of any which have already been assigned!

Of course, everyone's assuming that when S25.5 goes away at the International level, that the FCC will automatically drop the 5 WPM code test for General/Extra. Has there been any indication from the FCC that this was a fait accompli? It would be fun to see the FCC say, "We've done enough changing of the requirements, they're not set, live with them, we're not going to pay to print up a new set of rules just to drop the code test!" However, I'm sure that the whiners would eventually get their way with the government.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2283. Re: Net Tonight

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 02:09:13 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <v50h43sb5ld077@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 61366

Jackie, are you sure your mic input is shot? Double click the speaker
icon in your tray and when the window opens, check to see if your microphone
is enabled (there is a box which may need to be unchecked). BTW, I am using
Echo Link and have found it necessary to change my firewall configuration as
well to use it.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Jackie" <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> wrote in message
news:bgX3a.144940$Ec4.144845@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net...
> EchoLink is very cool. Too bad the mic input to my soundcard's shot or I
> would've been using it. Having tried it out (and then determining that my
> mic input is shot), I was still able to "connect" to different repeaters
and
> "talk" via the computer chat interface (if the stations had themselves
> hooked up on a PC). The interface is very easy to use; I didn't even need
a
> tutorial to guide me. Do check it out, it might be very interesting
> listening to what the Shuttle recovery group has to say.
>
> Jackie
> KC0ODY
>
> "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> news:37F9B23ACCE4012D.EE81E1F48E620A99.F7A9C13475ED77D1@lp.airnews.net...
> > For anyone who is interested, there will be a net tonight, in Dallas,
> > pertaining to the activities of amateur radio operators during the
Shuttle
> > Recovery operations.
> >
> > I am not real familiar with how this works, but I've been told the net
> will
> > be "broadcast" (may be wrong terminology) over EchoLink. I do know the
> > software for this can be had at http://www.echolink.org/el/ as well as
> other
> > web locations. In fact, once the software is installed, with a computer
> > microphone, you may ragchew with other hams all 'cross the world. How
to
> > "connect" for the net here in Dallas I haven't a clue. My guess would
be
> > the K5JD icon, near the bottom. Maybe there are some savvy enough with
> > EchoLink to figure this out.
> >
> > Thought you all might be interested in at least listening. Via

EchoLink,
> it
> > is my presumption that you could enter the net with recognition from
NCS,
> > whom I believe will be AA5QX, Jim Lawyer.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
> >
> >
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.455 / Virus Database: 255 - Release Date: 2/13/03

2284. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 02:40:37 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9324DC71DD79Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 61368

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in
news:20030216210447.19751.00001967@mb-cu.aol.com:

> In article <c2356669.0302141048.396cda03@posting.google.com>,
> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:
>
>>Well, the tests these days are all createdby the QPC, who are
>>volunteers. FCC checks and approves, but the grunt work of writing the
>>things is up to ham volunteers. Which means that last part could be
>>done under existing rules.
>>
>>Here's a question I forgot: Should Learners have distinctive calls, or
>>at least not be able to get any unassigned call?
>>
>>How about minimum age requirements?
>>
>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> I agree with Carl Stevenson's idea that entry-level hams should have
> reduced power limits on VHF/UHF.
>
> I don't think that entry-level hams should have the option of requesing
> Vanity Call signs. In fact, I would like to change the Vanity call
> sign program to eliminate the ability to request out-of-district call
> signs, with the retroactive cancellation of any which have already been
> assigned!
>
> Of course, everyone's assuming that when S25.5 goes away at the
> International level, that the FCC will automatically drop the 5 WPM
> code test for General/Extra. Has there been any indication from the
> FCC that this was a fait accompli? It would be fun to see the FCC
> say, "We've done enough changing of the requirements, they're not
> set, live with them, we're not going to pay to print up a new set of
> rules just to drop the code test!" However, I'm sure that the whiners
> would eventually get their way with the government.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>

From a regulator's point of view, dumping Element 1 is a 'small' change!
That's why the smart money is that they will do just that. Someone needs
to think of a 'simple' way to phase out the closed licence classes of
Advanced and Novice, and to redistribute their subbands. The FCC have said
that we must reach a consensus on that, and then they will do it, but not

before. I bet this group has a few proposals for that.

2285. Re: Net Tonight

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 02:41:53 UTC
From: Jackie <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com>
Message-ID: <RZX3a.142603$be.126228@rwcrnsc53>
Source record: 61369

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:v50h43sb5ld077@corp.supernews.com...
> Jackie, are you sure your mic input is shot? Double click the speaker
> icon in your tray and when the window opens, check to see if your
microphone
> is enabled (there is a box which may need to be unchecked). BTW, I am
using
> Echo Link and have found it necessary to change my firewall configuration
as

Yep. Did both the checking and config. of the soundcard and the firewall was changed to allow the Echolink protocols, nothing. Called the place I bought the computer and the tech said that the mic input's likely shot and that since it was still under warranty, they would replace the soundcard.

Jackie

2286. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 02:59:50 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v50k145bv3ppe1@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 61370

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030216185049.10587.00000315@mb-bk.aol.com...
> From: "KB9TMP"
> >That's easy V just learn the code and you'll "Beat" the test, or if
> >you feel you have to cheat it just learn the letters and pro signs.
> >If you pass you'll have cheated the test.
>
> I don't want to learn the code, okay?

I didn't WANT to either but I did because that is the requirement!

>I have a BSEE and am just interested in
> the technical portion.

You don't need a higher class of license for just
the technical portion of amateur radio.

>Learning the code is a waste of time.

I disagree on that one. That is what I thought
before I learned it and upgraded, now that
I'm on HF I'm finding that it's not wasted time
at all. I just wish I could do it better.

>
> Having the code license actually works against me, since it shows one
wasted
> time learning code.

You have wasted more time on this internet NG
than it would have taken you to learn code.

>This takes away from other (legitimate) skills.

BULL, I haven't lost any of my other skills by
learning Morse Code!

>I agree
> with that opinion. Also I just don't find code fun and I resent the higher
> license class being tied to the code.

At first I didn't find it fun either, and still don't on my "bad days"
but at times it's rather fun. You just resent having to do something
you don't like to get what you want. It's called "life" get over it!

>
> >> However, that picture of the club Homebrewing, shown to people outside
the

> >> club, is wrong. It gives the apperance of wanting to homebrew, when
noone
> >in
> >> the club actually is interested in that.
>
> >I have a picture on my wall from the newspaper that shows our first
> >club meeting with me as the president. We had it at a local resturant
> >but none of us were eating at the time. Does that show that our club
> >doesn't like food?
>
> If they had their picture taken, they probably posed for the picture.

No we didn't! The newspaper just came in told us who they were and
started taking pictures. All the photos were of us sitting at the table.

>So, they
> had to put their utensils down.

Breakfast was already over, we were having the meeting then.
>
> The homebrewing photo is placed to show the club likes to Homebrew.
However,
> noone in the club likes to homebrew. I see a contradiction.
>

How do you know they don't like to homebrew. Your
not spying on them at home are you? BTW you come
off as a "know-it-all" in here, if you do the same in
person that might explain why they don't want to do
any homebrewing with you. That BSEE might be
what's doing it, I am a certified GM service tech and
that seems to put the weekend mechanics noses out
of joint when I try to point stuff out to them. Any
more I just play dumb until they ASK for my help.
--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx

2287. Re: ARRL DX CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 03:24:02 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <mBY3a.5418$4y4.2767831@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 61367

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:b2pbks$7vf$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> Anyone play in the contest? I managed 651q and nearly half a mil points.
>
> SO HP all bands.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

Yup had a lot of fun but I'm not as good at this as some. But then again I
only operated a few hours each day.

33 contacts
31 countries
3,069 points

Dee Flint, N8UZE

2288. Re: Net Tonight

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 04:24:58 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <v50p2mgoe8v2ef@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 61371

OK, Jackie. Sounds good if it's under warranty. One other thing to check - there are **THREE** connectors on the sound card; one is for speakers, one is for the microphone, and one is line input. Just make sure you aren't accidentally plugged into the line in as the microphone output is way to low for the line in and it will act as though you have no microphone. Good luck!

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.455 / Virus Database: 255 - Release Date: 2/13/03

2289. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 06:50:03 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030217015003.23989.00000404@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 61372

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 2/16/03 5:50 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030216185049.10587.00000315@mb-bk.aol.com>

>I don't want to learn the code, okay? I have a BSEE and am just interested in
>the technical portion. Learning the code is a waste of time.

BSEE from who? Ronco? K-Tel?

And statistically, 50% of everything you learn in college is useless byt
eh time you get to the job market, but you still did it to get YOUR degree,
didn't you...?!?! Paid a lot of money for it too.

>Having the code license actually works against me, since it shows one wasted
>time learning code.

Refer to the above comment. This isn't the MOST stupid thing you've ever
posted, Vippy, but it's in the top three.

> This takes away from other (legitimate) skills.

Such as? Morse Code STILL ahs it's uses, Vippy.

>Also I just don't find code fun and I resent the higher
>license class being tied to the code.

The lazy and the spoiled usually do resent having to do something to get
something...They want it given to them for as cheap as they can get it,
regardless of how easily it can be come by.

>The homebrewing photo is placed to show the club likes to Homebrew. However,
>noone in the club likes to homebrew. I see a contradiction.

The contradiction is in YOUR assertion that they dislike homebrewing when
they obviously posed for a picture that promotes it.

Vippy, you just don't make sense. The funny part is you think you do.

Steve, K4YZ

2290. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 06:53:40 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030217015340.23989.00000405@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 61373

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 2/15/03 12:00 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0302151000.688f109e@posting.google.com>

>> No...I had "real" experience in 18 1/2 years in the United States
>Marine
>> Corps.
>
>What happened to the other 1.5 years?

Got paid to take an early out, Brian. Remeber RIF?

>Make sure you leave the ones you didn't earn in the box.

Laying claim to awards or attributes I didn't legitimately deserve is
Leonard H. Anderscum's forte, Brian...Not mine.

>>There's a difference between "denying" and "correcting".
>
>And remaining silent.

Words you should heed next time you go barking about some exotic DX
location you allegedly operated from.

Steve, K4YZ

2291. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 06:55:47 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030217015547.23989.00000406@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 61374

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 2/15/03 9:28 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3E4E5C77.38F1B5E4@earthlink.net>

>I have noted that, while you are both white and male...(SNIP)

Being a bit generous there, aren't you Dave...?!?!

>I've not seen your
>a photo of you in any amateur radio magazine. Did I overlook it?

Ham Radio went belly up fast enough without it. I wonder what he'd do
WITH it...?!?!

73

Steve, K4YZ

2292. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 07:03:32 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030217020332.23989.00000407@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 61375

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 2/15/03 11:32 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030215123239.04085.00000370@mb-bh.aol.com>

>>> Think about this for an attitude: Perusing practically any issue,
>>> any year, of ham radio periodicals with pictures of hams and
>>> their stations shows that they are predominantly white and
>>> male. :-)
>>
>>Yup. I've thought about it. White, male radio amateurs must begin to
>>offer contrition for their unfeeling choices of gender, race and choice
>>of avocation.
>>How selfish we've been!
>>
>
>The periodicals represent the current demographics of Hams...(SNIP)

OK, Mr. Alleged Engineer. Who were you quoting? Why do you insist on
quoting posts and NOT give proper reference to the other author(s)..?!?!

>I don't believe
>being a minority is a problem in Ham radio. As long as you follow the Ham
>traditions, its not an issue.

What "Ham traditions" are you refering to, Vippy? Who decides who can
operate and NOT operate based upon compliance or non-compliance with these
assertions of yours? Who enforces these decisions?

I've not once been to a "Wouff Hong" ceremony, ever been twitched by the
readysnitch, nor am I on anyone's Honor Roll. So...How is it I was "allowed"
to be an Amateur Extra Class licensee for 24 years and a licensed Amateur for a
total of thirty without partaking in these "Ham traditions"...?!?!

Sheeesh.

Steve, K4YZ

2293. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 08:36:15 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030217033615.11988.00000639@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 61376

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 2/16/03 5:17 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030216181737.10587.00000314@mb-bk.aol.com>

>Please list one example of where your definition is used, in a sentense. I
>cannot find an example of "radio art" other than technical achievement.

"Sentense"...?!?! You claim to have a bachelor's degree?

How about in at least 30 years of QST, CQ and 73 that I am aware of where
the contributions of Amateurs has been refered to as the "radio art", Vippy?

>The only thing you established is your hostile attitude.

Let's see...Vippy hides his identity for 6 months until I take 30 minutes
to do a bit of detective work and "out" him. All the while he is making
disparging comments about Amateur radio in this and other forums.

He's posted COUNTLESS posts expressing significant anger, disapproval and
boldface lies in this and other radio-related forums about Amateur Radio and
THEN has the temerity to say >>I<< have a "hostile attitude"...?!?!?

BBBWWWAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAH
AHAHAHAHA ! ! ! ! ! ! !

And Yes, Vippy, I am not laughing WITH you, I am laughing AT you!

>>Only you, Leonard Anderson, for embellishing YOUR Army service on the
>>memory of combat KIA's who died IN combat 3 years before you were ever in
>the
>>unit.
>
>Not related to amateur radio. If someone disagree's with you, you try to
>attack
>the person's background.

I didn't attack Lennie's background, Vipul. He left himself wide open to
this when he tries to credit himself with some kind of "honor-by-association"
with REAL men who were killed in action in the Armed Forces.

I doubt you were ever IN the Armed Forces (ours or anyone elses) and have
no concept of what that act means to Soldiers who DID make that sacrifice.

What I did in the Marines was piddling compared to what a lot of others
did before, during and since MY tour of duty. I don't dishonor them by trying
to lay some personal claim to what THEY did.

That scumbag you are defending doesn't see it that way.

>> The "fun" you are poking, Lennie, lands in your own lap. You've lied
>so
>>often and misrepresented the truth that NO ONE believes or trusts you.
>
>He seems to put forth some credible points, and they are well backed up.

Backed up with WHAT...?!?! The ONE and ONLY "point" Lennie has made that bears even the slightest semblence of "credibility" is that the once assumed need for Code proficiency due to the prolific use by the Armed Forces and Maritime services is no longer there.

That there are still OTHER reasons for Code proficiency are beyond him (and you too, it would seem).

>Let's rewrite N2EY's paragraph:
>>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>>amateur opposes K5YZ's views...(SNIP)

You need to pay attention to how you "rewrite" someone else's words, Vippy.

K5YZ might not like you making such assertions when he may not even know this forum exisits.

>K4YZ will always find some fault with someone's background to use it to claim
>the person has no credibility in Ham radio.

"Always"...?!?!

So far I have been able to sucessfully discredit somone three times based upon thier "background".

First of all is Lennie. Lennie has made countless posts of how he is a "radio professional", yet he makes error after error related to Amateur radio practice.

You may ask of the regulars here...I have publically stated that Lennie knows more about the inside of the box than I do. That's a "gimme" for him as I have no real way of knowing otherwise other than he cut's-and-pastes well in this forum. Hardly "fault".

What I DO fault with Lennie is his assertions of "fact" when his own practical experience is "squat". Furthermore, Lennie continues to make patently false statements that are either easily disproved, or which he refuses to validate with any "evidence".

The next was Mark Morgan. What can I say? Mark is an illiterate, docutmented pathological liar with absolutely no honor, self-respect or dignity.

And then there's you.

Tried to enter this forum with some aire of "knowledge", yet time after time you have been shown to be lacking in practical experience. You hid behind "Vshah101" all the while denying that my assertions of your inexperience and relative "novice" status were incorrect.

Thirty minutes of "detective" work outted KB1HMW and we found out that I was right all along.

You make assertions of "support" for Amateur Radio, then go into a CB radio nwsgroup and don't even take the time to create another AOL screen name in order to hide your tracks..Did you think you could make such outlandish and disparaging comments about Amateur Radio in that other forum and NO ONE would see...?!?!

That's pretty arrogant, but I get the feeling that you are ALL ABOUT being arrogant. Your

Now you are again "hiding" something and I can only assume it's becausee you have yet another secret that you don't want exposed.

And to top it off, you have taken up the cause of "defending" yet another Amateur Radio basher who is not only NOT an Amateur, but who has been clearly shown to be a pathological liar.

Again..What does that say about you, Vipul?

I am not impressed. Not even amused. You are a parody of the court jester. Lennie is the original.

What a pair.

Steve, K4YZ

2294. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 09:05:55 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030217040555.12069.00000563@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 61377

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/12/03 8:07 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030212210745.09921.00001847@mb-md.aol.com>
>
>In article <20030211220432.28727.00000217@mb-fr.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com
>(Vshah101) writes:
>
>
>>Remember when "Ham Radio" became QST? It is representative of the change in
>>today's Ham radio.
>
> I'm sure you meant something else, but a new (misdirection)
> thread will start up in here where the Faithful will confuse
> "QST" with "Ham Radio" magazine (started in 1968, ended
> in 1990 by sale to CQ)...and "inform you" that you are a
> #$%^&!!! and a $@!$@!! for writing that.

Naaaaah...We just recognize where Vippy is getting his "facts" from,
Lennie.

The Learned in this forum (even you) know that "Ham Radio" did not become
QST. QST was an independent journal even before the creators of "Ham Radio"
were born.

Vipul, on the other hand, doesn't know the difference. His approach is
that if he slings enough mud something he's aiming at will get splatted.

>Steve Cannon will probably trot out one of his old set-pieces
> about "extras are So good because they expertly know how
> to tune their receivers..."

I am always tickled on how Lennie pulls stuff like this out when he has
nothing else to add.

>>>I have been an ACTIVE Amateur Radio
>>>licensee, probably before you were born, and I ahve NEVER heard of ANY
>>>"definintion" of "radio art" to be ONLY "technical achievement".
>
> Oh, my, another "OF" blowing his trumpet!

At least I have a trumpet to blow, Lennie.

>The first evidence of moonbounce came from US Army Signal
> Corps experimentation in Project Diana.

Nope. Amateurs and commercial stations as far back as the mid-1920's
reported "long delay echoes", some of which were (later) attributed to
terrestrial phenomena, other occassions were attributed to lunar reflectivity.

>That, in 1946, is considered the first.

...and about 20+ years after the phenomena was first nted.

>Outside of hobby "park flying" it is not possible to build
> cheap, safe rockets.

Not yet. But there will be.

>Governments who once launched a half million radiosondes
> a year go to industry for minimum cost and maximum
> reliability. Anything else is pipe-dream nonsense.

More ignorance and arrogance. Market forces are already driving for
alternatives to NASA and ESA assets.

>Membership organizations rationalize their statements by
> saying "we are talking about amateur radio" despite their
> constant attempts to align themselves with the rest of the
> radio world...and not telling their membership much about the
> rest of that world of radio.

Such as...?!?!

2295. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 09:11:33 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030217041133.12069.00000564@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 61378

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/15/03 5:15 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030215181527.09808.00000853@mb-fk.aol.com>

>> As I said before, Brian, YOU need to have some OTHER source for your
>>"facts" than Lennie's rants. You are obviously ill prepared, nor are you
>"up
>>to date" on current affairs.
>
> Yeah, pity that, Brian Burke as a veteran of the REAL USAF
> isn't any damn good on knowing about Real USAF things...
> but a CAP member does.

Well, Your Putziness, seems he doesn't know all of it since he had to ask
me about it in a public forum.

And as for "Real USAF things", I don't remember making any posts wherein I
tried to "tell" Brian about USAF matters. I would ask you to please cite your
source, but that's just one more thing on the "Lennie Won't Do It Lest He
Expose His Own Rants" pile.

Putz.

2296. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 09:16:04 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030217041604.12069.00000565@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 61379

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/15/03 5:15 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030215181525.09808.00000851@mb-fk.aol.com>

>Flight suits, one-piece coveralls, commonly called "poopie-suits"
> by those who wear them.

Oh?

I've been wearing flight suits in one form or another for over 30 years
and never heard them called "poopie-suits", by USAF, USN, USMC or even (dare I
say it...?!?!) CAP members.

>Ham Radio info! Ham Radio Policy!

Like I said, Your Scumminess, I don't make an issue of "off topic" issues
except with you, and that's only because you delight in resorting to chastising
others about it when the need suits your rants or provides you an exit from a
thread in which you are (again) taking heat.

Steve, K4YZ

2297. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 12:15:26 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030217071526.14527.00000387@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 61380

In article <Xns9324DC71DD79Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
<elektros@yahoo.com> writes:

>From a regulator's point of view, dumping Element 1 is a 'small' change!
>That's why the smart money is that they will do just that.

One paragraph, waiving Element 1 until a full rewrite can be done at some
future date.

>Someone needs
>to think of a 'simple' way to phase out the closed licence classes of
>Advanced and Novice, and to redistribute their subbands.

Why? FCC sees no problem with the way things are.

In fact, when ARRL and others proposed a free upgrade of Novices and Tech
Pluses to General back in 1998, FCC said no.

>The FCC have said
>that we must reach a consensus on that, and then they will do it, but not
>before. I bet this group has a few proposals for that.
>
The problem is simply one of not being able to meet all goals at once.

Take the Advanced for example. 88,000 of them, and slowly dropping.

If they get all privs, they've gotten a free upgrade to Extra that others had
to pass a test to get. Not going to be popular.

If they're reduced to General privileges, they've lost privs just to make the
rules a little shorter.

Neither idea is going to get much support.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2298. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 12:15:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030217071527.14527.00000388@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 61382

In article <20030216210447.19751.00001967@mb-cu.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam
(Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>In article <c2356669.0302141048.396cda03@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
>(N2EY) writes:
>
>>Well, the tests these days are all createdby the QPC, who are
>>volunteers. FCC checks and approves, but the grunt work of writing the
>>things is up to ham volunteers. Which means that last part could be
>>done under existing rules.
>>
>>Here's a question I forgot: Should Learners have distinctive calls, or
>>at least not be able to get any unassigned call?
>>
>>How about minimum age requirements?
>>
>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>I agree with Carl Stevenson's idea that entry-level hams should have
>reduced power limits on VHF/UHF.

Me too, but note K2ASP's observations on enforcement difficulties.

>I don't think that entry-level hams should have the option of requesing
>Vanity Call signs. In fact, I would like to change the Vanity call sign
>program to eliminate the ability to request out-of-district call signs, with
>the retroactive cancellation of any which have already been assigned!

Chances of that happening are slim-to-none, Larry!

How about this:

Entry level can have "six character" calls (2x3)
Middle level can have "five character" calls (2x2 or 1x3), OR they can keep
entry level call
Top level can have "four character" calls (1x2 or 2x1), OR they can keep
entry/middle level call

>Of course, everyone's assuming that when S25.5 goes away at the
>International level, that the FCC will automatically drop the 5 WPM
>code test for General/Extra. Has there been any indication from the
>FCC that this was a fait accompli?

Yes.

In the R&O to the 2000 restructuring, FCC addressed the various pro-code-test arguments and said they did not agree. FCC also said they saw "no regulatory purpose" in keeping any code test at all, EXCEPT meeting the requirements of S25.5.

And even though the majority of those who commented not only supported code testing, but supported code testing at at least 2 speeds, FCC dumped all but 5 wpm testing.

FCC made it as clear as they could without actually saying 'if/when S25.5 goes we'll just dump element 1'.

>It would be fun to see the FCC
>say, "We've done enough changing of the requirements, they're not
>set, live with them, we're not going to pay to print up a new set of
>rules just to drop the code test!"

I'd be very happy if they did just that. But I hold out little hope for such an outcome.

All FCC would have to do is issue some sort of order that Element 1 is waived for all applicants, pending a rewrite of the rules during the next review. One paragraph, replacing the current definition of Element 1. I think FCC could even cite their earlier R&O's on the subject and simply do it without needing a proposal or NPRM.

Another possibility, though less probable, would be for FCC to restart the whole restructure process yet again. It's been 5 years since they began the last one!

Main thing is that we hams should be proactive rather than waiting.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2299. Re: After S25.5 Goes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 12:15:29 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030217071529.14527.00000389@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 61381

In article <gkW3a.478$hj.476661@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>> >My *personal* view would be as follows:
>> >
>> >1) fix the disconnect between power levels and technical knowledge
>> >required for the tech license (either make the test a bit more
>> > comprehensive or limit
>> >the power to more reasonable levels ... the first option would make entry
>> >harder, so I prefer the second approach, so as not to make the bar
>> >discouragingly high for newbies)

I prefer the first approach too, but as K2ASP points out, enforcement could be
a big problem. FCC may not want to enact rules that are harder to enforce than
the existing ones.
>>
>> As we discussed before, RF safety at VHF/UHF is a big concern. To avoid
>>taking
>> privs away from anybody, existing Techs could be allowed to run full
>>power,
>> keeping their old license docs to show they really are "old" Techs.
>
>If it's broke, it ought to be fixed ... but I doubt that you'd really be
>taking away
>something that's actually used by the vast majority of techs if you imposed
>a limit
>akin to what most "higher powered" mobiles put out ... say about 50W ...

If the vast majority are not running more than a few dozen watts, is there
really a problem at all?

Also, I'm pretty sure that a proposal to remove privileges from anyone won't be
popular enough to get enacted. Heck, we still see/hear griping about the
incentive licensing changes of 35+ years ago, from folks who weren't even
licensed at the time!

>Also, I think that most of the "old" techs who would likely be doing
>something
>more than just FM/packet/APRS with commercially built radios have probably
>already upgraded to General or Extra already.

I don't know about that. I know some Techs who are simply not interested in
HF/MF and its physically large antennas, unpredictable propagation, narrrow
bands, etc. These folks are into satellites, ATV, etc.
>>
>> >2) add limited power HF access to the tech license (same bands as

>> >General?)
>>
>> If Techs get the same HF/MF as Generals, then the only reason to upgrade
>>to
>> General will be to get more power. Is that really the most desirable
>>incentive?
>
>Maybe not ... but they need to get "mainstreamed" so that they get a
>(decent)
>taste of HF ...

I'd say give 'em all of 160 and the WARC bands, plus about half the General subbands on 80/40/20/15. Same power level as allowed for Novices/Tech Pluses today. All it would require is a rewrite of the part of the rules which specify the bands/modes allowed to Novices and Tech pluses.

>to be honest, I'm hard pressed to think of a better "carrot"
>than giving them access but limiting their power

All depends where you put the power limit. The current limit for HF Novice/Tech plus was set to be above that of the typical "100 watt" HF rig. Many hams never use more power than that, so they would have no incentive to upgrade. Heck, the most powerful ham rig I've ever used at my own station put out maybe 150 watts. (but at other stations....)

Now if you limit them to QRP levels (as is done for UK novices), there's a whole set of different problems, like rig selection and the double whammy of low power and antenna inefficiency.

>> But Techs should definitely have a lot more HF/MF spectrum and modes than
>> just the old Novice bands.
>>
>> >3) improve the General and Extra tests a bit ... not necessarily to make
>> >them "harder" but to make them more up-to-date and comprehensive ... if
>> >this
>> >requires a reasonable increase in the number of questions on the test, so
>> >be
>> >it.
>>
>> Yup. In fact, I think the idea should be to make the Tech written more
>> focused
>> on operational and theory fundamentals.
>>
>> >4) fix outmoded bandwidth/baud_rate/modulation_type and any other
>> >technical
>> >rules that limit innovation
>>
>> Gotta give us more detail than that.
>
>Needs more thought to be detailed in a really coherent manner, but current
>rules
>tend to stifle innovation (and before folks start flaming, I'm not talking

>about doing
>spread spectrum all over HF at high powers ... if at all ... the HF bands
>aren't wide
>enough for SS except at rather low data rates, though there could be some
>applications
>for that ... but those applications could use low power ... much less than 1
>W)
>
What's wrong with the idea below?

>> I'd say the HF/MF bands should be divided by occupied bandwidth of mode,
>> and
>> forget about the baud rate or modulation type. What we now call the
>> "CW/digital" parts of the band would be open to any documented mode that
>> has
>> less than, say, 900 Hz bandwidth. What we now call the "phone" parts of
>> the
>> bands would be open to any documented mode that has less than, say, 7000
>> Hz
>> bandwidth. And the old "Novice" subbands would be open to any documented
>> mode
>> that will fit inside the subband.
>
>Sounds heavily slanted towards low data rate stuff ...

The problem right now is that in the area of HF mode subbands we have a strange set of rules about modes and bandwidths that, in my opinion, are based on a hodgepodge of ideas rather than a comprehensive plan.

For example, if somebody figures out a way to fit a voice signal into a 500 Hz occupied bandwidth (say, by buffering and accepting some time delays in transmission), they cannot use that mode in the CW/digital subbands. But they can use 850 Hz shift FSK Baudot RTTY, which is a much wider signal!

OTOH, data modes other than "image" are prohibited in the "voice" subbands, again regardless of bandwidth.

Why not keep all the narrow signals together, and likewise all the wide ones?

> and why would you
>allow the
>entire old novice bands to be consumed by one signal while restricting to
>much lower
>bandwidths elsewhere?

Some time back there was a proposal to "refarm" the Novice subbands. "Refarm" was just a euphemism for "widen the 'phone bands". Some of us thought a better use would be to create a few subbands where any mode that would fit could be tried out.
>
>> >5) pretty much leave the rest as is (if it ain't broke, don't fix it
>....)

>>
>> Three classes of license, 10 year term, no age requirement, etc.
>> >
>> I forgot one question: What happens to existing Advanceds and Novices?
>Just
>> leave 'em alone?
>
>Seems to be the approach ... though why someone who's actually
>interested/active
>in ham radio and already has lifetime credit for the 5 wpm Morse test would
>remain
>a novice really stumps me ...

In many cases I know, long-time Novices are inactive folks.

The number of Novices has dropped by about half since Restructuring - far faster than Advanceds.

> as for the advanceds, I suspect that
>eventually all of them
>will either upgrade or go SK (not that I'm eager for the latter in any way
>...).
>
Agreed.

>Once the numbers in those classes drop to zero, they can simply be ignored.

Or written out of the rules.

Tech pluses will simply disappear in about 7 years even if nothing else is done, due to renewal as Techs. Novices will continue to drop, but we may see an aymptotic effect towards the end. Who gets to be the "last Novice"?
>
And here's a scary thought....

Back at the very end of 1952, FCC closed off the Advanced to new issues. No new Advanceds were issued for almost 15 years - and then the license class was reactivated. ~40,000 Advanceds in 1952, maybe 80% of that number in 1967. ~88,000 today.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2300. Re: Net Tonight

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 13:49:38 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <EAFCBEBF43F0FC77.3AB48B6B68A40535.564BFB48380EFE78@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 61383

Heh!! After sending the note out to the group and all that...I ended up falling asleep while watching a movie. I was woke up by my hubby at 10:30 and got to hear the net being closed.

I assume it went well. I am recovering from being sick since Christmas, ultimately ending up in the hospital with major surgery--so I couldn't participate in any of the Shuttle Recovery nets in any way. I told myself I was going to listen, but didn't even do that. I'm just glad hams were involved and could help.

Kim W5TIT

"Jackie" <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> wrote in message news:bgX3a.144940$Ec4.144845@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net...
> EchoLink is very cool. Too bad the mic input to my soundcard's shot or I
> would've been using it. Having tried it out (and then determining that my
> mic input is shot), I was still able to "connect" to different repeaters and
> "talk" via the computer chat interface (if the stations had themselves
> hooked up on a PC). The interface is very easy to use; I didn't even need a
> tutorial to guide me. Do check it out, it might be very interesting
> listening to what the Shuttle recovery group has to say.
>
> Jackie
> KC0ODY
>
> "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> news:37F9B23ACCE4012D.EE81E1F48E620A99.F7A9C13475ED77D1@lp.airnews.net...
> > For anyone who is interested, there will be a net tonight, in Dallas,
> > pertaining to the activities of amateur radio operators during the Shuttle
> > Recovery operations.
> >
> > I am not real familiar with how this works, but I've been told the net
> will
> > be "broadcast" (may be wrong terminology) over EchoLink. I do know the
> > software for this can be had at http://www.echolink.org/el/ as well as
> other
> > web locations. In fact, once the software is installed, with a computer
> > microphone, you may ragchew with other hams all 'cross the world. How to
> > "connect" for the net here in Dallas I haven't a clue. My guess would be
> > the K5JD icon, near the bottom. Maybe there are some savvy enough with

> > EchoLink to figure this out.
> >
> > Thought you all might be interested in at least listening. Via
EchoLink,
> it
> > is my presumption that you could enter the net with recognition from
NCS,
> > whom I believe will be AA5QX, Jim Lawyer.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
> >
> >
>
>

2301. Re: After S25.5 Goes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 14:13:39 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0302170613.356bb7ec@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61384

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message news:<20030216133152.29016.00000363@mb-fy.aol.com>...
> In article <3CM3a.408$hj.424769@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>

> >2) add limited power HF access to the tech license (same bands as General?)
>
> If Techs get the same HF/MF as Generals, then the only reason to upgrade to
> General will be to get more power. Is that really the most desirable incentive?

Fuhgeddit. Power level regs are beyond useless. When was the last time
any ham in the ham bands got busted for running over the legal limit??

And the drift toward lower average power on HF has been underway for
years.

> >4) fix outmoded bandwidth/baud_rate/modulation_type and any other technical
> >rules that limit innovation

Who besides you in all of hamdom is bitching about not having enough
HF bandwidth to "innovate"??

>
> I'd say the HF/MF bands should be divided by occupied bandwidth of mode, and
> forget about the baud rate or modulation type. What we now call the
> "CW/digital" parts of the band would be open to any documented mode that has
> less than, say, 900 Hz bandwidth. What we now call the "phone" parts of the
> bands would be open to any documented mode that has less than, say, 7000 Hz
> bandwidth. And the old "Novice" subbands would be open to any documented mode
> that will fit inside the subband.

50,000 Hz wide sigs on 80, 40 & 15 eh? Lessee now, where have we seen
this nonsense before . . ?

> Three classes of license, 10 year term, no age requirement, etc.
> >
> I forgot one question: What happens to existing Advanceds and Novices? Just
> leave 'em alone?

What a novel concept!

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

2302. Re: ARRL DX CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 14:24:14 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0302170624.3ced5fe8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61385

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<mBY3a.5418$4y4.2767831@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:b2pbks$7vf$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> > Anyone play in the contest? I managed 651q and nearly half a mil points.
> >
> > SO HP all bands.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
>
> Yup had a lot of fun but I'm not as good at this as some. But then again I
> only operated a few hours each day.
>
> 33 contacts
> 31 countries
> 3,069 points

Playing the search & pounce game is how ya get good at it.

>
> Dee Flint, N8UZE

w3rv

2303. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 14:40:20 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302170640.76662833@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61386

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030217015340.23989.00000405@mb-fz.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 2/15/03 12:00 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0302151000.688f109e@posting.google.com>
>
> >> No...I had "real" experience in 18 1/2 years in the United States
> Marine
> >> Corps.
> >
> >What happened to the other 1.5 years?
>
> Got paid to take an early out, Brian. Remeber RIF?

Early retirement? Yeh, I remember. Weather kept getting exempted.

> >Make sure you leave the ones you didn't earn in the box.
>
> Laying claim to awards or attributes I didn't legitimately deserve is
> Leonard H. Anderscum's forte, Brian...Not mine.
>
> >>There's a difference between "denying" and "correcting".
> >
> >And remaining silent.
>
> Words you should heed next time you go barking about some exotic DX
> location you allegedly operated from.
>
Steve, I don't have a problem with what I did. I'm trying to think of
a way to go on another dxpedition, this time without all the hazards.

2304. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 14:57:28 UTC
From: Steve Adell - KF2TI <kf2ti@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <b2qtaepaq1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 61387

In article <f45722ac.0302170640.76662833@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com says...
about some exotic DX
> > location you allegedly operated from.
> >
> Steve, I don't have a problem with what I did. I'm trying to think of
> a way to go on another dxpedition, this time without all the hazards.

http://www.datasync.com/~bmusa/hamlet.htm

Jody runs a 1st class operation Beautiful rooms, excellent scenery and
great weekly rates. Will even help getting the necessary operating
permits

2305. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 15:28:46 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302170728.1d86203d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61388

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message news:<20030216173704.14527.00000384@mb-cc.aol.com>...

> --
>
> Think about how many stations you've heard on the air this weekend, all using
> CW. Consider that there are lots more out there you can't hear due to
> propagation, antenna limitations, etc. Also those you won't hear because
> they're mostly in hunt'n'pounce mode rather than calling CQ.
>
> Remember all those stations next time somebody says or writes that CW has no
> relevance in ham radio today, or that nobody uses it anymore.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Welp, if you say you can't hear a CW station, then you just shot down
the Morse Myth that CW always gets through.

As far as CW having no relevance, that's just not true. Lots of hams
enjoy using it.

The ARGUMENT is that a CW EXAM is no longer relavant. Give CW the
same exam that FM, SSB, RTTY, SSTV, FSTV, PACKET, PACTOR and PSK31
have.

2306. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 15:40:23 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302170740.708d4241@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61389

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message news:<20030216173703.14527.00000383@mb-cc.aol.com>...

> As for removing incentive licensing, FCC seems to have moved from the idea that
> amateur radio needs 5 or 6 levels of license to the idea that 3 levels are
> adequate.

Jim knows the mind of the FCC.

Why would 3 levels be adequate?

Why wouldn't 3 levels be optimum?

In the FCC's view, that is.

2307. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 15:42:42 UTC
From: PDQ <pdq@volaris.net>
Message-ID: <170220030942424672%pdq@volaris.net>
Source record: 61390

In article <20030215183644.25154.00000424@mb-cb.aol.com>, N2EY
<n2ey@aol.com> wrote:

> As of May 14, 2000:
>
> Novice - 49,329
> Tech - 205,394
> Tech Plus - 128,860
> General - 112,677
> Advanced - 99,782
> Extra - 78,750
> Total - 674,792
>
>
> As of February 14, 2003:
>
> Novice - 35,446 (decrease of 13,883)
> Tech - 250,120 (increase of 44,726)
> Tech Plus - 71,924 (decrease of 56,936)
> General - 140,120 (increase of 27,443)
> Advanced - 84,099 (decrease of 15,683)
> Extra - 103,503 (increase of 24,753)
> Total - 685,212 (increase of 10,420)
>
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Interesting, 52% of all hams are Novice, Tech or Tech+. Tech+ and
Novice decreased by 70,819 but General and Extra only increased by
37,863. I suspect that much of the upgrade to Extra is by Advanced and
Generals who had those licenses prior to the the reduction in the code
speed requirement. So where are the Tech+ licensees going?

Does this have something to do with the FCC database not listing the
Tech+ anymore and movement from Novice or Tech to Tech with code credit
is reflected in the Tech license increase?

The overall increase is 1.54% or a little over 1/2 percent per year,
with Novice, Tech, Tech+ decreasing by 6.8% and General, Advanced,
Extra increasing by 12.6%. While the ARS does not seem to be growing
very much since May of 2000, the movement to higher class licenses and
Hf privileges (General, Extra) seems to be increasing at good rates.

2308. Re: Getting old call sign back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 15:52:42 UTC
From: tad danley <tdanley@nospamatearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E51053A.FA90A995@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61391

N2EY wrote:

> I did - and there's more odd stuff going on there.
>
> QRZ and ARRL databases both agree on issue date of June 4, 1999, which
> agrees with an SK of about three years ago. But the expiration date is
> in 2006, which doesn't make any sense because a vanity callsign issue
> automatically causes a 10 year renewal. (FCC does it that way so the
> fee isn't pro-rated. Vanity callsign issue is the one way to get a
> renewal outside of the 90 day window. Moving and upgrading don't do it
> anymore).
>
> So the vanity callsign must have been issued back in 1996?

Very interesting ... the original gate 2 grants (or gate 3, can't remember which now, but it was the gate
that allowed Extra class hams to apply whether or not they or a family member had ever held the call they
were requesting) were issued on November 4th - election day.

> Seems to me that what's needed here is a paper or CD-ROM Callbook to
> check up on who held what call when.

The vanity hq web site at http://www.vanityhq.com/ has some information on old call signs. It shows some
interesting grant dates for W3DW and AB0AL.

73,

--
Tad Danley, K3TD

* Anti-spam return address in use *

2309. Re: Any good Iraq related listening?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 16:10:10 UTC
From: Your name here <public@e.mail>
Message-ID: <v522b2gd1i0816@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 61392
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Not until they're broadcasting live and you can hear the bombs going off in the background.

"Bill Crocker" <wcrocker007@comcast.net> wrote in news:iOudnUp8YMeFGNOjXTWcpQ@comcast.com:

> Is there any good stations / programs (English language), to monitor,
> with informative conversation, and views, related to the conflict with
> Iraq?
>
> Thanks,
> Bill Crocker

2310. Re: ARRL DX CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 16:17:43 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b2r39qtgt1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 61393

True....good to see he tried. Now the next one will show how much he improved.

My first contest was back in about 62 or so. Novice roundup. Think it went for two weeks ??. Looked at my old logs. Looks like I made 3 contacts in two weeks.

See you can get better...hi.

Dan/W4NTI

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message news:d22b54c3.0302170624.3ced5fe8@posting.google.com...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message news:<mBY3a.5418$4y4.2767831@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:b2pbks$7vf$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> > > Anyone play in the contest? I managed 651q and nearly half a mil points.
> > >
> > > SO HP all bands.
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > >
> >
> > Yup had a lot of fun but I'm not as good at this as some. But then again I
> > only operated a few hours each day.
> >
> > 33 contacts
> > 31 countries
> > 3,069 points
>
> Playing the search & pounce game is how ya get good at it.
>
> >
> > Dee Flint, N8UZE
>
> w3rv

2311. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 16:41:32 UTC
From: Janet <janet11@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <d2425vk7s52cgc1o196ni7fvnvednr4h3r@4ax.com>
Source record: 61607

One more thing that is resulting from the ham activities in East Texas: we have had requests for licensing classes at our local club. In the last 2 weeks, we set up and filled up our next Tech class starting next week.

No, these likely aren't going to be 'home-brew' type of hams, they'll be 'public service' type of hams. Thank goodness the hobby has room for all of us (*smile*).

Janet
WB9ZPH

On 12 Feb 2003 07:45:22 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:

>Janet,
>
>I can only add two words to your excellent post:
>
>Thank you
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>
>Janet <janet11@attbi.com> wrote in message
news:<agvh4v8ag320rpf57j3os102nalon2uk5j@4ax.com>...
>> On Tue, 11 Feb 2003 00:44:06 -0500, "Lloyd" <Lloyd@LloydandHerbareNrOne.com>
>> wrote:
>>
>> > The ARRL continues to spew fiction about "glorious and
>> >important" valuable ham radio operations in selected
>> >emergencies. The league has been living in a dream world
>> >since the 1960s incentive licensing flap.
>>
>> Obviously you weren't working in east texas during the last week. I was. Along
>> with many other ham volunteers.
>>
>> And of course the news wasn't picking this up. We're a support function, not
>> the 'front lines'. And that's how it should be. There weren't big articles
>> about what the Salvation Army or Red Cross were doing there. There weren't big
>> articles about the highway patrol. But the National Guard search team I was
>> was with also included a highway patrolman.
>>
>> "glorious", no. But important? Yes. We were wanted and useful. Can't beat
>> that! Even when teams had cell phones, what happened?
>>
>> If the search organizers needed to contact all the search teams, net control

>> could put one call out via ham radio and all hams would then confirm they
>> received it individually. For 20 teams, this took about 5-10 mins max. But
>> when contacting teams via cell phone, let's see. Most cell systems didn't work
>> in San Augustine. And those that did were picky about where they worked. Walk
>> a few feet and they were silent. And the person with a cell phone tended to put
>> it in a pocket or pack and not notice when it rang. 4 hours later, many of
>> those search teams without a ham still hadn't received the change of search
>> protocols.
>>
>> No, "ham radio" isn't the critical thing here. It was just that our "job" there
>> was communications. We paid attention to it. We listened. And when there was
>> something important to pass on, we did it.
>>
>> In this case, there's nothing the national/local news would even bother to pick
>> up. So it's nice that the ARRL DOES try to get some publicity for things that
>> the hams do that help the public in time of need.
>>
>> It's funny. One of the guys on my search team told me they thought that ham
>> radio was only for 'old guys' and wasn't worth much in this modern world. He
>> told me he couldn't believe how wrong he was (*grin*).
>>
>> Janet
>> WB9ZPH

2312. Re: ARRL DX CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 17:27:00 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0302170927.62843a4f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61394

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<b2pbks$7vf$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>...
> Anyone play in the contest? I managed 651q and nearly half a mil points.
>
> SO HP all bands.

Here's how one of the neighborhood heavy hitters played the game. From
the club refelector:

- - - -

Call: W2UP
Operator(s): W2UP
Station: W2UP

Class: SOAB(A) HP
QTH: PA
Operating Time (hrs): 38
Radios: SO2R

Summary:
Band QSOs Mults

160: 37 33
80: 237 68
40: 688 91
20: 1022 108
15: 1002 105
10: 777 97

Total: 3763 502 Total Score = 5,667,078

>
> Dan/W4NTI

w3rv

2313. Re: After S25.5 Goes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 17:45:09 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E511FEC.775A49D9@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61395

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <gkW3a.478$hj.476661@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

> >If it's broke, it ought to be fixed ... but I doubt that you'd really be
> >taking away
> >something that's actually used by the vast majority of techs if you imposed
> >a limit
> >akin to what most "higher powered" mobiles put out ... say about 50W ...
>
> If the vast majority are not running more than a few dozen watts, is there
> really a problem at all?
>
> Also, I'm pretty sure that a proposal to remove privileges from anyone won't be
> popular enough to get enacted. Heck, we still see/hear griping about the
> incentive licensing changes of 35+ years ago, from folks who weren't even
> licensed at the time!
>
> >Also, I think that most of the "old" techs who would likely be doing
> >something
> >more than just FM/packet/APRS with commercially built radios have probably
> >already upgraded to General or Extra already.
>
> I don't know about that. I know some Techs who are simply not interested in
> HF/MF and its physically large antennas, unpredictable propagation, narrrow
> bands, etc. These folks are into satellites, ATV, etc.

...and there are still plenty of "old" Technicians who, while not
particularly interested in HF are interested in unpredictable
propagation and BIG antennas on tall towers. These folks are doing weak
signal work on 50, 144, 432 and above with KW amps on SSB and CW. A
number are doing moon bounce on 6m, 2m and 70cm.

Dave K8MN

2314. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 17:53:08 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E5121E0.42131FD4@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61398

Brian wrote:
>
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030216173704.14527.00000384@mb-cc.aol.com>...
>
> > --
> >
> > Think about how many stations you've heard on the air this weekend, all using
> > CW. Consider that there are lots more out there you can't hear due to
> > propagation, antenna limitations, etc. Also those you won't hear because
> > they're mostly in hunt'n'pounce mode rather than calling CQ.
> >
> > Remember all those stations next time somebody says or writes that CW has no
> > relevance in ham radio today, or that nobody uses it anymore.

> Welp, if you say you can't hear a CW station, then you just shot down
> the Morse Myth that CW always gets through.

Those cans will work better if you plug them in.

> As far as CW having no relevance, that's just not true. Lots of hams
> enjoy using it.

Please advise your friend Mr. Anderson.

> The ARGUMENT is that a CW EXAM is no longer relavant. Give CW the
> same exam that FM, SSB, RTTY, SSTV, FSTV, PACKET, PACTOR and PSK31
> have.

That's AN argument.

Dave K8MN

2315. Re: New Field Day Entry Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 17:53:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030217125330.23182.00000395@mb-mi.aol.com>
Source record: 61451

In article <f45722ac.0302160901.59dd188c@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> > Jim seems a little testy lately, turns on Crony.
>>
>> We're natural borned contesters with thick skins. Which comes with our
>breed.
>
>No you're not. You just had this to say on CW DX? OT:
>
>"I can easily imagine a first crack at this contest being very
>discouraging. If you do jump into the thing don't let yourself become
>discouraged. None of us were born with any of the skills required to
>be competitive in any dx contest. We all started right where you are
>now in this game, ground zero and you can do it too."

I must correct my previous post. Not just "thick skin" on the
head, thick skull too! Plus a touch of Alzeimers syndrome.

US ham radio is all about working DX on HF with CW. :-)

2316. Re: New Field Day Entry Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 17:53:31 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030217125331.23182.00000396@mb-mi.aol.com>
Source record: 61397

In article <d22b54c3.0302152243.21cb0b66@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>> Jim seems a little testy lately, turns on Crony.
>
>We're natural borned contesters with thick skins. Which comes with our breed.

Not in here. The only thickness shown is of the cabeza. :-)

2317. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 17:53:31 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030217125331.23182.00000397@mb-mi.aol.com>
Source record: 61399

In article <d22b54c3.0302160709.7dc14c97@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>Bet: The FCC is not about to put themselves thru another
>"restructuring" of ham radio for years. We've only had three major
>overhauls in last 52 years, that's one every 17+ years. History does
>repeat itself, yes?

Ahem...take a look at the title of NPRM 98-143 and R&O 99-412.
it reads "biennial." "Biennial" as ordered by the Congress of
the United States. "Biennial" is defined as "happening every
two years" or as a "period of two years."

2318. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 17:53:32 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030217125332.23182.00000398@mb-mi.aol.com>
Source record: 61453

In article <20030215203615.12173.00000572@mb-mr.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>If/when S25.5 goes away and FCC dumps Element 1, what should the US license
>classes, requirements and privs be?

I thought that Mr. N2EY said that was a "done deal?"

If it is so "done" why the qualifier "if/when?"

>Obviously FCC isn't going to go for a more-complex system than we have now,
but
>maybe a better system can be developed that will have wide ranging support in
>the amateur radio community.

To get INTO amateur radio, one cannot ALREADY be in it. If one
is already in it, there is no need to be concerned about getting in.

"Wide ranging support in the amateur radio community" is invalid
for any federal regulation applying to ALL citizens.

2319. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 17:53:33 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030217125333.23182.00000399@mb-mi.aol.com>
Source record: 61455

In article <v50k145bv3ppe1@corp.supernews.com>, "KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com>
writes:

>"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030216185049.10587.00000315@mb-bk.aol.com...
>> From: "KB9TMP"
>> >That's easy V just learn the code and you'll "Beat" the test, or if
>> >you feel you have to cheat it just learn the letters and pro signs.
>> >If you pass you'll have cheated the test.
>>
>> I don't want to learn the code, okay?
>
>I didn't WANT to either but I did because that is the requirement!

Following orders like a good little soldier? :-)

I've never had any requirement for "the code" in a half
century past...and I started out in Big Time HF comm.

>>I have a BSEE and am just interested in
>> the technical portion.
>
>You don't need a higher class of license for just
>the technical portion of amateur radio.

Yes, "get in the back of the bus!" :-)

Tsk, tsk, tsk.

>>Learning the code is a waste of time.
>
>I disagree on that one. That is what I thought
>before I learned it and upgraded, now that
>I'm on HF I'm finding that it's not wasted time
>at all. I just wish I could do it better.

What you personally like is fine, but why do you
insist on subjugating others to what "you like"
or "don't like?"

If manual telegraphy is so wonderful, why didn't
you voluntarily learn it without having to follow
orders?

>> Having the code license actually works against me, since it shows one wasted
>> time learning code.
>

>You have wasted more time on this internet NG
>than it would have taken you to learn code.

Nonsense. The US military found out in WW2 that only
about one in eight recruits had the aptitude to learn
morse code successfully. Seven out of eight would
have a hard time becoming marginally proficient.
That's why one of the recruit tests (WW2 through at
least 1960) was a morse code cognition aptitude test.

>>This takes away from other (legitimate) skills.
>
>BULL, I haven't lost any of my other skills by
>learning Morse Code!

Unverifiable. We are not informed of those "other
skills" of yours...

>At first I didn't find it fun either, and still don't on my "bad days"
>but at times it's rather fun. You just resent having to do something
>you don't like to get what you want. It's called "life" get over it!

Ah, another Attilla the Ham clone...wonderful.

>How do you know they don't like to homebrew. Your
>not spying on them at home are you? BTW you come
>off as a "know-it-all" in here, if you do the same in
>person that might explain why they don't want to do
>any homebrewing with you. That BSEE might be
>what's doing it, I am a certified GM service tech and
>that seems to put the weekend mechanics noses out
>of joint when I try to point stuff out to them. Any
>more I just play dumb until they ASK for my help.

Oh, my, a "certified GM service tech!" My late
neighbor Ralph Hurley was one of those. His nose
never got out of joint nor did anyone else at his
work at the service department. Ralph, bless his
soul, related well with other people.

Maybe if you quit waving around your certificate and
going "nyah-nyah" you might improve your working
relations with others?

2320. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 17:53:34 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030217125334.23182.00000400@mb-mi.aol.com>
Source record: 61454

In article <20030216181737.10587.00000314@mb-bk.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>From K4YZ:
>>>Okay, this definition is possible. I have never seen anyone reference this
>>>phrase to any other meaning than technical achievement.
>>
>> That's because the sphere of your experience is very minimal.
>>
>>Steve, K4YZ
>
>Please list one example of where your definition is used, in a sentense. I
>cannot find an example of "radio art" other than technical achievement.

Quite true. You must give him some slack since he's never been involved in any professional or military communications and his only experience, other than ham radio, is a short-time job as a purchasing agent of parts. He does not understand the context "state of the radio art" other than it might be a drawing on black velvet.

>>(Except Vipul and BB, and I think we've been able to establish what kind of
>peanut gallery THEY are...)
>
>The only thing you established is your hostile attitude.

He is Attilla the Ham. :-)

>> Only you, Leonard Anderson, for embellishing YOUR Army service on the
>>memory of combat KIA's who died IN combat 3 years before you were ever in
>>the unit.
>
>Not related to amateur radio. If someone disagree's with you, you try to
>attack the person's background.

Standard operating procedure of Attilla the Ham. Barbarian.

>> The "fun" you are poking, Lennie, lands in your own lap. You've lied so
>>often and misrepresented the truth that NO ONE believes or trusts you.
>
>He seems to put forth some credible points, and they are well backed up.

Attilla doesn't want them. He wants to win on bluster and intimidation without seeking knowledge of anything himself.

>Let's rewrite N2EY's paragraph:
>>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or

>>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>>amateur opposes K5YZ's views,
>
>K4YZ will always find some fault with someone's background to use it to claim
>the person has no credibility in Ham radio.

Interesting psychological quirk is that outrage and temper causes
him to even mis-spell his own call sign... :-)

>However, he will go to great lenghts to defend a club's action for a club he
>has never been to just to prove the club did not use hype.

Attilla is influenced only by images of greatness, illusions of
grandeur, uniforms and distinctive unit insignia. :-)

>K4YZ insults, ridicules wherever he can. He has insulted alot in this thread.
>General infantile behavior is also pretty common. Name calling often includes
>"putz".

The sad part is that Attilla is not a Jew and doesn't understand
that "putz" is a middle-European Jewish ethnic swearword
meaning "dickhead." Not even close to being acceptible
behavior by a superior amateur extra of the US amateur radio
corps, er, I mean community. :-)

2321. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 17:53:35 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030217125335.23182.00000401@mb-mi.aol.com>
Source record: 61396

In article <3E5014C3.C133E0A7@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Been there. Done that. Sent you the T-shirt.

No T-shirt was sent. Just a used Tissue. Torn at that...

2322. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 17:53:35 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030217125335.23182.00000402@mb-mi.aol.com>
Source record: 61452

In article <20030216105021.23397.00000294@mb-da.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

> What were the effective dates of those awards, Lennie? I got a nickle says
>neithr one was awarded for periods of service WHILE you were a member of it.

Note: N-E-I-T-H-E-R.

See other message. First Presidential Unit Citation was awarded to the FEC Sig Svc Bn in 1954, the second Presidential Unit Citation awarded in 1955. I was stationed in the battalion from February of 1953 to the end of January 1956.

You L-O-S-E cheapskate.

Such a challenge is not relevant to amateur radio unless all you care about are uniforms and pretty medals and ribbons and things. Apparently all you care about is image. Try to confine your topics to something relevant at least to radio in here.

2323. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 17:53:55 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030217125355.23182.00000403@mb-mi.aol.com>
Source record: 61456

In article <20030216104243.23397.00000293@mb-da.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Poor baby...all that volunteer "work" and no one cares to
>> erect anything in his honor
>
> Please cite the quote where I asked, Your Putziness.

Don't you want something erected every time you post here?
:-)

>>During the Gulf War!!! Hmmm...Sgt Putz was "commissioned"
>> in the Fighting 4th BDE (soldierly abreviation for 'brigade') during
>> the Gulf War? One of those Seven Hostile Action heroism
>> events was the Gulf War
>
> Nope. I was in the USMC then.

The Tennessee State Guard is NOT any part of the National Guard and certainly NOT a part of any USA military. They are essentially a sort of security guard unit wearing surplus US Army uniforms who are supposed to be caretakers of abandoned US military posts in Tennessee if the US military units normally at those posts are called to federal duty. They meet once a month according to their website information.

>>I guess all us
>> Army veterans should all hang our heads in shame for doing
>> rear-area "radio clerking," huh?
>
> Only you, Leonard Anderson, for embellishing YOUR Army service on the
>memory of combat KIA's who died IN combat 3 years before you were ever in the
>unit.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, Sgt Putz is one total sad sack...

My assignment in Japan (as part of a REAL US Army tour of duty) was the 8235th Army Unit, first named 71st Signal Service Battalion about 1947, then renamed Far East Command Signal Service Battalion in 1954. The 71st/FEC Sig Svc Bn served the Headquarters, Far East Command located in Tokyo, Japan. I was in the 8235th AU from February 1953 on through January 1956.

When the Korean War broke out in June 1950, FEC Hq ordered extra communications personnel to Korea. 19 members of the 71st, along with communications equipment, were on a C-54 that crashed on landing in Korea on June 1, 1950. The 19 and

the flight crew of 4 were killed. Five more members of the 8235th AU were casualties after that date and until the truce agreement was reached in July 1953.

Note: The numeric Army Unit designation is an alternate form of identification and is kept as-is despite the full title changes that might occur.

The billet for most companies of the 71st/FEC battalion was "Hardy Barracks," so named in honor of one of the 19 of the 71st that were the first casualties, Cpl. Elmer Hardy. That renaming was done in 1951. Hardy Barracks was also the site of offices of Central Command, US Army. It still exists as a US military site with that name although much reduced in size now with fewer units there.

None of the above has any direct relation to amateur radio (a MARS station was put up at Hardy in mid-1954)...but the 71st/FEC Sig Svc Bn did operate-maintain all HF radio communications for the Far East Command. HF radio was the only reliable long-distance communications means at that time.

The HF radio communications facility had the call sign ADA, that call sign still used by Headquarters, US Army Pacific, located at Fort Shafter, Hawaii. ADA transmitters in Tokyo in the 1950s had the following separate communication circuits working as a minimum, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week: 63 TTY, 9 Voice using 36 to 44 transmitters ranging in RF power output of 1 KW to 40 KW. Those circuits were to: Seoul and Pusan, Korea; Saigon, French Indochina (to become Vietnam later); Manila, Phillippines; Okinawa; US end-points of Anchorage, Seattle, Hawaii, and San Francisco. Additional radio circuits were also made to other places but not on a full 24/7 basis. Not a single radio circuit used on-off keyed telegraphy. None. HF radio, 24/7.

Battalion strength was approximately 1200 divided into four companies, Hq, A, B, C. A Company was composed of the photography unit, FEC Hq tasks directly at Pershing Heights (including crypto) and the downtown Tokyo central telephone exchange English-language section. B Company was located far northwest of Tokyo at newly-named Camp Owada, manning an HF receiving site jointly with the USAF. C Company was transmitters located first on Tsukishima Island, then northeast of Tokyo at Kashiwa, named Camp Tomlinson. A fifth Company was formed in 1956, D, for the Control Center personnel at Chuo Kogyo outside Camp Drake. D Company operated the "torn-tape" TTY manual message switching system for both receivers, transmitters, and landline TTY circuits.

The Far East Command Signal Service Battalion received TWO Presidential Unit Citations, the first about 1954, the second in

1955, both for excellence in signal corps work. That consisted
of a small cloth laurel wreath worn on the lower right sleeve of the
Class A unitform. For a second award the center of the wreath
bore a numeral 2. Few of us in the battalion thought much about
it at the time since it meant some extra sewing to replace the first
with the second.

I am proud to have done my military duty in the "71st" and honor
the names of all 71st members who died for their country. I'm
sure Eugene Rosenbaum, N2JTV, thinks accordingly although we
have not talked for over a half year (he lives on Long Island, NY).
Gene was in the 71st at the same time I was, but on a different
transmitters shift. I keep a list of all the 71st's casualties and
give them a mental salute from time to time.

HF radio as the prime long-distance communications medium
would enter its twilight in a decade and be relegated to just a
back-up communications facility for the US military by the
mid-1980s. For permanent locations, the US military depends
first on the DSN (Defense Switched Network), basically a
digital data medium which has built-in cryptographic facilities.
For sea-mobile, the USN depends on satellite relay and ELF
for submarine alert notices (a coded alert, not the message
itself). USAF uses a variety of communications depending on
mission requirements, everything from satellite relay to relay
through J-STARS aircraft to direct UHF and VHF comm to
ground units. US Army has everything of the above plus a
variety of shorter-range radio relay LOS and by Troposcatter.
DSN may be routed through any of the general systems
mentioned except for the ELF. HF radio is available for field
use, from low-power backpack to KW mobile but that is
generally older and kept in reserve as a secondary method.
No manual telegraphy is in any military communications
doctrine on land or in the air but some older HF radio
equipment still has a CW mode function capability (not all
equipment). For "behind-lines" intelligence gathering, there is
a variety of UHF radios which have medium-speed data rates
and encryption, capable of operating with satellites or airborne
J-STARS or other relay aircraft.

> The "fun" you are poking, Lennie, lands in your own lap. You've lied so
>often and misrepresented the truth that NO ONE believes or trusts you.
>(Except
>Vipul and BB, and I think we've been able to establish what kind of peanut
>gallery THEY are...)

None of what I have written about is any sort of lie. It is factual
and may be verified through a variety of third-party references
from NARA to the US Army Historical Center to the issues of
the Pacific Stars and Stripes military newspaper. There is
considerable military communications information on the Internet,

much of it found at the Foundation of American Scientists (FAS) large site (some of it old but newer items only five years old). None of the information written above is classified and a catalog of military signal equipment is found at the Army Training and Doctrine Command Digital Library, cleared for public viewing. Much technical information on military doctrine and equipment is also available from the US Government Printing Office (branch stores in major US cities), but that costs a nominal fee as their publications are mostly on paper (a few are now on CD).

For personal references of members of the 71st/FEC Bn, there is myself and Gene, N2JTV. When I was in the battalion, the transmitters officer-in-charge was Capt. William Boss, a licensed radio amateur and maintenance NCOIC SFC Donald Ross, holder of an amateur, first 'phone, and first 'telegraph licenses. Callsigns of those two are not remembered nor do I know if they still live. I have been in contact with James Brendage, a retired civilian who had worked at both ADA transmitter sites and for the USAF as a civilian engineer when the USAF took over all HF radio functions from the US Army in 1963.

> Pitiful, Lennie...You're just pitiful.

Such a comment was expected from a so-called superior amateur interested not in radio or radio techniques but in verbal combat for the sake of fighting. That reflects badly on the US amateur radio community.

> (Rest of anti-volunteerism and anti-veteran tripe snipped...Sam
>Anderscumisms we've heard before)

"Anti-veteran?" Hardly. I do not consider veterans of state guard units as having much importance or deserving of respect for pretending to be army soldiers. State guard units are NOT with the federal government or the US military.

"Anti-volunteerism?" No. I do not believe in gratuitous praise heaped upon any group that has done no more than any other citizen could do. Volunteerism by amateurs (in anything) is fine, but it is ridiculous to claim that such volunteers are better than professionals in a particular task.

> Putz.

Sgt Putz does not need to sign his name after a message.

2324. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 17:53:56 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030217125356.23182.00000404@mb-mi.aol.com>
Source record: 61400

In article <20030216173703.14527.00000383@mb-cc.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>As for removing incentive licensing, FCC seems to have moved from the idea that
> amateur radio needs 5 or 6 levels of license to the idea that 3 levels are
>adequate. Seems like a form of removal to me.

Seems like the SIX levels of amateur licenses were five too many to me...unless it was to segregate the newbies and less superior (to the long-time extras mind) amateurs?

Why not just have a single license? Amateur radio is a hobby, not a guild, not a union, not a profession.

If you need rank-status-title and other posturing of your whatevers, just join a state guard unit... :-)

2325. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 18:31:29 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030217133129.25403.00000457@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 61457

In article <20030216185049.10587.00000315@mb-bk.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>From: "KB9TMP"
>>That's easy V just learn the code and you'll "Beat" the test, or if
>>you feel you have to cheat it just learn the letters and pro signs.
>>If you pass you'll have cheated the test.
>
>I don't want to learn the code, okay?

OK, fine. So you can't operate on amateur HF/MF until the rules change. And the rules won't change unless the treaty changes.

>I have a BSEE and am just interested in
>the technical portion.

Great! Enjoy!

>Learning the code is a waste of time.
>
I have BSEEand MSEE and I say it's not a waste of time at all.

>Having the code license actually works against me, since it shows one wasted
>time learning code.

You have spent far more time posting here than it would take most people to learn enough code to pass the 5 wpm test.

How you spend your time is up to you, but the way you write says that learning code is a waste of time for everyone, not just for you.

>This takes away from other (legitimate) skills.

Is Morse code not a "legitimate" skill for a ham to have?

>I agree
>with that opinion. Also I just don't find code fun and I resent the higher
>license class being tied to the code.

Nothing anybody can do about it until the treaty changes.

Did you get to pick and choose the courses you wanted for the BSEE, and reject any that didn't interest you? Or did you have to learn some stuff that was of no interest but was required for the degree?

(I'm NOT saying a ham license is an academic certificate, just that one doesn;t get to pick and choose.)
>
>>> However, that picture of the club Homebrewing, shown to people outside the

>>> club, is wrong. It gives the apperance of wanting to homebrew, when noone
>>in
>>> the club actually is interested in that.
>
>>I have a picture on my wall from the newspaper that shows our first
>>club meeting with me as the president. We had it at a local resturant
>>but none of us were eating at the time. Does that show that our club
>>doesn't like food?
>
>If they had their picture taken, they probably posed for the picture. So,
>they
>had to put their utensils down.
>
Could have been a candid picture.

>The homebrewing photo is placed to show the club likes to Homebrew. However,
>noone in the club likes to homebrew.

How do you know?

>I see a contradiction.

Yeah, me too.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2326. Re: After S25.5 Goes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 18:31:30 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030217133130.25403.00000458@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 61458

In article <d22b54c3.0302170613.356bb7ec@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

> Power level regs are beyond useless. When was the last time
>any ham in the ham bands got busted for running over the legal limit??

Good question! Better yet, how about this one:

When was the last time any ham in the ham bands got busted for running over the legal limit when the rules allowed less than 1500W output??
>
>And the drift toward lower average power on HF has been underway for
>years.
>
If the only thing to be gained by upgrading beyond entry-level was power beyond 100 W, I for one might still hold an entry level license.
>
>> >4) fix outmoded bandwidth/baud_rate/modulation_type and any other
>technical
>> >rules that limit innovation
>
>Who besides you in all of hamdom is bitching about not having enough
>HF bandwidth to "innovate"??

>> I'd say the HF/MF bands should be divided by occupied bandwidth of mode,
>and
>> forget about the baud rate or modulation type. What we now call the
>> "CW/digital" parts of the band would be open to any documented mode that
>has
>> less than, say, 900 Hz bandwidth. What we now call the "phone" parts of the
>> bands would be open to any documented mode that has less than, say, 7000 Hz
>> bandwidth. And the old "Novice" subbands would be open to any documented
>mode
>> that will fit inside the subband.
>
>50,000 Hz wide sigs on 80, 40 & 15 eh?

That's the upper limit.

>Lessee now, where have we seen
>this nonsense before . . ?
>
>
>> Three classes of license, 10 year term, no age requirement, etc.
>> >
>> I forgot one question: What happens to existing Advanceds and Novices? Just

>> leave 'em alone?
>
>What a novel concept!

Naw, it's been done before. 1952-1967.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2327. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 19:59:02 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030217145902.14740.00000268@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 61459

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/17/03 11:53 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030217125355.23182.00000403@mb-mi.aol.com>

>> Please cite the quote where I asked, Your Putziness.
>
> Don't you want something erected every time you post here?

Lennie, I am SURE something get's "erected" every time I post...You LIVE for it...

>The Tennessee State Guard is NOT any part of the National
> Guard and certainly NOT a part of any USA military.

You are again redirected to the relationship between the Tennessee State Guard and the Tennessee State National Guard. Part of the TNSG's stated mission is to support Family Services and to man evacuated armories in the even of a Guard activation.

>They
> are essentially a sort of security guard unit wearing surplus
> US Army uniforms who are supposed to be caretakers of
> abandoned US military posts in Tennessee if the US military
> units normally at those posts are called to federal duty. They
> meet once a month according to their website information.

You attempt to define it to the least common denominator without having any first hand experience of thier training. This, of course, to further denigrate yet another volunteer function, this one staffed by Veterans.

You got a "two-fer"...Got to "diss" volunteers AND veterans in on fellled swoop.

>My assignment in Japan (as part of a REAL US Army tour of duty)
> was the 8235th Army Unit...(SNIP)

Yes, yes, yes, Lennie...We've heard it over and over.

It still does not make you any more knowledgeable in Amateur Radio matters, nor does it "score" you any points for having tried to embellish your career by associating yuorself with KIA's before.

>None of the above has any direct relation to amateur radio...(SNIP)

Exactly. But you DID find it necessary to recite it for the billionth time.

>I am proud to have done my military duty in the "71st" and honor
> the names of all 71st members who died for their country. I'm
> sure Eugene Rosenbaum, N2JTV, thinks accordingly although we
> have not talked for over a half year (he lives on Long Island, NY).
> Gene was in the 71st at the same time I was, but on a different
> transmitters shift. I keep a list of all the 71st's casualties and
> give them a mental salute from time to time.

Next time try using all five fingers in a traditional military salute, and without doing it so as to try and make YOU look like some kind of rear area war hero.

You were a radio clerk in a rear area radio station. Period.

>None of what I have written about is any sort of lie.

About the unit history? I am sure it's reasonably correct.

But I was not addressing the history of the "71st". I was addressing YOUR histroy in this newsgroup, Pinnochhio.

>Such a comment was expected from a so-called superior amateur
> interested not in radio or radio techniques but in verbal combat for
> the sake of fighting.

I don't need to be "superior" in ANY venue to see through YOUR lies, Your Putziness. You are as transparent as glass.

>"Anti-veteran?" Hardly. I do not consider veterans of state
> guard units as having much importance or deserving of respect
> for pretending to be army soldiers. State guard units are NOT
> with the federal government or the US military.

They are not "pretending" anything, Lennie. Thier uniforms do not say "US ARMY".

>"Anti-volunteerism?" No. I do not believe in gratuitous praise
> heaped upon any group that has done no more than any other
> citizen could do.

OK, what have YOU done, Your Scumminess? TELL us about all the organizations you support (and I don't mean by dropping a buck in thier bucket at Christmas).

You consistently denigrate the services of volunteers in all pursuits. I ahve yet to see you say a single complimentary thing about ANY one or ANY agency that provides, supports or utilizes volunteers.

None.

>Volunteerism by amateurs (in anything) is
> fine, but it is ridiculous to claim that such volunteers are
> better than professionals in a particular task.

In some cases volunteers ARE better than professionals. It happens.

>>Putz.
>
> Sgt Putz does not need to sign his name after a message.

Then let me clarify who it was intended for...

YOU'RE a putz.

Better?

2328. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 20:03:25 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030217150325.14740.00000269@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 61461

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/17/03 11:53 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030217125335.23182.00000402@mb-mi.aol.com>

>See other message. First Presidential Unit Citation was awarded
> to the FEC Sig Svc Bn in 1954, the second Presidential Unit
> Citation awarded in 1955. I was stationed in the battalion from
> February of 1953 to the end of January 1956.

No, Lennie, I asked what were the effective dates of the awards...for WHAT PERIODS were they awarded for?

Not WHEN were they awarded. Very few awards are issued immediately upon recommendation.

If those dates were when you were there, you will receive your nickle (and appropriate acknowledgement in this forum).

>You L-O-S-E cheapskate.

Either way, I win. A nickle invested in a bet wih you is more than YOU ever invested in Amateur Radio.

You're a putz.

2329. Re: New Field Day Entry Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 20:03:26 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E513FF9.296E4C4C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61460

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <d22b54c3.0302152243.21cb0b66@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >> Jim seems a little testy lately, turns on Crony.
> > >
> > >We're natural borned contesters with thick skins. Which comes with our breed.
> >
> > Not in here. The only thickness shown is of the cabeza. :-)

Emoticon disregarded. We're radio amateurs. Those of us who choose to
use morse and participate in contests do so as we see fit. We do it
because we like it and because we choose to do so. You, as a non radio
amateur, may do as you can. You remain a sidewalk superintendant.

Dave K8MN

Dave K8MN.

2330. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 20:09:36 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030217150936.14740.00000270@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 61462

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/17/03 11:53 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030217125334.23182.00000400@mb-mi.aol.com>

>>Let's rewrite N2EY's paragraph:
>>>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>>>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>>>amateur opposes K5YZ's views,
>>
>>K4YZ will always find some fault with someone's background to use it to
>claim
>>the person has no credibility in Ham radio.
>
> Interesting psychological quirk is that outrage and temper causes
> him to even mis-spell his own call sign

Interesting psychological quirk is that YOUR outrage and temper at being constantly proven to be the liar you are allowed you to try and put that "error" on me when indeed the error was your east coast franchisee, Vippy the Voiciferous.

You should follow the attributes a bit closer, Your Foolishness.

>The sad part is that Attilla is not a Jew and doesn't understand
> that "putz" is a middle-European Jewish ethnic swearword
> meaning "dickhead."

I don't? I thought I chose that word rather carefully and appropriately.

Why?

Because YOU'RE a putz, Lennie.

2331. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 20:12:02 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E5141FB.3E185308@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61463

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <v50k145bv3ppe1@corp.supernews.com>, "KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com>
> writes:
>
> >"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20030216185049.10587.00000315@mb-bk.aol.com...
> >> From: "KB9TMP"

> >> I don't want to learn the code, okay?
> >
> >I didn't WANT to either but I did because that is the requirement!
>
> Following orders like a good little soldier? :-)

Didn't you follow orders when you were a little soldier?

> I've never had any requirement for "the code" in a half
> century past...and I started out in Big Time HF comm.

Lemme clue you in: You won't be getting that "Extra right out of the
box" any time soon. There is a *requirement* of 5 wpm morse for HF
access in ham radio.

> >You have wasted more time on this internet NG
> >than it would have taken you to learn code.
>
> Nonsense. The US military found out in WW2 that only
> about one in eight recruits had the aptitude to learn
> morse code successfully. Seven out of eight would
> have a hard time becoming marginally proficient.
> That's why one of the recruit tests (WW2 through at
> least 1960) was a morse code cognition aptitude test.

The current five word per minute test is less than what would be
considered "marginally proficient".

Dave K8MN

2332. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 20:15:20 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E5142D8.CAC96F5C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61464

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E5014C3.C133E0A7@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Been there. Done that. Sent you the T-shirt.
>
> No T-shirt was sent. Just a used Tissue. Torn at that...

You didn't get your shirt? Check with UPS. I can give you the tracking
number. I didn't send the tissue. Check with all of the others with
whom you've crossed swords. I understand that it will take some time.

Dave K8MN

2333. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 20:17:01 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030217151701.14740.00000271@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 61465

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/17/03 11:53 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030217125333.23182.00000399@mb-mi.aol.com>

>In article <v50k145bv3ppe1@corp.supernews.com>, "KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com>
>writes:

>>I didn't WANT to either but I did because that is the requirement!
>
> Following orders like a good little soldier?

A trait I am sure you didn't manifest while YOU were in the Army, Lennie.

>I've never had any requirement for "the code" in a half
> century past...and I started out in Big Time HF comm.

And we are still waiting to see what it got you? Your retirement?
Congratulations. Too bad the only "HF" operating you can do today is on 11
meters or with some Part 15 device made out of a 2n2222 and a 9 volt battery.

>What you personally like is fine, but why do you
> insist on subjugating others to what "you like"
> or "don't like?"

WHOA! YOUR PUTZINESS! Before HE answers that, why don't YOU answer it,
since we've been asking YOU the EXACT SAME QUESTION of YEARS ! ! ! ! ! !

>>You have wasted more time on this internet NG
>>than it would have taken you to learn code.
>
> Nonsense.

Nope. If Vippy the Virtuous can earn a BSEE (which I doubt he did), he
could have mastered 5WPM code by now.

>Ralph, bless his soul, related well with other people.

You could learn something from that, but never did, I see.

>Maybe if you quit waving around your certificate and
> going "nyah-nyah" you might improve your working
> relations with others?

Maybe you could learn from your OWN advice, Lennie.

But I doubt it.

2334. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 20:19:55 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030217151955.14740.00000272@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 61466

>Subject: Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/17/03 11:53 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030217125356.23182.00000404@mb-mi.aol.com>

>Seems like the SIX levels of amateur licenses were five too
> many to me

Any number of licenses will always be too many levels for you, Your
Putziness.

You can't even pass the simplest of them now......

2335. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 20:28:54 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030217152854.14740.00000273@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 61467

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 2/17/03 2:12 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3E5141FB.3E185308@earthlink.net>

>> Following orders like a good little soldier?
>
>Didn't you follow orders when you were a little soldier?

I doubt that Lennie's "little soldier" has been able to follow any orders
for a long time.

2336. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 20:54:06 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b2ri9evpe1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 61468

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030217071526.14527.00000387@mb-cc.aol.com...
> In article <Xns9324DC71DD79Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>
> >From a regulator's point of view, dumping Element 1 is a 'small' change!
> >That's why the smart money is that they will do just that.
>
> One paragraph, waiving Element 1 until a full rewrite can be done at some
> future date.

However, dropping Element 1 doesn't necessarily mean there will be any
"full rewrite" at all.

> >Someone needs
> >to think of a 'simple' way to phase out the closed licence classes of
> >Advanced and Novice, and to redistribute their subbands.
>
> Why? FCC sees no problem with the way things are.

And, in reality, the Novice bands are available to all Tech+, Gen, Advanced
and Extra anyway.

Likewise, even if the Advanced hams all vaporized tomorrow, the "advanced
subbands are are fully usable by Extras. Indeed, today that is the major
benefit
of going from General to Extra...you get all frequency privileges.

> >The FCC have said
> >that we must reach a consensus on that, and then they will do it, but not
> >before. I bet this group has a few proposals for that.
> >
> The problem is simply one of not being able to meet all goals at once.

Yep, there's almost never a perfect solution to anything.

> Take the Advanced for example. 88,000 of them, and slowly dropping.
>
> If they get all privs, they've gotten a free upgrade to Extra that others
had
> to pass a test to get. Not going to be popular.
>
> If they're reduced to General privileges, they've lost privs just to make
the
> rules a little shorter.
>

> Neither idea is going to get much support.

Nor is there any reason for the FCC to do anything anyway. The renewal process
is pretty much automated (my renewal was done via ARRL and it was processed in less than 10 days earlier this month. Now I'm just waiting for the hard copy to
show up in the mail which is probably computer generated and mailed.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2337. Re: Net Tonight

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 20:58:40 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b2rii2$j1h$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 61469

Note also that some sound cards also have a 4th jack for "rear-speakers".
(e.g. Soundblaster).

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:v50p2mgoe8v2ef@corp.supernews.com...
> OK, Jackie. Sounds good if it's under warranty. One other thing to
check -
> there are **THREE** connectors on the sound card; one is for speakers, one
> is for the microphone, and one is line input. Just make sure you aren't
> accidentally plugged into the line in as the microphone output is way to
low
> for the line in and it will act as though you have no microphone. Good
> luck!
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA
>
>
>
> ---
> Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
> Version: 6.0.455 / Virus Database: 255 - Release Date: 2/13/03
>
>

2338. Re: ARRL DX CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 21:35:34 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030217163534.25154.00000434@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 61470

In article <d22b54c3.0302170927.62843a4f@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>Total: 3763 [QSOs] 502 [band/countries] Total Score = 5,667,078
>
That's 99 QSOs per hour, every hour, for more than a day and a half. Single op, too.

Simply amazing.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2339. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 22:39:34 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302171439.578b7b9b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61471

Steve Adell - KF2TI (Landing, NJ FN20qv) <kf2ti@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:<b2qtaepaq1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>...
> In article <f45722ac.0302170640.76662833@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com says...
> about some exotic DX
> > > location you allegedly operated from.
> > >
> > Steve, I don't have a problem with what I did. I'm trying to think of
> > a way to go on another dxpedition, this time without all the hazards.
>
> http://www.datasync.com/~bmusa/hamlet.htm
>
> Jody runs a 1st class operation Beautiful rooms, excellent scenery and
> great weekly rates. Will even help getting the necessary operating
> permits

Looks like fun. I hope they don't have shoot-outs every night. I'd
like to leave the flack vest and helmut home this time.

2340. Re: arrl article on echolink - impress a non ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 23:05:28 UTC
From: perry chamberlain <kato@qnet.com>
Message-ID: <3E516AB8.2030401@qnet.com>
Source record: 61472
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

-- hey you've been spying on our ham club meetings.

Perry Chamberlain
Kato@qnet.com
Liv'n on de Edge n de Desert
Everyone has someone in their family who is crazy,
if you don't know who it is, its you!

2341. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-17 23:50:42 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030217185042.04532.00000243@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 61473

From K4YZ:
>How about in at least 30 years of QST, CQ and 73 that I am aware of where
>the contributions of Amateurs has been refered to as the "radio art", Vippy?

They must have been referring to technical accomplishment. Still, you did not cite an example from one of these magazines. Also, these are "Ham" radio magazines, so they follow the same hype that Hams do.

Please provide a sentence where "radio art" is used to mean non-technical achievement, from an unbiased source.

2342. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 00:41:06 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030217194106.04532.00000252@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 61474

From K4YZ:
>Nope. If Vippy the Virtuous can earn a BSEE (which I doubt he did), he
>could have mastered 5WPM code by now.

I can learn code. I don't find Morse code fun or relevant to the higher license class.

2343. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 00:51:36 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030217195136.04532.00000253@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 61476

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
> And statistically, 50% of everything you learn in college is useless byt
>eh time you get to the job market, but you still did it to get YOUR degree,
>didn't you...?!?! Paid a lot of money for it too.

I don't believe that 50% learned is worthless in EE degree. N2EY (probably)
will agree. 50% of skills useless by the time you learn them could be true of
trendy IT "field".

>>Having the code license actually works against me, since it shows one wasted
>>time learning code.
>Refer to the above comment. This isn't the MOST stupid thing you've ever
>posted, Vippy, but it's in the top three.

Someone else claimed it. I agree with it. If you have a General class license,
it shows you learned the code. This is a waste of time for technical skills.

2344. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 01:16:10 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030217201610.04532.00000254@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 61477

From N2EY:
>>Learning the code is a waste of time.
>>
>I have BSEEand MSEE and I say it's not a waste of time at all.

It is a waste of time for those that have a degree or are just interested in the technical aspect. The exception is if you TRULY enjoy it. In that case, it is not a waste of time. You may truly enjoy it,so it is not a waste of time for you. I do not truly enjoy Morse code.

>How you spend your time is up to you, but the way you write says that
>learning
>code is a waste of time for everyone, not just for you.

It should not be tied to the higher licence class.

>>This takes away from other (legitimate) skills.
>
>Is Morse code not a "legitimate" skill for a ham to have?

Its legitamate for a Ham. Not for one who wants to increase technical skills and does not enjoy Morse code.

>Did you get to pick and choose the courses you wanted for the BSEE, and
>reject
>any that didn't interest you? Or did you have to learn some stuff that was of
>no interest but was required for the degree?

There were many course I didn't like. Many even were irrelevant. To satisfy some rationalization, or to act as filler courses to get the required amount of credits, or for a variety of reasons, they were tied to the degree. That does not make it right. There is not need to do the same thing to amateur radio.

>(I'm NOT saying a ham license is an academic certificate, just that one
>doesn;t
>get to pick and choose.)

One has the ability to use common sense and not tie the code to the technical license class.

>>The homebrewing photo is placed to show the club likes to Homebrew. However,
>>noone in the club likes to homebrew.
>
>How do you know?

I can ask someone in the photo if they like homebrewing. What proof do you need?

Morse code, dissected:

It is possible that in the early stages of learning an "audio-motory" skill such as Morse code , a quasi-phonological approach to temporal processing is used, which prioritizes sequence over temporal precision, and that what marks the acquisition of a motor skill is the changeover to from sequence-priority processing to time-priority processing.

It is this state of "time-priority" processing, when one can say they "learned" the code. This state is not achieved at 5wpm. (It is still a waste of time, however). I have successfully learned another real-time encoding/decoding symbol set scheme, with Kinaesthetic processing (because I enjoy it). Once one reaches the state of time-priority processing, one cannot unlearn the code.

After the changeover to time-priority processing, one may lose the ability of sequence priority processing. This is called "motor-memory".

The end result is communication over a medium, which despite hypothetical scenarios, can be achieved by voice. If you don't enjoy it, or find it relevant, don't learn it. Don't be pressured into it, just to satisfy some "requirement".

2345. Re: After S25.5 Goes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 01:39:16 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hah2lq3.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 61478

On 17 Feb 2003 01:53:14 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>But let me play devil's advocate and ask this question....
>
>Once upon a time, Novices were only allowed 75 watts input - was
>there ever a serious enforcement problem with QRO Novices? How about
>today, with the low-power limits on the Novice subbands and 30 meters?

Hard to tell if there is compliance where modern enforcement is on a
reactive (complaint-driven) rather than a proactive ("on patrol")
basis.

I can relate first hand to what it takes to prove that a "CB style"
operator is operating with more than 4 watts - the following is no
secret to anyone who has been so inspected:

It takes two technically-qualified agents (engineers or
technicians). The signal is df-ed to a particular antenna, (yes,
for at least 25 years the FCC has had hand-held concealable
equipment that can differentiate between two antennas on the same
house on close-in df) and the level of the signal is noted on a
spectrum analyzer for reference. One agent goes into the premises
to attempt the inspection while the other agent observes the antenna
(if it is rotatable) and the signal level. Meanwhile the inspector
is usually kept waiting outside while the very characteristic
"tinkle" sound of PL-259s being hastily uncoupled from equipment is
heard inside before being admitted. The inspector measures the
transmitter power (which by that time is at or below legal limits
umless the operator is stupid as well as sleazy) with an in-line
wattmeter while the other agent notes the level of the signal on the
spectrum analyzer. From that it is easy to calculate the power of
the original "before inspection" transmission. If the antenna is
rotated or the spectrum analyzer moved between those readings there
are certain "fudge factors" applied in the operator's favor.

Contrast that with frequemcy or occupied bandwidth measurements
which do not require two agents and can be done at long range.

>Do you think today's test questions and methods are an adequate determination
>of that knowledge?

Not being involved with the VE program (by choice) I could not say
one way or another, but from the comments that I have heard about
the level of today's testing, I have my doubts.

I could be 100% wrong, though. Ed Hare (whom we haven't heard from
lately) could speak with more authority.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2346. Re: After S25.5 Goes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 01:39:16 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hah2wb4.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 61484

On 17 Feb 2003 06:13:39 -0800, Brian Kelly wrote:

>Fuhgeddit. Power level regs are beyond useless. When was the last
>time any ham in the ham bands got busted for running over the legal
>limit??

The last time that -I- busted a licensed ham for overpower was
the oiperator at the Peoples Temple in San Francisco. Remember
them - the stateside terminal of the Jonestown settlement of
Massacre fame in 1978.

However, unlicened "CB style" operators get busted routinely when
the complaint volume gets great enough and there are extrinsic
factors involved to warrant assigment of the necessary crew.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2347. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 01:39:17 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hah3dq5.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 61479

On 17 Feb 2003 02:04:47 GMT, Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>In fact, I would like to change the Vanity call sign program to
>eliminate the ability to request out-of-district call signs, with the
>retroactive cancellation of any which have already been assigned!

Are we going through this hoo-hah-hah again?

Don't hold your breath, man - you don't look good in blue.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2348. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 01:39:17 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hah3m46.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 61481

On 17 Feb 2003 12:15:26 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>>From a regulator's point of view, dumping Element 1 is a 'small' change!
>>That's why the smart money is that they will do just that.
>
>One paragraph, waiving Element 1 until a full rewrite can be done at some
>future date.

And because it removes a burdensome requirement, the FCC can do it
by Memorandum Report and Order without going through the NPRM and
public input process.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2349. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 01:39:18 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hah49t8.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 61480

On 17 Feb 2003 17:53:31 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:

>>Bet: The FCC is not about to put themselves thru another
>>"restructuring" of ham radio for years. We've only had three major
>>overhauls in last 52 years, that's one every 17+ years. History does
>>repeat itself, yes?
>
> Ahem...take a look at the title of NPRM 98-143 and R&O 99-412.
> it reads "biennial." "Biennial" as ordered by the Congress of
> the United States. "Biennial" is defined as "happening every
> two years" or as a "period of two years."

Yes but - the "Biennial" refers to the requirement to review SOME service's rules in depth every two years. There's such a review going on all the time. We in the ARS had ours in '98. Now it's someone else's turn.

The last thong that Billy Tauzin thinks of when he thinks of "getting" the FCC is Amateur Radio Service Rule Revisions. He has much bigger fish to fry.

As Bill Cross intimated in his famous statement two years ago - we have to keep our head down and stay out of the crossfire.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2350. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 01:39:18 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hah3wf7.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 61482

On 17 Feb 2003 12:15:27 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>Another possibility, though less probable, would be for FCC to restart the
>whole restructure process yet again. It's been 5 years since they began the
>last one!

My gut feeling is that after the last Congressionally-ordered
"vaudeville fire drill" that's the last thing that Bill Cross wants
to do.

You didn't think that the FCC wanted to do that exercise on its
own, did you?

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2351. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 01:39:19 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hah4ji9.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 61483

On 17 Feb 2003 17:53:32 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:

> "Wide ranging support in the amateur radio community" is invalid
> for any federal regulation applying to ALL citizens.

Tell that to Bill Cross and the other staff members who decide when to make revisions and what they should be. He's not going to do anything unless there is a consensus WITHIN the amateur community. That's part of the "self policing" that the Commish' expects from the licensees in the ARS.

He said so in Dayton two years ago.

But then again you are not a licensee nor are you within the amateur radio community.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2352. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 01:39:40 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030217203940.29016.00000377@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 61485

In article <170220030942424672%pdq@volaris.net>, PDQ <pdq@volaris.net> writes:

>> As of February 14, 2003:
>>
>> Novice - 35,446 (decrease of 13,883)
>> Tech - 250,120 (increase of 44,726)
>> Tech Plus - 71,924 (decrease of 56,936)
>> General - 140,120 (increase of 27,443)
>> Advanced - 84,099 (decrease of 15,683)
>> Extra - 103,503 (increase of 24,753)
>> Total - 685,212 (increase of 10,420)
>>
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>Interesting, 52% of all hams are Novice, Tech or Tech+.

Yup - down from 57% in May of 2000.

>Tech+ and
>Novice decreased by 70,819 but General and Extra only increased by
>37,863. I suspect that much of the upgrade to Extra is by Advanced and
>Generals who had those licenses prior to the the reduction in the code
>speed requirement. So where are the Tech+ licensees going?

Three places:

- Some are upgrading to General or Extra. Note that Tech+s who can show they were license-tested before March 21, 1987 don't need to take any tests to upgrade to General, but they must show up at a VE session, do the paper, pay the fee etc.

- Some are dropping out (not renewing).

- Some are becoming Techs. Since April 15, 2000, FCC has been renewing Tech Pluses as Techs, and leaving it up to the license holder to maintain records of being a Tech Plus. So even if no other changes are made to the rules, there will be no more Tech Pluses in about seven years from now.

>Does this have something to do with the FCC database not listing the
>Tech+ anymore and movement from Novice or Tech to Tech with code credit
>is reflected in the Tech license increase?
>
See above.

>The overall increase is 1.54% or a little over 1/2 percent per year,
>with Novice, Tech, Tech+ decreasing by 6.8% and General, Advanced,

>Extra increasing by 12.6%. While the ARS does not seem to be growing
>very much since May of 2000, the movement to higher class licenses and
>Hf privileges (General, Extra) seems to be increasing at good rates.
>
This thread has been going on since September of 2001 so there would be a
consistent way of measuring the trends.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2353. Re: ARRL DX CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 01:56:10 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b2s3rnger1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 61486

Not bad indeed......one of these days I'll put up a real antenna...hi.

Dan/W4NTI

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0302170927.62843a4f@posting.google.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<b2pbks$7vf$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>...
> > Anyone play in the contest? I managed 651q and nearly half a mil
points.
> >
> > SO HP all bands.
>
> Here's how one of the neighborhood heavy hitters played the game. From
> the club refelector:
>
> - - - -
>
> Call: W2UP
> Operator(s): W2UP
> Station: W2UP
>
> Class: SOAB(A) HP
> QTH: PA
> Operating Time (hrs): 38
> Radios: SO2R
>
> Summary:
> Band QSOs Mults
> -------------------
> 160: 37 33
> 80: 237 68
> 40: 688 91
> 20: 1022 108
> 15: 1002 105
> 10: 777 97
> -------------------
> Total: 3763 502 Total Score = 5,667,078
>
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
>
> w3rv

2354. Re: ARRL DX CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 01:57:28 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <cqg4a.5569$4y4.2912127@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 61475

I'm a YL not an OM.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:b2r39qtgt1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> True....good to see he tried. Now the next one will show how much he
> improved.
>
> My first contest was back in about 62 or so. Novice roundup. Think it
> went for two weeks ??. Looked at my old logs. Looks like I made 3
> contacts in two weeks.
>
> See you can get better...hi.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
> news:d22b54c3.0302170624.3ced5fe8@posting.google.com...
> > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:<mBY3a.5418$4y4.2767831@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > news:b2pbks$7vf$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> > > > Anyone play in the contest? I managed 651q and nearly half a mil
> points.
> > > >
> > > > SO HP all bands.
> > > >
> > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > Yup had a lot of fun but I'm not as good at this as some. But then
> again I
> > > only operated a few hours each day.
> > >
> > > 33 contacts
> > > 31 countries
> > > 3,069 points
> >
> > Playing the search & pounce game is how ya get good at it.
> >
> > >
> > > Dee Flint, N8UZE
> >

> > w3rv
>
>

2355. Re: ARRL DX CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 01:58:42 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b2s40f$d2t$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 61487

So?

Dan/W4NTI

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:cqg4a.5569$4y4.2912127@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> I'm a YL not an OM.
>
> Dee Flint, N8UZE
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:b2r39qtgt1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> > True....good to see he tried. Now the next one will show how much he
> > improved.
> >
> > My first contest was back in about 62 or so. Novice roundup. Think it
> > went for two weeks ??. Looked at my old logs. Looks like I made 3
> > contacts in two weeks.
> >
> > See you can get better...hi.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
> > news:d22b54c3.0302170624.3ced5fe8@posting.google.com...
> > > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> > news:<mBY3a.5418$4y4.2767831@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > news:b2pbks$7vf$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> > > > > Anyone play in the contest? I managed 651q and nearly half a mil
> > points.
> > > > > >
> > > > > SO HP all bands.
> > > > > >
> > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > Yup had a lot of fun but I'm not as good at this as some. But then
> > again I
> > > > > only operated a few hours each day.
> > > > >
> > > > > 33 contacts
> > > > > 31 countries
> > > > > 3,069 points

> > >
> > > Playing the search & pounce game is how ya get good at it.
> > >
> > > >
> > > > Dee Flint, N8UZE
> > >
> > > w3rv
> >
> >
>
>

2356. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 02:11:26 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030217211126.03532.00000535@mb-cp.aol.com>
Source record: 61489

In article <20030216173702.14527.00000382@mb-cc.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>>Oops, that was supposed to read "Imagine that...a young person actually
>>having <fun with> Morse code!"
>>
>Not hard to imagine at all. Seen it in reality many times. Also experienced it
>myself.

Why don't you pull out that qualitative Poll that shows all the
"young persons" NOT liking morse code?

Is this a precursor to another Sermon on the Antenna Mount?

:-)

2357. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 02:11:26 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030217211126.03532.00000534@mb-cp.aol.com>
Source record: 61493

In article <20030217015003.23989.00000404@mb-fz.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Attilla the Ham) writes:

>>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>>Date: 2/16/03 5:50 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20030216185049.10587.00000315@mb-bk.aol.com>
>
>>I don't want to learn the code, okay? I have a BSEE and am just interested in
>>the technical portion. Learning the code is a waste of time.
>
> BSEE from who? Ronco? K-Tel?

Chill, nursie. We all see the steam from your ears...

> And statistically, 50% of everything you learn in college is useless byt
>eh time you get to the job market, but you still did it to get YOUR degree,
>didn't you...?!?! Paid a lot of money for it too.

Of course, spoken by some Dean of Admissions or
professor? Or by some amateur dumshit who hasn't
gotten an academic degree OR worked in any sort of
academic or professional area other than once filling
out forms as a purchasing agent?

Or is it the amateur saying others make "countless errors"
when he, again, tries to bite somebody with "...byt eh..."?

You ARE one vindictive little son of a beeper, Attilla. You
will make fun and ridicule against anyone who goes out of
their way to learn something. [see the attempted defamation
of "15 years of night school" as a pejorative in here often
enough]

>>Having the code license actually works against me, since it shows one wasted
>>time learning code.
>
> Refer to the above comment. This isn't the MOST stupid thing you've ever
>posted, Vippy, but it's in the top three.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Still sucking that dill brine, Sgt Putz?

Hard day at the orifice?

Hospital administrator took away your keys to the medication
cabinet?

>
>> This takes away from other (legitimate) skills.
>
> Such as? Morse Code STILL ahs it's uses, Vippy.

"...ahs...?" What's an "ahs," mighty macho morseman?

Could that be one of the "countless errors" others commit
by mighty macho morsemen never do? :-)

>>Also I just don't find code fun and I resent the higher
>>license class being tied to the code.
>
> The lazy and the spoiled usually do resent having to do something to get
>something...They want it given to them for as cheap as they can get it,
>regardless of how easily it can be come by.

Ooopsie. Nursie got the wrong pill bottle again? Tsk, tsk.

Here we go on another jaunt down ONE HAS TO *WORK*
AT HAVING FUN IN A HOBBY from one of the afflicted
brain-dead old farts ("thirty years a ham!").

Work. Slave. All for "dedication and resolution to show the
amateur community!" Yeah, like everyone has to be
subservient to the wishes and demands of the BDOFs
wearing distinctive unit insignia.

Go for it, mighty macho morseman, dress down them nasty
young recruits in your hambone boot camp. Show 'em who
is god. [you are, of course, there was never any doubt]

Make everyone WORK, WORK, WORK.

>>The homebrewing photo is placed to show the club likes to Homebrew. However,
>>noone in the club likes to homebrew. I see a contradiction.
>
> The contradiction is in YOUR assertion that they dislike homebrewing when
>they obviously posed for a picture that promotes it.

The only "contradiction" Attilla the Ham makes is attempting
to pass hisself off as a civil human being who knows something
about radio.

> Vippy, you just don't make sense. The funny part is you think you do.

Steamy, you've lost it again, sitting on standby, garbled
modulation, and your electrolytics are all leaking out. Go
wipe up the mess with some of your extra certificates. Get
a better human disguise, alien, your echoes are long delayed.

Temper fry

2358. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 02:11:27 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030217211127.03532.00000536@mb-cp.aol.com>
Source record: 61491

In article <20030216173704.14527.00000384@mb-cc.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>Remember all those stations next time somebody says or writes that CW has no >relevance in ham radio today, or that nobody uses it anymore.

The epitome of US amateur radio is working DX on HF with CW.

;-)

2359. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 02:11:27 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030217211127.03532.00000537@mb-cp.aol.com>
Source record: 61492

In article <20030217041604.12069.00000565@mb-mr.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Attilla the Ham) writes:

>>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 2/15/03 5:15 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20030215181525.09808.00000851@mb-fk.aol.com>
>
>>Flight suits, one-piece coveralls, commonly called "poopie-suits"
>> by those who wear them.
>
> Oh?

YES. That's one of many colloquial names for that garment.

> I've been wearing flight suits in one form or another for over 30 years
>and never heard them called "poopie-suits", by USAF, USN, USMC or even (dare
>I say it...?!?!) CAP members.

Then you haven't been listening, Attilla the Ham. There are
dozens more euphamisms for flight coveralls and flight
helmets and other things in air crew quarters. They are
THERE and no amount of exaggeration of your "experience"
in changing black boxes (under instruction) is going to make
you some definitive etymological source.

> Like I said, Your Scumminess, I don't make an issue of "off topic" issues
>except with you, and that's only because you delight in resorting to
chastising
>others about it when the need suits your rants or provides you an exit from a
>thread in which you are (again) taking heat.

Hell, boy, you can't even get ON-topic subjects correct!

You've flipped out, lost it, switched off, drifted off frequency
a long time ago and live in a world of fantasy, certificatism,
and uniforms with distinctive unit insignia.

Temper fry

2360. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 02:11:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030217211128.03532.00000538@mb-cp.aol.com>
Source record: 61490

In article <20030217041133.12069.00000564@mb-mr.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Attilla the Ham) writes:

>>> As I said before, Brian, YOU need to have some OTHER source for your
>>>"facts" than Lennie's rants. You are obviously ill prepared, nor are you
"up
>>>to date" on current affairs.
>>
>> Yeah, pity that, Brian Burke as a veteran of the REAL USAF
>> isn't any damn good on knowing about Real USAF things...
>> but a CAP member does.
>
> Well, Your Putziness, seems he doesn't know all of it since he had to ask
>me about it in a public forum.
>
> And as for "Real USAF things", I don't remember making any posts wherein I
>tried to "tell" Brian about USAF matters. I would ask you to please cite your
>source, but that's just one more thing on the "Lennie Won't Do It Lest He
>Expose His Own Rants" pile.
>
> Putz.

There's no need to sign your posts with your surname.

Temper fry

2361. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 02:11:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030217211130.03532.00000539@mb-cp.aol.com>
Source record: 61496

In article <20030217040555.12069.00000563@mb-mr.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Attilla the Ham) writes:

>>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 2/12/03 8:07 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20030212210745.09921.00001847@mb-md.aol.com>
>>
>>In article <20030211220432.28727.00000217@mb-fr.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com
>>(Vshah101) writes:
>>
>>
>>>Remember when "Ham Radio" became QST? It is representative of the change in
>>>today's Ham radio.
>>
>> I'm sure you meant something else, but a new (misdirection)
>> thread will start up in here where the Faithful will confuse
>> "QST" with "Ham Radio" magazine (started in 1968, ended
>> in 1990 by sale to CQ)...and "inform you" that you are a
>> #$%^&!!! and a $@!$@!! for writing that.
>
> Naaaaah...We just recognize where Vippy is getting his "facts" from,
>Lennie.
>
> The Learned in this forum (even you) know that "Ham Radio" did not become
>QST. QST was an independent journal even before the creators of "Ham Radio"
>were born.

Oh? Ham Radio magazine's first issue came out in 1968. Were the publisher (Skip Tenney) and editor in chief (Jim Fisk) infants in that year. HR remained in publication for 22 years until Communications Technology, Inc., sold it to CQ Communications.

Attilla the Ham has maintained HR "went defunct," as some kind of epithet. To Attilla it wouldn't matter since most of the material in 22 years of monthly issues was above Ohm's Law in level and such is beyond what Attilla can grasp. Even after three decades as an amateur.

Simple arithmetic rules are seemingly beyond the BDOFs. Some say that "1 = 26" (Kellie), "7 x 24 = 148" (Heil) and Reverend Jimmie Callsign, pastor of the newsgroupies, can see trends in numbers that elude statisticians. :-)

> Vipul, on the other hand, doesn't know the difference. His approach is
>that if he slings enough mud something he's aiming at will get splatted.

Hello? Anyone there? Just who has signed posts with epithets
like "Putz" and "Creep" for months in here?

>>Steve Cannon will probably trot out one of his old set-pieces
>> about "extras are So good because they expertly know how
>> to tune their receivers..."
>
> I am always tickled on how Lennie pulls stuff like this out when he has
>nothing else to add.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, attention deficit disorder by Attilla the Ham...who
once tried to make a case where he was "deserved to have an
extra" by some unique "ability to tune in a station!"

Try Google, mighty macho morseman Attilla.

Or don't...you will become totally freaked out by some of your
own postings. :-)

>>>>I have been an ACTIVE Amateur Radio
>>>>licensee, probably before you were born, and I ahve NEVER heard of ANY
>>>>"definintion" of "radio art" to be ONLY "technical achievement".
>>
>> Oh, my, another "OF" blowing his trumpet!
>
> At least I have a trumpet to blow, Lennie.

Yes, a battered little thing, a child's toy trumpet that a couple
of four-year-olds got to play with. [Steamy don' really wanna
go there again, he gonna bleed and bleed again if he do...]

>>The first evidence of moonbounce came from US Army Signal
>> Corps experimentation in Project Diana.
>
> Nope. Amateurs and commercial stations as far back as the mid-1920's
>reported "long delay echoes", some of which were (later) attributed to
>terrestrial phenomena, other occassions were attributed to lunar
>reflectivity.

"Attributed?!?" By whom? Some articles in ANALOG magazine
a few decades ago by a member of the British Interplanetary
Society? Show the EVIDENCE, Attilla. At least come close to
some kind of definitive source.

THE FIRST EVIDENCE OF MOONBOUNCE CAME FROM US
ARMY SIGNAL CORPS EXPERIMENTATION IN PROJECT DIANA.

The subject was MOONBOUNCE...using the moon as a reflector.
Not some mythical "long delay echoes" said to be observed by a
few and verified by no one. PROJECT DIANA. Hello? 1946.
Definitive evidence, witnesses from the press, echo waveform
photographs, verification by others doing the same thing
afterwards. It was in Real radio literature and recognized as first
by the rest of the Real radio world, not by some UFOnaut.

I guess that I have to use all capitals in order to make things
clear to your few neurons, Attilla.

>>Outside of hobby "park flying" it is not possible to build
>> cheap, safe rockets.
>
> Not yet. But there will be.

Oh, a PREDICTION from a resident rocket scientist!

Wow, Attilla was a member of the Verein fur Raumschart?

>>Governments who once launched a half million radiosondes
>> a year go to industry for minimum cost and maximum
>> reliability. Anything else is pipe-dream nonsense.
>
> More ignorance and arrogance. Market forces are already driving for
>alternatives to NASA and ESA assets.

Attilla is now a meteorologist? Did he think so because
he once read a meter?!?

Go reasearch radiosondes and their use, their history,
Attilla. Try NOAA "assets" on radiosondes before you
make yourself another ass again.

You can find out about meteorology, too, and how all those
little isobars get on weather charts...did you think some
artist drew them because they looked nice that way?

If you weren't known as a total ignorant slut about radio
technology behind the front panels you could learn about
pencil triodes by the tens of thousands installed in little
plastic boxes containing PC switches and one-shot
batteries tracked by radar-like directional receivers having
automatic tracking.

>>Membership organizations rationalize their statements by
>> saying "we are talking about amateur radio" despite their
>> constant attempts to align themselves with the rest of the
>> radio world...and not telling their membership much about the
>> rest of that world of radio.
>
> Such as...?!?!

ARRL. That group that was formed in 1912 to hack telegram
carriers in New England. The "Napster" of its day. :-)

Temper fry

2362. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 02:11:32 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030217211132.03532.00000540@mb-cp.aol.com>
Source record: 61497

In article <20030217033615.11988.00000639@mb-mr.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Attilla the Ham) writes:

>>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>>Date: 2/16/03 5:17 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20030216181737.10587.00000314@mb-bk.aol.com>
>
>>Please list one example of where your definition is used, in a sentense. I
>>cannot find an example of "radio art" other than technical achievement.
>
> "Sentense"...?!?! You claim to have a bachelor's degree?

Tsk, tsk, tsk, alleged 'amatuer,' you do NOT want to go there.

[poor baby gets all uptight and frequently makes writing errors,
one common one being spelling 'amateur' as "amatuer"]

> How about in at least 30 years of QST, CQ and 73 that I am aware of where
>the contributions of Amateurs has been refered to as the "radio art", Vippy?

Oh? Now Attilla the alleged educated Ham claims "awareness?"
:-)

Other than paintings on black velvet, what does the alleged
educated Attilla the Ham consider as state of the art in amateur
radio? Having one-tube regenerative receivers showing up on an
annual basis? Two-transistor transmitters built in tuna cans?

>>The only thing you established is your hostile attitude.
>
> Let's see...Vippy hides his identity for 6 months until I take 30 minutes
>to do a bit of detective work and "out" him. All the while he is making
>disparging comments about Amateur radio in this and other forums.

Awwww...somebody said something nasty about "the corpse"
and the dill sergeant came all unglued? Another person who
ignored your mighty command to get down and give you twenty?
Tsk, tsk, tsk, Sgt Putz.

Clue: This is NOT boot camp, you are NOT an NCO anymore,
and few in here are recruits. Most importantly, Sgt Putz, you
are NOT entitled to act like a barbarian by a single certificate
you own and have yet to act in a civil manner to anyone here or
anywhere else who disagrees with your opinions.

Google has many archived posts where Sgt Putz has signed
his posts by "Putz," sometimes adding "Creep" (another family
surname?), unaware that "Putz" is a middle-European Jewish-
ethic epithet for colloquial English "dickhead."

That's NOT anywhere close to being civil.

> He's posted COUNTLESS posts expressing significant anger, disapproval and
>boldface lies in this and other radio-related forums about Amateur Radio and
>THEN has the temerity to say >>I<< have a "hostile attitude"...?!?!?

Sgt Putz has a very hostile attitude, confrontational, aggressive
and all from a decided ignorance of anything technical in radio or
in electronics pertaining to any radio. He cannot play well with
others. Sociopaths are like that.

> And Yes, Vippy, I am not laughing WITH you, I am laughing AT you!

Sociopaths think nothing of laughing at others, attempting to
ridicule them from some imagined superior state. Since they
cannot understand a subject under discussion, they attempt
to assassinate the character of anyone disagreeing with them.

>>Not related to amateur radio. If someone disagree's with you, you try to
>>attack the person's background.
>
> I didn't attack Lennie's background, Vipul. He left himself wide open to
>this when he tries to credit himself with some kind of "honor-by-association"
>with REAL men who were killed in action in the Armed Forces.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. [does everyone need me to repeat what I've written
about my military unit and its history?]

> I doubt you were ever IN the Armed Forces (ours or anyone elses) and have
>no concept of what that act means to Soldiers who DID make that sacrifice.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Attilla the Ham tries to put on some kind of uniform
and winds up in a poopie-suit (having "distinctive unit insignia").

> What I did in the Marines was piddling compared to what a lot of others
>did before, during and since MY tour of duty. I don't dishonor them by trying
>to lay some personal claim to what THEY did.

Hello? Did someone say something about "in hostile action
seven times" plus something about "saving a fellow marine?"
:-)

No identification of when, no identification of where, no reference
to third-party sources of reference for any of those "seven times."

A fish story is still a fish story, regardless of what it is about.

Attilla the Ham is desperately trying to find some "opening" of
attack. He cannot find that so he manufactures something
never before made. If Attilla the Ham's statement were true,
then I would be a ghost in this machine, having died in 1950.

:-)

> That scumbag you are defending doesn't see it that way.

Nobody "sees" things like Attilla the Ham.

>>He seems to put forth some credible points, and they are well backed up.
>
> Backed up with WHAT...?!?! The ONE and ONLY "point" Lennie has made that
>bears even the slightest semblence of "credibility" is that the once assumed
>need for Code proficiency due to the prolific use by the Armed Forces and
>Maritime services is no longer there.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Attilla the Ham not only sees things but is quite
blind to what has been posted in here...references of many kinds,
all credible. Attilla ignores those, thinking his sword of epithets
can cut through anything. :-)

> That there are still OTHER reasons for Code proficiency are beyond him
>(and you too, it would seem).

Yes...the common PCTA BDOF refrain is "do as I did because
I am your superior." :-)

>>K4YZ will always find some fault with someone's background to use it to claim
>>the person has no credibility in Ham radio.
>
> "Always"...?!?!

Absolutely. :-)

> So far I have been able to sucessfully discredit somone three times
>based upon thier "background".

"...thier...?" Some mighty warrior cut himself in the club foot
again with his sword of epithets? Tsk, tsk, tsk.

:-)

> First of all is Lennie. Lennie has made countless posts of how he is a
>"radio professional", yet he makes error after error related to Amateur radio
>practice.

"Error after error?" :-)

Of course. Disliking certain things about amateur radio regulations
is a capital crime in the world of Attilla the Ham. To say anything
opposite to his mighty morse magnificence is a higher crime, one
of sacrilege against his godhood.

Attilla (formerly Sgt Putz) flipped out years ago. He is in some
Twilight Zone, a black-and-white rerun fantasyland no one else can
see. :-)

> You may ask of the regulars here...I have publically stated that Lennie
>knows more about the inside of the box than I do.

Anyone knowing simple Ohm's Law knows more about the
"inside of the box" than Attilla. :-)

>That's a "gimme" for him as
>I have no real way of knowing otherwise other than he cut's-and-pastes well in
>this forum. Hardly "fault".

Oh, my. "Thirty years a ham" and there's no evidence of knowing
a forking thing about radio-electronics technology theory or
practice. Tsk, tsk, tsk. How would Attilla the Ham "know" if
something is "cut and paste" since he has no base of knowledge
to judge?

But, Attilla has all those nice certificates and has spent all that
money for those ready-made radios over "thirty years" (and
probably memorized lots of advertisements) so now he feels
entitled to attempt killing anyone who disagrees with him.
Weird science. :-)

> What I DO fault with Lennie is his assertions of "fact" when his own
>practical experience is "squat". Furthermore, Lennie continues to make
>patently false statements that are either easily disproved, or which he
>refuses to validate with any "evidence".

Poor baby. Too lazy to check out any of the references I posted
in here a long time ago...became all upset and outraged because
I made a mistake in sending him the wrong image file, had to make
a libelous character-assassination homepage on AOL to get even
(that lasted only two days, AOL got rid of it), then refused to even
look at the correct image sent several times in e-mail. Tsk, tsk.

If anyone wants a copy of the correct image, I will send one in
e-mail unless there are signs of just wanting something else to
fight about. :-) [it's just a scan of my first First Class
Radiotelephone (Commercial) license received in 1956, not a
real big thing like an amateur radio license]

> Tried to enter this forum with some aire of "knowledge", yet time after
>time you have been shown to be lacking in practical experience. You hid behind
>"Vshah101" all the while denying that my assertions of your inexperience and
>relative "novice" status were incorrect.

"...aire...?" :-)

"...hid...?" How? Internet screen names are just screen names.
Those aren't bona fide identifications of a person, Attilla.

"Denying your assertions" of anything is such a common practice
in here that it becomes 99% of what Attilla the Ham posts. :-)

> Thirty minutes of "detective" work outted KB1HMW and we found out that I
>was right all along.

Oh, wow! Ellery Queen should worry, Nero Wolfe should worry,
Mighty macho morseman Attilla the Ham is on the job!!! :-)

> You make assertions of "support" for Amateur Radio, then go into a CB
>radio nwsgroup and don't even take the time to create another AOL screen name
>in order to hide your tracks..Did you think you could make such outlandish and
>disparaging comments about Amateur Radio in that other forum and NO ONE >would
see...?!?!

"...nwsgroup...?" :-)

Oh, my, Attilla the Ham is waving his lil' sword of epithets again,
poising to strike! :-)

Tsk, tsk, tsk, capital crimes against the state! The "state" of
Attilla's vengeful imagination! :-)

> That's pretty arrogant, but I get the feeling that you are ALL ABOUT
being
>arrogant. Your

"Your " ? Couldn't finish? Had to wipe the spittle off the screen?
Had to take a tranquilizer to lower your blood pressure?

> Now you are again "hiding" something and I can only assume it's becausee
>you have yet another secret that you don't want exposed.

Oh, wow! CONSPIRACY TIME! Somebody is HIDING
something! Tsk, tsk, tsk.

Is that anything like a military medical discharge?

Is that anything like being in "seven hostile actions?"

> And to top it off, you have taken up the cause of "defending" yet another
>Amateur Radio basher who is not only NOT an Amateur, but who has been clearly
>shown to be a pathological liar.

Oooooo! The "medical professional" knows about "pathological
liars?" :-)

> Again..What does that say about you, Vipul?

I'd say Shah ought to be commended for standing up to Attilla
the Ham. It takes courage to go up against a mental basket
case like Attilla.

> I am not impressed. Not even amused. You are a parody of the court
>jester. Lennie is the original.

Get help, Steamy.

Temper fry

2363. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 02:11:34 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030217211134.03532.00000541@mb-cp.aol.com>
Source record: 61495

In article <20030217020332.23989.00000407@mb-fz.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Attilla the Ham) writes:

>>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>>Date: 2/15/03 11:32 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20030215123239.04085.00000370@mb-bh.aol.com>
>
>>>> Think about this for an attitude: Perusing practically any issue,
>>>> any year, of ham radio periodicals with pictures of hams and
>>>> their stations shows that they are predominantly white and
>>>> male. :-)
>>>
>>>Yup. I've thought about it. White, male radio amateurs must begin to
>>>offer contrition for their unfeeling choices of gender, race and choice
>>>of avocation.
>>>How selfish we've been!
>>>
>>
>>The periodicals represent the current demographics of Hams...(SNIP)
>
> OK, Mr. Alleged Engineer. Who were you quoting? Why do you insist on
>quoting posts and NOT give proper reference to the other author(s)..?!?!

Tsk, tsk, tsk. The alleged human being, allegedly working as
a nurse, allegedly having served in some corps or corpse (and
getting a medical discharge) is now allegedly knowing all
about engineering?!?!?

>>I don't believe
>>being a minority is a problem in Ham radio. As long as you follow the Ham
>>traditions, its not an issue.
>
> What "Ham traditions" are you refering to, Vippy? Who decides who can
>operate and NOT operate based upon compliance or non-compliance with these
>assertions of yours? Who enforces these decisions?

Who IS your mental therapist? Drop that one and get a real
pshrink (one with plenty of nice certificates and qualification
papers hanging on the office walls to impress you).

"Ham traditions" are many and varied, chief among them is the
lore and mythos collection based on the 1920s and 1930s
good works issued by the very official BoDs of Newington.
You do not want to go there. It isn't the Corps.

> I've not once been to a "Wouff Hong" ceremony, ever been twitched by the
>readysnitch, nor am I on anyone's Honor Roll. So...How is it I was "allowed"
>to be an Amateur Extra Class licensee for 24 years and a licensed Amateur for
a
>total of thirty without partaking in these "Ham traditions"...?!?!

The mythical instrument is the "rittysnitch," not the 'readysnitch.'
Try to keep up.

So, 30 alleged years as an amateur? Oh, my. Three decades and
there is NO evidence of having learned anything of radio theory or
of how to get along with others. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

Thirty years...still a de facto novice, still the barbarian, still the
dill sergeant with mind pickled in brine, unable to smile due to
too much dill.

Being even a semi-reasonable human being isn't for everyone.
Don't let the door hit your poopie-suited backside on the way
out...

<alleged 73>

Temper fry

2364. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 02:11:35 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030217211135.03532.00000542@mb-cp.aol.com>
Source record: 61494

In article <20030217015340.23989.00000405@mb-fz.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Attilla the Ham) writes:

>>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>>Date: 2/15/03 12:00 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <f45722ac.0302151000.688f109e@posting.google.com>
>
>>> No...I had "real" experience in 18 1/2 years in the United States Marine
>>> Corps.
>>
>>What happened to the other 1.5 years?
>
> Got paid to take an early out, Brian. Remeber RIF?

Must be the new military...medical discharges are the easy out with pay...

>>Make sure you leave the ones you didn't earn in the box.
>
> Laying claim to awards or attributes I didn't legitimately deserve is
>Leonard H. Anderscum's forte, Brian...Not mine.

Now, now, Sgt Putz, don't get up the usual head of steam, you'll trip the safety valve. Again. :-)

What are these "legitimate awards and attributes not deserved?"

Failure to get down and give you twenty when you command?

Failure to obey your orders as a dill sergeant calling all recruits maggots or worse?

Failure to bow down to a blowhard cussing others who won't agree with Attilla the Ham's opinions?

>>>There's a difference between "denying" and "correcting".
>>
>>And remaining silent.
>
> Words you should heed next time you go barking about some exotic DX
>location you allegedly operated from.

Of course. All heed the barbarians issuing orders, even if they haven't the foggiest notion of reality or what they are doing. The barbarians only want to fight and kill those who displease them.

Tsk, tsk, tsk.

Temper fry

2365. Re: ARRL DX CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 03:01:45 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <tmh4a.5578$4y4.2922531@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 61488

It's just that it bothers me when people jump to conclusions about gender.

Dee Flint, N8UZE

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:b2s40f$d2t$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net...
> So?
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:cqg4a.5569$4y4.2912127@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> > I'm a YL not an OM.
> >
> > Dee Flint, N8UZE

2366. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 04:08:13 UTC
From: Jackie <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com>
Message-ID: <Nki4a.157130$be.141628@rwcrnsc53>
Source record: 61498

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030217211127.03532.00000536@mb-cp.aol.com...
> In article <20030216173704.14527.00000384@mb-cc.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
(N2EY)
> writes:

> The epitome of US amateur radio is working DX on HF with CW.

Despite your ardent insistence to the contrary, Len, there is no "one" mode of communication that epitomizes amateur radio. That's one of the things that makes it interesting.

While you might continue to insist that a REAL ham must worship at the altar of CW so that others in the hobby might consider them worthy (which I still don't get, since I've never heard anyone say such a thing on the air, but ONLY off the air), the facts are out there if you bother to listen... I turn the VFO knob up and down the bands and hear the dits and dahs of Morse, the bleep-bloops of RTTY and other digital modes, lots of tinny, untuned vocalizations of SSB (if I don't tune explicitly to every QSO I hear) plus many other weird noises that I cannot yet identify. Some ops may prefer one mode, and some may work multiple modes. The only thing that I think "epitomizes" amateur radio communications is that there IS no "one" way of communicating.

Those who insist that Morse is an onerous, backwater mode of communication and who don't want to be forced to learn it in order to upgrade will probably see their position vindicated soon by the powers that be. I don't care one way or the other about Morse testing going away, so long as it's not outlawed as a communication method (some people will always want to work it-- so what). That certainly won't happen. It will be interesting to see what happens when it's time to decide what privileges the new Techs will get on HF if E1 is done away with. However, I will certainly not be whining for one nanosecond if/when the new Techs get HF privileges without taking E1. I don't consider this anything to get my undies in a bunch over.

I think that the key to the future of AR does not reside in any one mode, but rather in the people who're attracted to it in the first place. With some exceptions (and there are always exceptions), the type of people that are attracted to this hobby are technically oriented and fascinated by technical/scientific stuff that the general public finds mostly undecipherable, and therefore many (if not most) of us who're initially interested are plenty capable of keeping this hobby alive via the sheer force of our curiosity and willingness to experiment. Such experiments have borne the fruits of advancement in RF communication. There are many new digital modes that've come out in the past couple of decades; there are many new, state-of-the-art, tiny, yet cheap commercial rigs, and there are many,

many design plans on the Internet for antennas, transceivers, etc. etc. But no matter how hard we yell to get the word out about AR, only some will be inclined, indeed able to hear-- and, more importantly, understand-- the value of this hobby.

If you've got an amateur radio license, use the privileges you have and have maximum fun with them. Don't let the jackass know-it-alls tell you what is fun. As a human being that has reached adulthood, YOU get to decide what is fun about your hobbies. I've got my HF privileges and rig set up now, but I still can't wait to get a 6 meter SSB transceiver and try out the "Magic Band" before the sunspots disappear. A new Tech licensee can do this from the get-go, no code required. Life's too short to not have as much fun as you can in your hobbies of choice.

Jackie

"The middle-age temptation to get serious about everything is Satan's handiwork." - Berke Breathed (cartoonist, "Bloom County")

2367. Re: New Field Day Entry Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 05:05:42 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0302172105.444e29b3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61499

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message news:<20030216133150.29016.00000361@mb-fy.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0302151756.24421a10@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>

> >I'll look into that. Tnx.
>
> Us natural borned thick skinned contesters do give out the tips to those smart
> enough to pick up on 'em.

Roger that!

> >Keyed a "coherent msg"?? ME?? WTF kinda goofy question izzat?? If
> >perchance ya mean did I ever actually ship a msg thru NTS the answer
> >is emphatically no. NTS is 1915 ham radio epitomized.
>
> Not at all. Back then they used the trunk line system. NTS is post WW2.

That minor detail aside so was my S-40B which today would actually
more useful than NTS has been for years. There isn't a single third
district regional NTS net on 80/75/40. Even Mae Burke gave up traffic
handling long ago. Traffic handling had a lotta good points and a
lotta hams benifitted from being involved in it. But those days are
long past. E-mail drove the final stake in it.

> So what's your solution? Where's the all-digital high speed UHF relay system
> that we were told was just around the corner, as soon as the code test went
> away?

The solutions are already on the Internet. Which is why it ain't gonna
happen on the ham bands.

> Points is points. Besides, the Southgate Type 7 is a decade newer than your
> TS-940.

That's why I popped for the 847 which is newer than . .

> >
> >> And it's another easy 100 points for maybe 15 minutes on a traffic
> >> net. How long did ya say those 50 phone/ 25 CW QSOs would take ya?
> >
> >Yeah, right, you're gonna pump out ten on 90 second centers outta
> >nowhere. Baloney.
>
> What are you talking about?

Now I gotta be *your* FD rules lawyer. The msg to the SCM is not the message handling bonus I'm talking about, look up the lousy ten points per ya get when ya waste yer time chasing down the bonus points per 7.3.6.

> Lessee, you need to bring two antennas, tripod mount and hardware, associated
> coax and other goodies. Plus set it up and take it down. Have fun!

No more hauling a truck load of FD crap for me. One way trip once except for the electronics and the toolbox. Which this time will weigh only around 35 pounds total and I'll have room left in the back seat. Radio, 'puter, P/S, keyer, mic and that's about it as far as the equipment goes. The tripod would be built there and would stay there along with the coax, all the other cables and the antennas and all the rest of the junque which is already stored there from last year. I even had the coax drop-shipped there. The monitor also stays there.

I expect to have everything set up and well tested long before FD weekend. I'm a helluva lot more interested working dx wih the antennas I have in mind than I have in my FD score and I hope to have plenty of that activity under my belt before FD. I'll do a cerimonial dipping of the antennas Friday nite to keep that detail kosher. I won't have anybody leaning on me about being home for dinner on Sunday so it might still be set up after the event in order to continue antenna experiments if I have that notion.

> 2980 points, 629 CW/11 phone QSOs, class 1B-1. No help at all, FD site 73 miles
> from home. No computer, not even a memory keyer. No usable trees, put up a 41
> foot mast single handed. Gas engine generator for power.

Should have gotten ya the Field Day version of the Darwin Award.

> >I'm not above a bit of slimery but that was outrageous.
>
> It worked, though. And actually met the goal of the whole thing, which was to
> promote mobile installations back when they were a big deal to do.

Uh-huh, the ARRL thought so much of it that they immediately rewrote the rules to keep it from happenimng again.

> >> How many QSOs so far?
> >
> >Zip.
>
> No points for that!

The filters got snowed into the post office.

> Good to be thinking about FD when the snow is piling up outside, anyway.

Yeah, I'm sure the MN group is well into their FD "planning phase" instead of yakking on Bill's Freq abt the WX.

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

2368. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 05:16:07 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b2t96b02sa0@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 61435

> I agree with Carl Stevenson's idea that entry-level hams should have
> reduced power limits on VHF/UHF.

I also agree, as in most cases I don't see the need for more than about
200watts output for 50Mhz on up.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

2369. Re: Net Tonight

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 05:26:17 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b2t96c12sa0@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 61436

Ya know.... I have Echolink installed, but have only used it a little bit. Have Eqso and Ilink as well and same usage for the most part. Although I do see some usage in regards to keeping in contact with certain people in different areas that you normally would not have the ability to contact, I just don't get too enthused over it.

I have used the programs to contact one of our club members who is a snowbird, and goes to Arizona from Michigan and would not normally have the opportunity to speak to him until he gets back. Another good benefit I could see is to get to know some of the hams in the communities you may be traveling to in the future. For instance, I may be going to Maryland in about 3 months and may establish some friendships before I even get there.

Don't get me wrong. I am not really supporting or discouraging those programs. I guess I just don't get too enthused over them.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

"Jackie" <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> wrote in message
news:bgX3a.144940$Ec4.144845@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net...
> EchoLink is very cool. Too bad the mic input to my soundcard's shot or I
> would've been using it. Having tried it out (and then determining that my
> mic input is shot), I was still able to "connect" to different repeaters
and
> "talk" via the computer chat interface (if the stations had themselves
> hooked up on a PC). The interface is very easy to use; I didn't even need
a
> tutorial to guide me. Do check it out, it might be very interesting
> listening to what the Shuttle recovery group has to say.
>
> Jackie
> KC0ODY
>
> "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> news:37F9B23ACCE4012D.EE81E1F48E620A99.F7A9C13475ED77D1@lp.airnews.net...
> > For anyone who is interested, there will be a net tonight, in Dallas,
> > pertaining to the activities of amateur radio operators during the
Shuttle
> > Recovery operations.
> >

> > I am not real familiar with how this works, but I've been told the net
> will
> > be "broadcast" (may be wrong terminology) over EchoLink. I do know the
> > software for this can be had at http://www.echolink.org/el/ as well as
> other
> > web locations. In fact, once the software is installed, with a computer
> > microphone, you may ragchew with other hams all 'cross the world. How
to
> > "connect" for the net here in Dallas I haven't a clue. My guess would
be
> > the K5JD icon, near the bottom. Maybe there are some savvy enough with
> > EchoLink to figure this out.
> >
> > Thought you all might be interested in at least listening. Via
EchoLink,
> it
> > is my presumption that you could enter the net with recognition from
NCS,
> > whom I believe will be AA5QX, Jim Lawyer.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
> >
> >
>
>

2370. Re: Net Tonight

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 05:27:36 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b2t96g22sa0@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 61437

Could be something as simple as unchecking the "mute" box underneath the slider in the audio control panel.....

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:v50h43sb5ld077@corp.supernews.com...
> Jackie, are you sure your mic input is shot? Double click the speaker
> icon in your tray and when the window opens, check to see if your
microphone
> is enabled (there is a box which may need to be unchecked). BTW, I am
using
> Echo Link and have found it necessary to change my firewall configuration
as
> well to use it.
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA

2371. Re: Net Tonight

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 05:30:26 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b2t96h32sa0@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 61434

Line level in
Line level out
Microphone in
Headphone out

Those are the inputs/outputs on my soundcard..... dunno about "rear speakers" but used to have my DJ equipment connected to the computer a few years ago when it wasn't at a gig. Playing some of the shoot-em-up games sound cool as hell with 400-500watts audio output!

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:b2rii2$j1h$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net...
> Note also that some sound cards also have a 4th jack for "rear-speakers".
> (e.g. Soundblaster).
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>
> "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
> news:v50p2mgoe8v2ef@corp.supernews.com...
> > OK, Jackie. Sounds good if it's under warranty. One other thing to
> check -
> > there are **THREE** connectors on the sound card; one is for speakers,
one
> > is for the microphone, and one is line input. Just make sure you aren't
> > accidentally plugged into the line in as the microphone output is way to
> low
> > for the line in and it will act as though you have no microphone. Good
> > luck!
> >
> > 73 from Rochester, NY
> > Jim AA2QA
> >
> >
> >
> > ---
> > Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> > Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).

> > Version: 6.0.455 / Virus Database: 255 - Release Date: 2/13/03
> >
> >
>
>

2372. Re: After S25.5 Goes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 05:50:51 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0302172150.6e1cad53@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61500

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message news:<20030217133130.25403.00000458@mb-fm.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0302170613.356bb7ec@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> > Power level regs are beyond useless. When was the last time
> >any ham in the ham bands got busted for running over the legal limit??
>
> Good question! Better yet, how about this one:
>
> When was the last time any ham in the ham bands got busted for running over the
> legal limit when the rules allowed less than 1500W output??

Back when the legal limit was one kW *input* power, or roughly 700w
max output on a good day. Also back when there were gross violations
of that rule to the point that pairs of 4-1000As running 3-4kW input
were not uncommon. Hell, I built a few of those big two-holers myself
for a couple of the multi-multis and did the metalworking for others.
None of the numerous users of even outrageous illegal amps I know or
knew personally ever got spanked by the FCC for running those beasts.
The FCC did tap a few I never knew but the game went on undaunted.

Those monster RF decks were usually based on cheap military and
industrial surplus parts, sources which have long since dried up. So
now costs (and RFI) rule and amps almost all come outta the catalogs
today. Those costs just ain't worth the few dB "gain" ya get out of
monster amps vs. legal amps. If yer s9+20 with a single 3-500Z an
additional 3-500Z only gets ya an s9+23. Fuhgeddit, the smart guys
spend the money on their antennas instead.

> >And the drift toward lower average power on HF has been underway for
> >years.
> >
> If the only thing to be gained by upgrading beyond entry-level was power beyond
> 100 W, I for one might still hold an entry level license.

Not me. I want the whole enchilada available even I don't make use of
all the privs. Ya never know . .

> >> I forgot one question: What happens to existing Advanceds and Novices? Just
> >> leave 'em alone?
> >
> >What a novel concept!
>
> Naw, it's been done before. 1952-1967.

Leaving *anything* alone is a novel concept in RRAP.

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

2373. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 06:19:13 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BA773A91.EE02%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 61401

"Bill, W7TI" wrote:
>
> Is there actually anyone who's still on their
> learner's permit after years of driving? I
> would suggest that someone who can not progress
> beyond that point may have insufficient driving
> skills and should be put on the bus. Would you
> like to be on the same road as that guy? Not me.
> Would you like to be on the same band as someone
> who can not acquire the skills needed to get a
> "regular" ham license? Not me.

You seem focused on the driver's license/learner's permit concept when neither compares to a ham license. There is no "regular" ham license - each have the same goals and intent - only method changes (that eliminates the driver's license concept). Since there is no regular ham license, there is also no suggestion that the goal of the lower licenses is to upgrade to it (and there goes the learner's permit concept).

Further, I find your premise somewhat disingenuous. If you truly feel the ultimate goal of the lower licenses is to upgrade to something else, why aren't you concerned about those who have not reached the Extra after many years. A quick search shows that many General licensees have been so for many years, yet I see nothing about this.

> Because the existing licensing structure is flawed,
> IMHO. (snip) Having this authority carries
> with it the responsibility to do so, well,
> responsibly. (snip) Yes, some technical knowledge
> is required, but the emphasis should be on:
>
> 1. Proper operating techniques (ID'ing, working
> split, knowing band limits, etc)
>
> 2. Not causing interference (listen before
> transmitting, avoiding splatter, etc)
>
> 3. Safety (RF exposure, high voltage precautions,
> etc)
>
> 4. Neighborhood relations (TVI, etc)

But, again, you haven't show how the present license structure does not accomplish these things, or that the present licensees have not used their authority responsibly, or how your learner's permit concept would change

either. Without these, you're offering a solution where no problem has been shown.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2374. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 06:30:01 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BA773D19.EE04%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 61402

"Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com" wrote:
>
> Do you still post from Google as Aaron Voobner?

You must be thinking of someone else, my friend. I have never posted as Aaron Voobner, nor have I ever posted from Google. In fact, I have never posted using anything other than my own name.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2375. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 06:32:41 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BA773DB8.EE05%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 61403

"W5TIT" wrote:

> The attractiveness of administrative reductions?
> Budgetary constraints/reductions? Wouldn't less
> licenses and less testing make it easier and less
> expensive (or "taxing" to the public...heh heh)
> to regulate?

Adding another license, or even replacing one with another, would have no effect on any of that.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2376. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 06:37:45 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030218013745.24516.00000001@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 61404

In article <3E5121E0.42131FD4@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>That's AN argument.

Army-Navy?

Sir, this isn't the US military, your lardship.

2377. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 06:37:45 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030218013745.24516.00000002@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 61405

In article <f45722ac.0302170728.1d86203d@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>The ARGUMENT is that a CW EXAM is no longer relavant. Give CW the
>same exam that FM, SSB, RTTY, SSTV, FSTV, PACKET, PACTOR and PSK31
>have.

As CW goes, so goes the glory of the nation...

[Alien Nation]

The epitome of US amateur radio is working DX on HF with CW.

We've all been told by the Fearless Leaders of the Beeper
Brigade.

[or is that Feckless Leaders?]

Beep, beep.

2378. Re: After S25.5 Goes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 06:37:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030218013746.24516.00000003@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 61407

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hah2lq3.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

> ... Meanwhile the inspector
> is usually kept waiting outside while the very characteristic
> "tinkle" sound of PL-259s being hastily uncoupled from equipment is
> heard inside before being admitted.

"Tinkle?!?"

Gosh, community leader, I've been familiar with Type UHF connectors since Army days of 1952. Never heard one "tinkle" yet, not even at Christmas holiday time. Same with BNC, N, TNC, C, SMA, SMB, and some other types. No "tinkle." Maybe a slight "click," very soft. I've never found PL-259s to "hastily uncouple."

Please advise.

Thank you.

2379. Re: New Field Day Entry Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 06:37:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030218013747.24516.00000004@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 61411

In article <3E513FF9.296E4C4C@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Emoticon disregarded. We're radio amateurs.

No, just amateurs.

>Those of us who choose to
>use morse and participate in contests do so as we see fit.

Fine.

>We do it because we like it and because we choose to do so.

Fine. But what are you complaining about? You have
everything you need. Or do you need more rather than morse?

Yes, that's it...CONTROL. Ultimate want. Make others obey
your wishes. MORE, not morse.

>You, as a non radio amateur, may do as you can.

Damn well believe it, senior.

>You remain a sidewalk superintendant.

Incorrect. I've walked on a sidewalk. I've been a superintendant.
I've never found a sidewalk that could be supervised. Do you
have supervisory sidewalks in the east?

Why are you talking about sidewalks, boss?

This is an amateur radio newsgroup full of the regular newsgroupies
with the PCTAs full of it.

Please keep to the program.

2380. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 06:37:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030218013747.24516.00000005@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 61415

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hah49t8.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>Date: Tue, 18 Feb 2003 01:39:18 GMT
>
>On 17 Feb 2003 17:53:31 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>>>Bet: The FCC is not about to put themselves thru another
>>>"restructuring" of ham radio for years. We've only had three major
>>>overhauls in last 52 years, that's one every 17+ years. History does
>>>repeat itself, yes?
>>
>> Ahem...take a look at the title of NPRM 98-143 and R&O 99-412.
>> it reads "biennial." "Biennial" as ordered by the Congress of
>> the United States. "Biennial" is defined as "happening every
>> two years" or as a "period of two years."
>
> Yes but - the "Biennial" refers to the requirement to review SOME
> service's rules in depth every two years. There's such a review
> going on all the time. We in the ARS had ours in '98. Now it's
> someone else's turn.

Dang...there's that arithmetic problem with morsemen again.

1998 + 2 = 2000; 2000 + 2 = 2002; 2002 + 2 = 2004; etc.

> The last thong that Billy Tauzin thinks of when he thinks of
> "getting" the FCC is Amateur Radio Service Rule Revisions. He has
> much bigger fish to fry.

I'm not licensed in the congressional service and I'm not a
member of congress. I do prefer salmon or red trout.

Tauzin thinks of thongs? Folk thongs? He folks around?

> As Bill Cross intimated in his famous statement two years ago - we
> have to keep our head down and stay out of the crossfire.

Well, community leader, I'm not licensed in amateur radio and
I'm not a community leader. You've ruled on that. The
"crossfire" won't hurt me.

2381. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 06:37:48 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030218013748.24516.00000006@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 61413

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hah4ji9.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 17 Feb 2003 17:53:32 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>> "Wide ranging support in the amateur radio community" is invalid
>> for any federal regulation applying to ALL citizens.
>
> Tell that to Bill Cross and the other staff members who decide when
> to make revisions and what they should be. He's not going to do
> anything unless there is a consensus WITHIN the amateur community.
> That's part of the "self policing" that the Commish' expects from
> the licensees in the ARS.
>
> He said so in Dayton two years ago.

Well, "there you have it."

That was two years ago. What are the inside opinions of
today?

> But then again you are not a licensee nor are you within the amateur
> radio community.

True. I'm not in the broadcast community any longer so that
excludes me from talking about broadcasting? Of course.
One has to be an "insider" to everything in order to talk about
it. The American Way, right? Right. Thanks, counselor.

By gosh and golly, I'm so happy to have had a legal ruling on
that. Next time you are admitted to a bar I will buy you a
drink. Hemlock with or without the sprig of mint?

2382. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 06:37:49 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030218013749.24516.00000007@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 61409

In article <20030217185042.04532.00000243@mb-fx.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>From K4YZ:
>>How about in at least 30 years of QST, CQ and 73 that I am aware of where
>>the contributions of Amateurs has been refered to as the "radio art", Vippy?
>
>They must have been referring to technical accomplishment. Still, you did not
>cite an example from one of these magazines. Also, these are "Ham" radio
>magazines, so they follow the same hype that Hams do.
>
>Please provide a sentence where "radio art" is used to mean non-technical
>achievement, from an unbiased source.

While I can't read minds, I'll bet his idea of radio art is a portrait of Hiram P. Maxim painted on black velvet. :-)

2383. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 06:37:50 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030218013750.24516.00000009@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 61406

In article <20030217150936.14740.00000270@mb-cc.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Attilla the Ham) writes:

> Because YOU'RE a putz, Lennie.

Temper fry, murine.

2384. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 06:37:50 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030218013750.24516.00000010@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 61408

In article <20030217150325.14740.00000269@mb-cc.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Attilla the Ham) writes:

> No, Lennie, I asked what were the effective dates of the awards...for >WHAT PERIODS were they awarded for?

As long as the unit is organized. Presidential Unit Citations are awarded to a unit. Hello? Can you read, dumass? Do you need the ARs (Army Regulations) or SRs (Special Regulations) for a non-amateur-radio-related subject and for incessant arguing in here? You lose either way.

Sgt Putz, aka Attilla the Ham, is suffering PMS (Powerful Marine Syndrome). It is his period apparently.

Let's all bear with this poor soul. Somebody else can take up a collection to buy him some Midol.

Temper fry

2385. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 06:37:50 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030218013750.24516.00000008@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 61412

In article <3E5141FB.3E185308@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <v50k145bv3ppe1@corp.supernews.com>, "KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com>
>> writes:
>>
>> >"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
>> >news:20030216185049.10587.00000315@mb-bk.aol.com...
>> >> From: "KB9TMP"
>
>> >> I don't want to learn the code, okay?
>> >
>> >I didn't WANT to either but I did because that is the requirement!
>>
>> Following orders like a good little soldier? :-)
>
>Didn't you follow orders when you were a little soldier?

Amateur radio is NOT a military unit or auxilliary.

No soldier, sailor, or airman can "argue" the UCMJ.

The regulations for US amateur radio are US law set by
a federal agency. Those CAN be argued.

Why does the colonel wish to stop discussions about
US law?

>Lemme clue you in: You won't be getting that "Extra right out of the
>box" any time soon.

"Lemme clue YOU in," Herr Robust. That isn't the subject.

>There is a *requirement* of 5 wpm morse for HF
>access in ham radio.

There is a REGULATION about it, dumass. See appropriate
sub-parts of Part 97.

>The current five word per minute test is less than what would be
>considered "marginally proficient".

No problem, Herr Robust, your orders and commands are
marginally nonsense items better left to dialogue in the TV
sitcom "Hogan's Heroes." You are a distempered Werner
Klemperer character, a Klink without a clink.

Gutt nacht, Herr Oberst. Gruss gott.

2386. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 06:37:54 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030218013754.24516.00000011@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 61416

In article <20030217145902.14740.00000268@mb-cc.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Attilla the Ham) writes:

>>> Please cite the quote where I asked, Your Putziness.
>>
>> Don't you want something erected every time you post here?
>
> Lennie, I am SURE something get's "erected" every time I post...You LIVE
>for it...

Poor baby. Doesn't get much. Thoughts of SEX permeate his
mighty macho morsemanship machinations in here.

Erection of a statue, dumass. Erection of a monument to your
mighty machismo of being able to fight, fight, fight when your
brain is dead, dead, dead. Long live the weird zombie.

> You are again redirected to the relationship between the Tennessee State
>Guard and the Tennessee State National Guard. Part of the TNSG's stated
>mission is to support Family Services and to man evacuated armories in the
>even of a Guard activation.

Wow! For that they need cammies and meetings every month
to discuss military matters using old US Army manuals?

Good grief, your distinctive unit insignianess, putting cammies on
state social workers would handle the family services duties.
No police forces in town? No civilian security guards? Those can
safeguard National Guard facilities if the REAL Guard is deployed.

It's fairly obvious that this TNSG thing is just another fraternal
order excuse for a bunch of macho military minded civilians to
have monthly fun playing sojer in da woods. All the trappings
of army post life are there for everyone to see.

> You attempt to define it to the least common denominator without having
>any first hand experience of thier training. This, of course, to further
>denigrate yet another volunteer function, this one staffed by Veterans.

Oh, pizza off, you little thin-skinned excuse..."thier" included.

I and anyone else can "define" it by what is seen and that looks
exactly like what I wrote.

>>My assignment in Japan (as part of a REAL US Army tour of duty)
>> was the 8235th Army Unit...(SNIP)
>
> Yes, yes, yes, Lennie...We've heard it over and over.

>
> It still does not make you any more knowledgeable in Amateur Radio
>matters, nor does it "score" you any points for having tried to embellish
>your career by associating yuorself with KIA's before.

Nobody can possibly "score points" with you because you
haven't any idea of what the score is.

I was assigned to a signal battalion for 35 months and that
same battalion suffered 23 killed in action in the Korean
War. I honor their sacrifice, but you, you sorry excuse for
a former US military person, want to damn them and me
in order to win some sort of message point thing because
you can't admit you are wrong in anything.

As far as I'm concerned, the USMC kicked you out of the
corps for failing to recognize the "US" part. They would be
correct since you've managed to not only damn the US
Army and veterans thereof but also the US Navy for insulting
a long-time Chief who served honorably longer than you
claim to have been in the Marines.

> Exactly. But you DID find it necessary to recite it for the billionth
>time.

Not the "billionth," not even a millionth. I don't mind repeating
it for as long as it takes you to understand it. I am pessimistic
in regards to your understanding any of it...you are just an
amateur in everything you do, nursie.

> Next time try using all five fingers in a traditional military salute,
and
>without doing it so as to try and make YOU look like some kind of rear area
>war hero.

Next time I give YOU the upraised finger you sorry excuse for
an EX United States serviceman. No...I won't. You don't
deserve any kind of salute.

I've never claimed any "heroism" in any war. I served my country,
the United States of America, for eight years and received an
Honorable Discharge for that. I did it honoring those who served
before me in my unit, all signalmen, the United States Army, and
all the members of the US military.

YOU "honor" no one but yourself and some perverted imagination
and attempt to DISHONOR anyone who served his country
honorably if they don't agree with your lardship's opinions. Ptui.
All you get is a bit of excess spit you sorry excuse for an EX
marine.

> You were a radio clerk in a rear area radio station. Period.

I was an operating team leader for fixed station transmitter operations and maintenance and a supervisor of operations and maintenance of microwave radio relay equipment.

I did NO clerking.

The headquarters of an entire area command IS a "rear area" you anal-retentive claimant to "seven hostile actions." Do you think an area command is done from the front lines?!?

What about those "seven hostile actions?" Where? When? Source of information? Or are you going to lie about that as well?

In the immediate post Korean War period, HF radio was the prime communications medium for long-distances absent any ground wireline facilities. That applied to the Army, the Navy, the Air Force. It also applied to other nations' military and to all the commercial communications carriers. HF radio behaved the same for all users. It had since before WW2.

Those of us who were IN such long-distance HF radio operations learned how it was done, what to expect, the theory of it, and took the time to learn more. Clerks don't do that. Clerks handle administration matters. They don't operate radios, they don't maintain them.

Some HF radio bands are used by amateurs for avocational recreation. Radio amateurs do not have to operate-maintain their radios 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Communications carriers must, for that is their business. The military must, for that is their mission in a period when thermonuclear war could begin in an hour or so.

HF radio works the same for anyone using that spectrum part. There is no difference between radio services and radio physics. Except in the perverted minds of some who have no real grasp of basic radio physics, shouting and waving their certificates "this is amateur radio!" No one can legislate fields and waves to make them do humans' bidding.

HF radio works the same way now as it did a half century ago or a century ago. Having a fancy certificate giving access to a limited spectrum space and limited mode selection (all optional) does not give more control over radio physics than anyone else. Training, knowledge, experience yields more insight into radio but myth, lore, and urban legends detract from true insight, a long tenure as an amateur or a fancy certificate saying someone is "extra" is no guarantee or qualification other than having a long tenure as an extra or having a certificate.

YOU, Sgt Putz, think you can "command" anyone by waving your magic certificate and hurling epithets. That does not

work in the real world. This is part of the real world. Your imagination is not the real world.

Temper fry

2387. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 06:37:56 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030218013756.24516.00000012@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 61414

In article <20030217133129.25403.00000457@mb-fm.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <20030216185049.10587.00000315@mb-bk.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com
>(Vshah101) writes:
>
>>From: "KB9TMP"
>>>That's easy V just learn the code and you'll "Beat" the test, or if
>>>you feel you have to cheat it just learn the letters and pro signs.
>>>If you pass you'll have cheated the test.
>>
>>I don't want to learn the code, okay?
>
>OK, fine. So you can't operate on amateur HF/MF until the rules change. And
the
>rules won't change unless the treaty changes.

...and nobody can possibly talk about changing regulations
without approval from the pastor of the newsgroupies?

>>I have a BSEE and am just interested in
>>the technical portion.
>
>Great! Enjoy!
>
>>Learning the code is a waste of time.
>>
>I have BSEEand MSEE and I say it's not a waste of time at all.

You can have a PhD if you wanted...all you have to do is some
post-graduate work. Why don't you? That would let you speak
with AUTHORITY on a non-academic avocational pursuit that
is burdened with federal regulations because of radio physics.

The more certificates you have, the more you can mention
them and present an image of AUTHORITY on morsemanship.

>>Having the code license actually works against me, since it shows one wasted
>>time learning code.
>
>You have spent far more time posting here than it would take most people to
>learn enough code to pass the 5 wpm test.

"Most people?!?" There's a Poll for that, too?!?

There's approximately 300 million people in the USA. How many
are "most people" in approximate numbers? Two? Three? A

four-year-old?

>How you spend your time is up to you, but the way you write says that
>learning code is a waste of time for everyone, not just for you.

Rev. Jimmie, the way you write is that anything, and I say
ANYTHING against morse code is an abomination before
the lord. Chill down, boy, this ain't the church.

>>This takes away from other (legitimate) skills.
>
>Is Morse code not a "legitimate" skill for a ham to have?

The epitome of US hamming is working DX on HF with CW.

But the FCC does not mandate CW-only use or require it
to be used over and above any other allocated mode.
No code test Technicians are given the option to use morse
code on their allocated bands.

Wow! Think about such a heresy! No code Techs working
CW and never ever taking any code test! Why that looks
like a fabulous subject for another Sermon on the Antenna
Mount!

>>I agree
>>with that opinion. Also I just don't find code fun and I resent the higher
>>license class being tied to the code.
>
>Nothing anybody can do about it until the treaty changes.

Don't fight city hall? Don't even TALK about it?

Tsk, tsk, tsk, if all that talk about the displeasure of morse
is grating on your superior-grade ears, your lordship, then
have them summarily eliminated.

>Did you get to pick and choose the courses you wanted for the BSEE, and reject
>any that didn't interest you? Or did you have to learn some stuff that was of
>no interest but was required for the degree?

Oh, wow, RETRO talk! The license test is a Degree Final!

Here's an amazing clue-in, Rev. Jimmie: There aren't any
federal regulations regarding the "courses for a BSEE" or
any other degree. No regulations mean no legislative stuff
to argue about. Hello? Are you beginning to see any light
yet?

>(I'm NOT saying a ham license is an academic certificate, just that one
>doesn;t get to pick and choose.)

You're shot down again, ace. Ever hear of "electives?" Those
are recognized by all the major colleges and universities.

Yes, you ARE all but shouting out loud that a ham license test
is just like a college degree final test. Everyone hears you
loud and clear..."599" in appropriate "reporting." :-)

>Could have been a candid picture.

Allan Funt you ain't.

>>The homebrewing photo is placed to show the club likes to Homebrew. However,
>>noone in the club likes to homebrew.
>
>How do you know?

How do YOU know? Do you now claim prescience in addition to
reading the minds of the FCC staff?!?!?

>>I see a contradiction.
>
>Yeah, me too.

The rest of us see just another irritated BDOF, Rev. Jimmie.

The epitome of US hamming is working DX on HF with CW.

2388. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 06:37:57 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030218013757.24516.00000013@mb-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 61410

In article <20030217151955.14740.00000272@mb-cc.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Attilla the Ham) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 2/17/03 11:53 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20030217125356.23182.00000404@mb-mi.aol.com>
>
>>Seems like the SIX levels of amateur licenses were five too
>> many to me
>
> Any number of licenses will always be too many levels for you, Your
>Putziness.

Oh? I was granted a First Phone in 1956. That's a (commercial) license, far inferior to your PhD-level AMATEUR license?

> You can't even pass the simplest of them now......

Oh, oh, oh, Attilla the Ham HAS to go the nyah-nyah route again in a no-road vehicle. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

FOUR YEAR OLD CHILDREN can pass a ham license. How many four-year-olds have passed even a General Radio-telephone license?

Hey! Attilla...your name isn't James Miccolis. Stop with the identity crisis, get some mental health help.

Temper fry

2389. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 07:01:03 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BA77445F.EE07%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 61417

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> The thing that really bugged me about the blue
> dress incident was the bald faced lying
> connected with it.

I absolutely agree, Jim. But this is something Clinton and his supporters would rather we not focus on - the bad boy screwing around image is better than the liar image.

Furthermore, I was never comfortable with the fact that Clinton was having a sexual relationship with a subordinate on the job - something that would, for many reasons, almost certainly get a regular employee of the government fired instantly.

And, to prevent this thread from getting too far out, I'll end my comments about that with this message.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2390. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 07:49:26 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0302172349.73f440a9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61418

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hah49t8.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> On 17 Feb 2003 17:53:31 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> >>Bet: The FCC is not about to put themselves thru another
> >>"restructuring" of ham radio for years. We've only had three major
> >>overhauls in last 52 years, that's one every 17+ years. History does
> >>repeat itself, yes?
> >
> > Ahem...take a look at the title of NPRM 98-143 and R&O 99-412.
> > it reads "biennial." "Biennial" as ordered by the Congress of
> > the United States. "Biennial" is defined as "happening every
> > two years" or as a "period of two years."
>
> Yes but - the "Biennial" refers to the requirement to review SOME
> service's rules in depth every two years. There's such a review
> going on all the time. We in the ARS had ours in '98. Now it's
> someone else's turn.

How many services are there at two years per look-see?

A mandate to review is not a mandate to change.

I assume that the all the FCC has to do to remain kosher is to log the
review and move on if that's what they choose to do.

> The last thong that Billy Tauzin thinks of when he thinks of
> "getting" the FCC is Amateur Radio Service Rule Revisions. He has
> much bigger fish to fry.
>
> As Bill Cross intimated in his famous statement two years ago - we
> have to keep our head down and stay out of the crossfire.
>
> ---
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

w3rv

2391. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 09:07:32 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030218040732.03273.00000564@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 61419

In article <b2ri9evpe1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>> One paragraph, waiving Element 1 until a full rewrite can be done at some
>> future date.
>
>However, dropping Element 1 doesn't necessarily mean there will be any
>"full rewrite" at all.

Actually, it's probably not a heck of a lot of editing work to simply eliminate
all references to Element 1 from Part 97. Not a "full rewrite" by any stretch
of the imagination.
>
>> >Someone needs
>> >to think of a 'simple' way to phase out the closed licence classes of
>> >Advanced and Novice, and to redistribute their subbands.
>>
>> Why? FCC sees no problem with the way things are.
>
>And, in reality, the Novice bands are available to all Tech+, Gen, Advanced
>and Extra anyway.

Yes, but the power level in those subbands is limited for all license classes.
And there are some folks who favor "refarming" the Novice subbands as more
'phone space.
>
>Likewise, even if the Advanced hams all vaporized tomorrow, the "advanced
>subbands are are fully usable by Extras. Indeed, today that is the major
>benefit
>of going from General to Extra...you get all frequency privileges.

And, if you want one, one of those spiffy 1x2 or 2x1 callsigns. Mine's not a
vanity callsign either - no V in the database..
>
>> >The FCC have said
>> >that we must reach a consensus on that, and then they will do it, but not
>> >before. I bet this group has a few proposals for that.
>> >
>> The problem is simply one of not being able to meet all goals at once.
>
>Yep, there's almost never a perfect solution to anything.

In this case, every solution I've seen has at least one of these two flaws:
>
>> Take the Advanced for example. 88,000 of them, and slowly dropping.
>>

>> If they get all privs, they've gotten a free upgrade to Extra that others
>> had
>> to pass a test to get. Not going to be popular.
>>
>> If they're reduced to General privileges, they've lost privs just to make
>> the
>> rules a little shorter.
>>
>> Neither idea is going to get much support.
>
>Nor is there any reason for the FCC to do anything anyway.

Right! The rules are on the books already. No new Advanceds being issued, so no admin work there.

>The renewal
>process
>is pretty much automated (my renewal was done via ARRL and it was processed
>in less than 10 days earlier this month. Now I'm just waiting for the hard
>copy to
>show up in the mail which is probably computer generated and mailed.

Been that way quite a while. Last time I did a modification (late '99) I just downloaded the PDF for Form 605, printed one, filled it out, sent it to the FCC. Computer printed license showed up a few weeks later.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2392. Re: After S25.5 Goes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 12:35:53 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <JMp4a.753$hj.704082@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 61420

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3E511FEC.775A49D9@earthlink.net...
>
> ...and there are still plenty of "old" Technicians who, while not
> particularly interested in HF are interested in unpredictable
> propagation and BIG antennas on tall towers. These folks are doing weak
> signal work on 50, 144, 432 and above with KW amps on SSB and CW. A
> number are doing moon bounce on 6m, 2m and 70cm.
>
> Dave K8MN

If they are really "old" techs (or Tech+), they have code credit for
5 wpm and the upgrade to General shouldn't be much of a hassle
(particularly if they are technically astute enough to do the sorts of
things that you list) ... I would suspect than many have already done
the upgrade ...

Carl - wk3c

2393. Re: After S25.5 Goes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 12:45:24 UTC
From: Lloyd <TinyTenna@SWLhq14313.net>
Message-ID: <b2t9shbls0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 61421

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message

> The last time that -I- busted a licensed ham for overpower was
> the oiperator at the Peoples Temple in San Francisco. Remember
> them - the stateside terminal of the Jonestown settlement of
> Massacre fame in 1978.
> However, unlicened "CB style" operators get busted routinely when
> the complaint volume gets great enough and there are extrinsic
> factors involved to warrant assigment of the necessary crew.

> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
Now I know why I quit going to the VFW. Too many old
men telling tall tales of yesteryear, and always tales in which they are
the hero.

Lloyd

2394. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 12:56:48 UTC
From: Herb <Herb@BrightSunTemple.org>
Message-ID: <b2tahu$e3j$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 61422

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message

> My gut feeling is that after the last Congressionally-ordered
> "vaudeville fire drill" that's the last thing that Bill Cross wants
> to do.
>
> You didn't think that the FCC wanted to do that exercise on its
> own, did you?
>
> ---
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>

Bill Cross? Makes me think of my old boss of many years, a very quiet, but highly professional and extremely intelligent engineer who rarely smiled, just went about his business in a highly professional manner. He now holds a professorship in engineering at a prestigious university. He was also a ham radio operator and enjoyed attending hamfests. I had the opportunity of attending a hamfest with him one time where Bill Cross was a speaker. Upon seeing Cross, my normally very serious boss broke into uncontrollable belly laughs, whooping his knees, and bringing the place down with loud laughter. When he finally regained his composure, I asked him what was so funny. All he would say is that the Cross always sent him into peels of laughter and he would tell me some day why. Hmmmm.

73,

Herb

prestigious

2395. Re: New Field Day Entry Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 13:37:19 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0302180537.659c69d4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61423

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0302172105.444e29b3@posting.google.com>...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030216133150.29016.00000361@mb-fy.aol.com>...
> > In article <d22b54c3.0302151756.24421a10@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> > (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> > >I'll look into that. Tnx.
> >
> > Us natural borned thick skinned contesters do give out the tips to those smart
> > enough to pick up on 'em.
>
> Roger that!
>
> > >Keyed a "coherent msg"?? ME?? WTF kinda goofy question izzat?? If
> > >perchance ya mean did I ever actually ship a msg thru NTS the answer
> > >is emphatically no. NTS is 1915 ham radio epitomized.
> >
> > Not at all. Back then they used the trunk line system. NTS is post WW2.
>
> That minor detail aside so was my S-40B which today would actually
> more useful than NTS has been for years. There isn't a single third
> district regional NTS net on 80/75/40.

No more 3RN? You better double-check.

> Even Mae Burke gave up traffic
> handling long ago. Traffic handling had a lotta good points and a
> lotta hams benifitted from being involved in it. But those days are
> long past. E-mail drove the final stake in it.

That last I can agree with. But the skills are still needed in
emergencies.
>
> > So what's your solution? Where's the all-digital high speed UHF relay system
> > that we were told was just around the corner, as soon as the code test went
> > away?
>
> The solutions are already on the Internet. Which is why it ain't gonna
> happen on the ham bands.

Bingo.
>
> > Points is points. Besides, the Southgate Type 7 is a decade newer than your
> > TS-940.

>
> That's why I popped for the 847 which is newer than . .
>
The K2 is prolly newer...
> > >
> > >> And it's another easy 100 points for maybe 15 minutes on a traffic
> > >> net. How long did ya say those 50 phone/ 25 CW QSOs would take ya?
> > >
> > >Yeah, right, you're gonna pump out ten on 90 second centers outta
> > >nowhere. Baloney.
> >
> > What are you talking about?
>
> Now I gotta be *your* FD rules lawyer. The msg to the SCM is not the
> message handling bonus I'm talking about, look up the lousy ten points
> per ya get when ya waste yer time chasing down the bonus points per
> 7.3.6.
>
That's not the 100 points I'm talkin' about at all.

You get 100 points for originating a message to the SM during the FD
period, reporting your FD activity. Write it up ahead of time, pass it
on a section net, 15 minutes tops. 100 more quickie bonus points.

The ten messages at ten points each I don't bother with.
>
> > Lessee, you need to bring two antennas, tripod mount and hardware, associated
> > coax and other goodies. Plus set it up and take it down. Have fun!
>
> No more hauling a truck load of FD crap for me. One way trip once
> except for the electronics and the toolbox. Which this time will weigh
> only around 35 pounds total and I'll have room left in the back seat.
> Radio, 'puter, P/S, keyer, mic and that's about it as far as the
> equipment goes. The tripod would be built there and would stay there
> along with the coax, all the other cables and the antennas and all the
> rest of the junque which is already stored there from last year. I
> even had the coax drop-shipped there. The monitor also stays there.

Get this: I dumpster-dove a nice 17" monitor the other dat. Only a
Goldstar 761 but nice and sharp. No pincushioning and it's clean and
in good shape.
>
> I expect to have everything set up and well tested long before FD
> weekend. I'm a helluva lot more interested working dx wih the antennas
> I have in mind than I have in my FD score and I hope to have plenty of
> that activity under my belt before FD. I'll do a cerimonial dipping of
> the antennas Friday nite to keep that detail kosher. I won't have
> anybody leaning on me about being home for dinner on Sunday so it
> might still be set up after the event in order to continue antenna
> experiments if I have that notion.

Points is points.
>
> > 2980 points, 629 CW/11 phone QSOs, class 1B-1. No help at all, FD site 73 miles
> > from home. No computer, not even a memory keyer. No usable trees, put up a 41
> > foot mast single handed. Gas engine generator for power.
>
> Should have gotten ya the Field Day version of the Darwin Award.

I'm still here.

btw, back then you could get 100 bonus points by making at least 10
VHF/UHF QSOs (FM simplex OK, but no repeaters). The 11 phone QSOs were
on FM simplex from the HW-2036 and a homebrew GP on one of the end
support masts.
>
> > >I'm not above a bit of slimery but that was outrageous.
> >
> > It worked, though. And actually met the goal of the whole thing, which was to
> > promote mobile installations back when they were a big deal to do.
>
> Uh-huh, the ARRL thought so much of it that they immediately rewrote
> the rules to keep it from happenimng again.

Ya still gotta admire the barracuda aspect of it. Plus they did
actually make all those QSOs.
>
> > >> How many QSOs so far?
> > >
> > >Zip.
> >
> > No points for that!
>
> The filters got snowed into the post office.

This little dusting?
>
> > Good to be thinking about FD when the snow is piling up outside, anyway.
>
> Yeah, I'm sure the MN group is well into their FD "planning phase"
> instead of yakking on Bill's Freq abt the WX.

HAW!

73 de Jim, N2EY

2396. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 13:40:14 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030218084014.04848.00000758@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 61424

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 2/17/03 5:50 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030217185042.04532.00000243@mb-fx.aol.com>

>Please provide a sentence where "radio art" is used to mean non-technical
>achievement, from an unbiased source

Vippy, this is an Amateur Radio NG, occupied by Radio Amateurs.

Your assertion is based upon wording of Amateur Radio related regulations
in the Code of Federal Regulations.

Any "reference" I provide is going to be ABOUT Amateurs from Amateur Radio
related sources.

We are discussing (on occassion, anyway...) AMATEUR PRACTICE...Not
commercial, military or any other form of excitation of the ether.

Therefore any reference to the use of the term "radio art" is going to be
as it is applied to Amateur Radio...NOT how the IEEE or any other source refers
to it.

It is impossible to provide a cite where it is NOT related to Amateur
Radio.

And what "hype" are you refering to, Vippy?

Steve, K4YZ

2397. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 13:45:39 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030218084539.04848.00000759@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 61425

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 2/17/03 6:41 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030217194106.04532.00000252@mb-fx.aol.com>

>I can learn code. I don't find Morse code fun or relevant to the higher
>license
>class.

It's not what YOU find relevent, Vippy. It's what the FCC and Congress
find relevent.

As of today, Fevruary 18th 2003, a Morse Code test IS relevent to the
operation of an Amateur Radio station authorized to operate below 30 mHz.

That's the law.

That you don't consider the benefits of what you would obtain in return
for the effort to learn the code "worth it" is YOUR opinion, suited to YOUR
lifestyle and choices.

Your demeaning and denigrating remarks about those who DO expend the
effort are spiteful and selfish.

Period.

Steve, K4YZ

2398. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 13:48:28 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030218084828.04848.00000760@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 61426

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 2/17/03 6:51 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030217195136.04532.00000253@mb-fx.aol.com>

>Someone else claimed it. I agree with it. If you have a General class
>license,
>it shows you learned the code. This is a waste of time for technical skills.

Why?

Is it your assertion that no one can learn more than one thing or be
proficient at more than one skill? or perhaps you mean no one BUT you...?!?!

In YOUR case, maybe, but the rest of us can multi-task pretty well.

Or in Lennie's case, "multi-tsk tsk tsk".

Steve, K4YZ

2399. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 13:57:21 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030218085721.04848.00000761@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 61427

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/17/03 8:11 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030217211127.03532.00000537@mb-cp.aol.com>

>>>Flight suits, one-piece coveralls, commonly called "poopie-suits"
>>> by those who wear them.
>>
>> Oh?
>
> YES. That's one of many colloquial names for that garment.

In what venue? In what periodicals, manuals or other "colloquial" media?

>You've flipped out, lost it, switched off, drifted off frequency
> a long time ago and live in a world of fantasy, certificatism,
> and uniforms with distinctive unit insignia.

Yep...I do.

I live in a world where I am proud to be serving in some capacity. My "service" has, on more than one occassion, meant that someone went home alive that might not have otherwise had that option had I and other like-minded volunteers not been there.

Uniforms come in all shapes, sizes and origins. Some were uniforms of military origin. Others were from EMS service and no connection to the Armed Forces at all.

That you disdain uniforms is obvious. That you try and discredit the people who wear them for your own selfish reasons is ugly.

You should try volunteering somewhere, Lennie. It's good to get out and be with people who enjoy helping other people.

I know it will be a new experience for you, but try it anyway.

You're a putz.

Steve

2400. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 14:02:30 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030218090230.04848.00000762@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 61428

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/17/03 8:11 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030217211126.03532.00000534@mb-cp.aol.com>

>You ARE one vindictive little son of a beeper, Attilla. You
> will make fun and ridicule against anyone who goes out of
> their way to learn something. [see the attempted defamation
> of "15 years of night school" as a pejorative in here often
> enough]

Nope...not vindictive at all, Lennie, unless you call punching holes in
your's and Vippy's stories "vindictive".

You've tried your OWN form of "vindictive(ness)" and had it spoon fed
back to you. retty bitter, eh, Oh Putzy One...?!?!

>The only "contradiction" Attilla the Ham makes is attempting
> to pass hisself off as a civil human being who knows something
> about radio

I know enough to be a current FCC licensee. Where's your's, Lennie?

>Steamy, you've lost it again, sitting on standby, garbled
> modulation, and your electrolytics are all leaking out. Go
> wipe up the mess with some of your extra certificates. Get
> a better human disguise, alien, your echoes are long delayed

Whew. Colorful stuff! Get this watching Spongebob or Catdog re-runs
again, Lennie?

2401. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 14:16:58 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030218091658.29188.00000427@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 61429

>Subject: Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)
>From: "Phil Kane" Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop
>Date: 2/17/03 7:39 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <cuvyxnansvbet.hah49t8.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>

>The last thong that Billy Tauzin thinks of...(SNIP)

....was probably NOT the thong on Jennifer Lopez......

But it was on mine!

=)

2402. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 14:18:26 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030218091826.29188.00000428@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 61430

>Subject: Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/18/03 12:37 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030218013747.24516.00000005@mb-bk.aol.com>

>I do prefer salmon or red trout.

Better for your kind of trolling techniques?

And I thought it was TROUSER trout you prefered....???

2403. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 14:19:24 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <EC2B60EE18D70CE6.B6410AAE1D36E578.9CA527C97AC83034@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 61432

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030218084539.04848.00000759@mb-cs.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
> >From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
> >Date: 2/17/03 6:41 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20030217194106.04532.00000252@mb-fx.aol.com>
>
> >I can learn code. I don't find Morse code fun or relevant to the higher
> >license
> >class.
>
> It's not what YOU find relevent, Vippy. It's what the FCC and
Congress
> find relevent.
>

With all due respect :) In actuality what anyone finds relevant *does*
matter, if they are a voting citizen. It is the public, after all, that
supposedly has influence on the decisions that ultimately reach the
regulatory and enforcement branches of our government. What the FCC and
Congress find relevant is, hopefully, what the majority of the public finds
relevant--the majority that is involved, that is.

Kim W5TIT

2404. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 14:23:28 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030218092328.29188.00000429@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 61431

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/17/03 8:11 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030217211134.03532.00000541@mb-cp.aol.com>

>The mythical instrument is the "rittysnitch," not the 'readysnitch.

Thanks for the correction AND for making my "point". Who cares about
them? I don't.

Steve, K4YZ

2405. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 14:35:51 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030218093551.29188.00000430@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 61433

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/17/03 8:11 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030217211130.03532.00000539@mb-cp.aol.com>

>>Vipul, on the other hand, doesn't know the difference. His approach is
>>that if he slings enough mud something he's aiming at will get splatted.
>
> Hello? Anyone there? Just who has signed posts with epithets
> like "Putz" and "Creep" for months in here?

Those were not aimed at anyone BUT you, Your Putziness...Or is it Your
Creepiness? Still too early in the day to decide.

>[Steamy don' really wanna
> go there again, he gonna bleed and bleed again if he do...]

Lennie! Making THREATS...?!?! Oooooh! I am SOOOOOOO scared!

Not.

>THE FIRST EVIDENCE OF MOONBOUNCE CAME FROM US
> ARMY SIGNAL CORPS EXPERIMENTATION IN PROJECT DIANA.

Shouting will not make you any more "right", Lennie.

>The subject was MOONBOUNCE...using the moon as a reflector.
> Not some mythical "long delay echoes" said to be observed by a
> few and verified by no one. PROJECT DIANA. Hello? 1946.

Hello yourself. Still wrong. Albeit not called "moonbounce" then the
phenomena was descibed in both "Radio" magazine and "QST" in the 20's and 30's.

>Definitive evidence, witnesses from the press, echo waveform
> photographs, verification by others doing the same thing
> afterwards. It was in Real radio literature and recognized as first
> by the rest of the Real radio world, not by some UFOnaut.

PRACTICAL Moonbounce was explored by Project Diana. That a website YOU
prefer says "this is the definitive word on the subject" does not make it so.

>I guess that I have to use all capitals in order to make things
> clear to your few neurons, Attilla

Nope. You use all capitals because you're the bully who has to yell it
out louder regardless of how wrong he may be.

>Go reasearch radiosondes and their use, their history,
> Attilla. Try NOAA "assets" on radiosondes before you

> make yourself another ass again.

I don't have to go anywhere, Lennie, and I am not the one who has a perception problem.

Private resources seeking to be NASA and ESA alternatives is old news.

>If you weren't known as a total ignorant slut about radio
> technology behind the front panels you could learn about
> pencil triodes by the tens of thousands installed in little
> plastic boxes containing PC switches and one-shot
> batteries tracked by radar-like directional receivers having
> automatic tracking.

I am familiar with radiosondes, Lennie, and your little detour does not change facts.

As for the little slut, I thought she was at YOUR house. Lose another one, Lennie?

>Temper fry

I see whose temper's frying, Lennie.

You PUTZ.

2406. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 14:52:45 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030218095245.27607.00000590@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 61438

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/18/03 12:37 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030218013750.24516.00000010@mb-bk.aol.com>

>> No, Lennie, I asked what were the effective dates of the awards...for
>>WHAT PERIODS were they awarded for?
>
> As long as the unit is organized. Presidential Unit Citations
> are awarded to a unit. Hello? Can you read, dumass? Do
> you need the ARs (Army Regulations) or SRs (Special
> Regulations) for a non-amateur-radio-related subject and
> for incessant arguing in here? You lose either way.

More arrogant refusal to specify for what periods of time the awards were earned...Which only leads me to beleive this is yet another Leonard H. Anderson claim to an award won without his input.

I read fine, Lennie. As for the adjective, I have asked you three different ways to tell us from what day to what day the PUC's to which you lay claim were awarded.

For those who have never served in the Armed Forces, unit citaions are awarded for one of two events...Either a specific event of notable accomplishment, or a period of time over which noteworthy and exemplary service was performed.

Lennie is once again dodging the question because he knows that if he reveals the periods over which the PUC's for his unit were awarded, we will know that he was NOT in the unit for the periods cited.

In other words, he did not contribute to the character of the service for which the award was made...He did not contribute...(as if we didn't already know...)

>Sgt Putz, aka Attilla the Ham, is suffering PMS (Powerful Marine
> Syndrome).

It seems to me that YOU are suffering from MY "Powerful Marine Syndrome", Lennie...

Ya Putz.

2407. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 14:56:51 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030218095651.27607.00000591@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 61439

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/18/03 12:37 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030218013750.24516.00000008@mb-bk.aol.com>

>No soldier, sailor, or airman can "argue" the UCMJ

Where in the Blue Blazes did your come up with that pearl, Your Lameness?

Of course they can! Members of the Armed Forces can still participate in
the judicial process just like any other citizen can!

What a freakin' IDIOT!

>>There is a *requirement* of 5 wpm morse for HF
>>access in ham radio.
>
> There is a REGULATION about it, dumass. See appropriate
> sub-parts of Part 97.

Whoaa! Frequent use of the term "dumass" noted in various "I can't make
my point any other way, so I will use profanity" posts.

Running out of other "perjoratives", Your Scuminess?

Ya Putz.

2408. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 15:02:02 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030218100202.27607.00000592@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 61440

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/18/03 12:37 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030218013756.24516.00000012@mb-bk.aol.com>

>Rev. Jimmie, the way you write is...(SNIP)

....usually personally respectful of you, Lennie, yet you continue to
belittle his name.

You assert that this is a "PCTA" tactic, yet with the exception of me, you
are most insulting and degrading of the one person here who refuses to partake
of the same tactics you do.

How ironic, Eh?

Pretty good example you are setting for MinnieLennie in MA, huh?!?!

>The epitome of US hamming is working DX on HF with CW.

Yet another assertion by the one person in this NG without the experience
to make an INFORMED opinion.

What a PUTZ.

2409. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 15:33:00 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <Mms4a.23493$Yv2.14310@nwrddc02.gnilink.net>
Source record: 61441

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030216173702.14527.00000382@mb-cc.aol.com...
> In article <wXv1a.210618$HG.35249296@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>, "Bert
Craig"
> <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> writes:
>
> >"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> >news:6rZ0a.169945$HG.28632745@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> >> Imagine that...a young person
> >> actually having Morse code!
> >
> >Oops, that was supposed to read "Imagine that...a young person actually
> >having <fun with> Morse code!"
> >
> Not hard to imagine at all. Seen it in reality many times. Also
experienced it
> myself.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Me too, Jim:

My very first experience with 2-way radio was a "CB" walkie-talkie that my best bud and I used to communicate accross the vast expanse that was the vacant lot between our houses. I put CB in quotation marks because although they were advertised as CB h/t's and operated on CB frequencies, they wer Part 15 devices @ 100mW rather than Part 95 @ 4W.

They were awfully fun though and had the 'International Morse Code' placarded on the front of the rig with a bright orange button labeled 'Morse Code Key.' After sending some very slow code back and forth for awhile, we wanted a little more range. (Here is where I admit my very first violation of a FCC rule.) So I read up a little on outdoor antennas and decided that a dipole would be best on a 13-yr. old's lawn-cutting/snow-shoveling earnings. Dad provided supervised access to his soldering iron and the h/t's telescoping whip was replaced by RG-58 coax feeding a half-wave dipole. My friend's whip was replaced by a commercial quarter-wave ground plane. Ah, those were the days!

I'd be remiss if I didn't mention the trip to the local CB/ham shop to buy the necessary materials. When the owner asked me about my planned "installation" and how much I had to spend, Mike (WB2 something or other) cheerfully supplied me with a Budwig-style center insulator, two dogbone end insulators, the required 14-gauge stranded copper antenna wire, 18 ft. of RG-58 coax, and a set of crystals for ch. 20, the local rag-chew freq. "Yep,

fourteen bucks'll just about cover that." The ch. 20 crystals were $8.99
alone. That was my first exposure to the amicable spirit of radio. :-D

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

2410. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 15:34:29 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030218103429.27607.00000593@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 61442

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/18/03 12:37 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030218013754.24516.00000011@mb-bk.aol.com>

>Erection of a statue, dumass

Temper fry, Your Putziness...Temper fry.

>Wow! For that they need cammies and meetings every month
> to discuss military matters using old US Army manuals?

No...They discuss military matters using CURRENT US Army manuals...The same one's that pertain to the active Army, the Reserves AND the National Guard.

>Good grief, your distinctive unit insignianess, putting cammies on
> state social workers would handle the family services duties.

You mean the social workers who are already so under staffed that kids are lost for YEARS in the social services programs?

You mean the social workers who already have to just rubber stamp cases bcasue they can't be in 20 places at once?

Yep...those are the same social workers I'd want taking care of MY family if I was overseas...Uh huh.

>No police forces in town? No civilian security guards? Those can
> safeguard National Guard facilities if the REAL Guard is deployed.

Geeeeee.....Guess all those "human interest" stories on CNN, MSNBC and other news outlets about how understaffed many police departments are because Guard units are getting called up and drawing away local police assets hasn't played in SoCal, huh...?!?!

>It's fairly obvious that this TNSG thing is just another fraternal
> order excuse for a bunch of macho military minded civilians to
> have monthly fun playing sojer in da woods. All the trappings
> of army post life are there for everyone to see.

More insults of veterans and veterans who volunteer.

Scum from the scumbag. What did I expect from a coward who makes his "fame" from hiding behind Army KIA's for newsgroup glory?

>Oh, pizza off, you little thin-skinned excuse..."thier" included.

Learn this in night school, did ya? I am impressed.

>Nobody can possibly "score points" with you because you
> haven't any idea of what the score is.

Sure I do. Been playing THIS game a lot longer than you have, Your
Putziness!

>I honor their sacrifice, but you, you sorry excuse for
> a former US military person, want to damn them and me
> in order to win some sort of message point thing because
> you can't admit you are wrong in anything.

I am not the one dishonoring those men, LennieH. You are. Every time you
recount their deaths so taht you can hide behind them.

I "damn" you for being a coward and a liar. You have yet to prove
otherwise. The above quoted passage yet another attempt to hide your own
misdeeds.

I DARE you to quote ONE sentence where I said ONE disrespectful thing
about those Men, Lennie. I am only sorry that a disgusting coward like you can
hide behind "Freedom of Speech" when you invoke their memory for your own gain.

>As far as I'm concerned, the USMC kicked you out of the
> corps for failing to recognize the "US" part. They would be
> correct since you've managed to not only damn the US
> Army and veterans thereo...SNIP)

I have not damend the Army, Lennie, and you are again tasked to provide
the quote wherein you say I did.

And I have "damned" only ONE veteran. That would be you. I still call
you a liar and a coward. That's MY right under the Freedom of Speech".

>Not the "billionth," not even a millionth. I don't mind repeating
> it for as long as it takes you to understand it.

I understand it fine.

You were in the Army.

You were voluntarily enlisted, not conscripted.

You were assigned to a rear area radio relay station in Japan, three years
AFTER that unit had been in combat.

You frequently invoke the memory of members of that unit who were KIA
during the active phase of the Korean Conflict, the sole purpose of which was
to embellish your own "record".

>I am pessimistic
> in regards to your understanding any of it...you are just an
> amateur in everything you do, nursie.

"Nursie" is with a capital "N", Lennie.

>I've never claimed any "heroism" in any war.

Sure you have. Everytime you invoke the memory of their deaths and then try to hide behind it, Lennie.

>I served my country,
> the United States of America, for eight years and received an
> Honorable Discharge for that.

According to what you have posted here, you only served for THREE years. The rest was inactive reserve. You were back home, working a civilian job, and not on any federal payroll. (at least not as a member of the Armed Forces).

What's the truth?

>I did it honoring those who served
> before me in my unit, all signalmen, the United States Army, and
> all the members of the US military.

You maybe did it then. You certainly don't do it now. In all of the Veteran's Day posts made by me and others in this forum you have not once acknowledged any of them. Nor have you ever acknowledged any of the Memorial Day posts made by me and other veterans in this forum.

>YOU "honor" no one but yourself and some perverted imagination
> and attempt to DISHONOR anyone who served his country
> honorably if they don't agree with your lardship's opinions. Ptui.

Not "anyone", Lennie. Just you. And only because of your cowardly and spiteful conduct in this forum, especially towards your fellow vets.

>In the immediate post Korean War period..(SNIP)

YadaYadaYada.

Still not germane. Same old stuff as yesterday.

>Temper fry

I am not the one who's got an anger problem, Lennie.

Ya Putz.

2411. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 15:41:09 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030218104109.27607.00000594@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 61443

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: "W5TIT" seventythree@eightyeight.net
>Date: 2/18/03 8:19 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id:
><EC2B60EE18D70CE6.B6410AAE1D36E578.9CA527C97AC83034@lp.airnews.net>

>With all due respect :) In actuality what anyone finds relevant *does*
>matter, if they are a voting citizen.

Point taken, Kim...Let me change it to "that you find it irrelevent is in itself irrelevent since the state of international treaties to which the United States is signatory requires it. Unitl the treaty is changed, what YOU find "relevent" IS irrelevent".

Better?

>What the FCC and
>Congress find relevant is, hopefully, what the majority of the public finds
>relevant--the majority that is involved, that is.

And I think they have. Like I said, I don't necessarily like it, but it is the "majority rule" that we change. Onwards and upwards.

88

Steve, K4YZ

2412. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 15:46:21 UTC
From: "Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now>
Message-ID: <Xns93264F10DC65Cpookster@216.168.3.50>
Source record: 61444

Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net> wrote in
news:BA773A91.EE02%stewart@say.net:

> You seem focused on the driver's license/learner's permit concept
> when neither compares to a ham license. There is no "regular" ham
> license -

Maybe I didn't make it clear. I am proposing a new license structure
where there are only two classes: learner's and regular.

> Since there is no regular
> ham license, there is also no suggestion that the goal of the lower
> licenses is to upgrade to it (and there goes the learner's permit
> concept).

See the answer above.

> Further, I find your premise somewhat disingenuous. If you truly
> feel the
> ultimate goal of the lower licenses is to upgrade to something else,
> why aren't you concerned about those who have not reached the Extra
> after many years. A quick search shows that many General licensees
> have been so for many years, yet I see nothing about this.

For the second time, see the answer above.

> But, again, you haven't show how the present license structure does
> not
> accomplish these things, or that the present licensees have not used
> their authority responsibly, or how your learner's permit concept
> would change either. Without these, you're offering a solution where
> no problem has been shown.

I never said the present license structure does not accomplish these
things. I said the present license structure is overly complex and
focuses on the wrong things for beginners. We have too many hams now
with General and above who exhibit poor understanding of the basics of
operating. I'd like to see that changed. The other, more technical
items can come later.

--
Bill, W7TI

2413. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 15:54:51 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <512AFB9BC8336D67.1EC53216531093E1.2BDA00F1AF3C420D@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 61445

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030218104109.27607.00000594@mb-mj.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
> >From: "W5TIT" seventythree@eightyeight.net
> >Date: 2/18/03 8:19 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id:
> ><EC2B60EE18D70CE6.B6410AAE1D36E578.9CA527C97AC83034@lp.airnews.net>
>
> >With all due respect :) In actuality what anyone finds relevant *does*
> >matter, if they are a voting citizen.
>
> Point taken, Kim...Let me change it to "that you find it irrelevent
is in
> itself irrelevent since the state of international treaties to which the
United
> States is signatory requires it. Unitl the treaty is changed, what YOU
find
> "relevent" IS irrelevent".
>
> Better?
>

Oh, you're always better, Steve!! Wink, wink!

> >What the FCC and
> >Congress find relevant is, hopefully, what the majority of the public
finds
> >relevant--the majority that is involved, that is.
>
> And I think they have. Like I said, I don't necessarily like it, but
it
> is the "majority rule" that we change. Onwards and upwards.
>
> 88
>
> Steve, K4YZ
>
>

73/88 to you. By the way--you ever check your AOL mail? If you don't, do,
and if you do--I sent you a nice long message!

Kim W5TIT

2414. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 16:20:21 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0302180820.657b7d66@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61446

"Jackie" <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> wrote in message
news:<Nki4a.157130$be.141628@rwcrnsc53>...
> "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030217211127.03532.00000536@mb-cp.aol.com...
> > In article <20030216173704.14527.00000384@mb-cc.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
> (N2EY)
> > writes:
>
> > The epitome of US amateur radio is working DX on HF with CW.

For the record, I did not write the above quote, nor have I ever
written them. And I don't think that way, either.
>
> Despite your ardent insistence to the contrary, Len, there is no "one" mode
> of communication that epitomizes amateur radio.

Len's just trying to pick a fight.

> That's one of the things
> that makes it interesting.
>
> While you might continue to insist that a REAL ham must worship at the altar
> of CW so that others in the hobby might consider them worthy (which I still
> don't get, since I've never heard anyone say such a thing on the air, but
> ONLY off the air), the facts are out there if you bother to listen...

Gotta wonder if some folks ever actually do that...

> I turn
> the VFO knob up and down the bands and hear the dits and dahs of Morse, the
> bleep-bloops of RTTY and other digital modes, lots of tinny, untuned
> vocalizations of SSB (if I don't tune explicitly to every QSO I hear) plus
> many other weird noises that I cannot yet identify. Some ops may prefer one
> mode, and some may work multiple modes. The only thing that I think
> "epitomizes" amateur radio communications is that there IS no "one" way of
> communicating.
>
> Those who insist that Morse is an onerous, backwater mode of communication
> and who don't want to be forced to learn it in order to upgrade will
> probably see their position vindicated soon by the powers that be. I don't
> care one way or the other about Morse testing going away, so long as it's
> not outlawed as a communication method (some people will always want to work
> it-- so what). That certainly won't happen. It will be interesting to see
> what happens when it's time to decide what privileges the new Techs will get
> on HF if E1 is done away with. However, I will certainly not be whining for
> one nanosecond if/when the new Techs get HF privileges without taking E1. I

> don't consider this anything to get my undies in a bunch over.
>
> I think that the key to the future of AR does not reside in any one mode,
> but rather in the people who're attracted to it in the first place. With
> some exceptions (and there are always exceptions), the type of people that
> are attracted to this hobby are technically oriented and fascinated by
> technical/scientific stuff that the general public finds mostly
> undecipherable, and therefore many (if not most) of us who're initially
> interested are plenty capable of keeping this hobby alive via the sheer
> force of our curiosity and willingness to experiment. Such experiments have
> borne the fruits of advancement in RF communication. There are many new
> digital modes that've come out in the past couple of decades; there are many
> new, state-of-the-art, tiny, yet cheap commercial rigs, and there are many,
> many design plans on the Internet for antennas, transceivers, etc. etc. But
> no matter how hard we yell to get the word out about AR, only some will be
> inclined, indeed able to hear-- and, more importantly, understand-- the
> value of this hobby.
>
> If you've got an amateur radio license, use the privileges you have and have
> maximum fun with them. Don't let the jackass know-it-alls tell you what is
> fun. As a human being that has reached adulthood, YOU get to decide what is
> fun about your hobbies. I've got my HF privileges and rig set up now, but I
> still can't wait to get a 6 meter SSB transceiver and try out the "Magic
> Band" before the sunspots disappear. A new Tech licensee can do this from
> the get-go, no code required. Life's too short to not have as much fun as
> you can in your hobbies of choice.

Well said!
>
> Jackie
>
> "The middle-age temptation to get serious about everything is Satan's
> handiwork." - Berke Breathed (cartoonist, "Bloom County")

Which is why I don't take Len seriously.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2415. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 16:59:02 UTC
From: "QV-105.7 FM" <Top40@QV1057FM.com>
Message-ID: <b2tonf$5ia$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 61447

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
>
> The last thong that Billy Tauzin thinks of when he thinks of
^^^^^^^^^

> "getting" the FCC is Amateur Radio Service Rule Revisions. He has
> much bigger fish to fry.

> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>
I see you are still a big "name dropper" eh Phil?

Hoagie @ QV-105.7 FM

2416. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 17:03:40 UTC
From: "... - - - ..."
Message-ID: <Q7ScnUyAZqT3-s-jXTWcog@comcast.com>
Source record: 61448

<Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
news:20030215165931.503$Dp@newsreader.com...
> Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net> wrote:
> > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> >
> > http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
> >
> Why did you take down your Aaron Voobner website,Dwight?

Don't mind this Guy Moparhed he trolls around in rec.radio.cb

2417. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 17:08:58 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0302180908.4c225b2e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61449

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hah3m46.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> On 17 Feb 2003 12:15:26 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
> >>From a regulator's point of view, dumping Element 1 is a 'small' change!
> >>That's why the smart money is that they will do just that.
> >
> >One paragraph, waiving Element 1 until a full rewrite can be done at some
> >future date.
>
> And because it removes a burdensome requirement, the FCC can do it
> by Memorandum Report and Order without going through the NPRM and
> public input process.

"Memorandum Report and Order" - thanks, Phil, for the proper name of
what I've been referring to by other names.

I took a quick look at Part 97, and it seems to me that all that's
required to remove Element 1 would be revision of 97.501, 97.503,
97.505, 97.507 and 97.509. Most of the revision consists of simple
deletions, with a few rewordings and some renaming.

I'm pretty sure my good friend K2UNK has all the new wording ready to
go, which will save the Commission a little time.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2418. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 17:20:24 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0302180920.6d0ef744@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61450

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hah4ji9.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> On 17 Feb 2003 17:53:32 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> > "Wide ranging support in the amateur radio community" is invalid
> > for any federal regulation applying to ALL citizens.
>
> Tell that to Bill Cross and the other staff members who decide when
> to make revisions and what they should be. He's not going to do
> anything unless there is a consensus WITHIN the amateur community.
> That's part of the "self policing" that the Commish' expects from
> the licensees in the ARS.
>
> He said so in Dayton two years ago.

Since I'm the one who wrote the phrase "Wide ranging support in the
amateur radio community" in the first place, let me clarify what it
was intended to mean.

I intended 'amateur radio community' to mean all parties interested in
the good of the amateur radio service. That includes hams of all
license classes, people in the process of getting a ham license,
people thinking about getting a ham license, amateur radio
organizations ranging from NCI and ARRL to your local radio club,
amateur radio publishers and equipment manufacturers, regulatory
agencies like the FCC, and probably some others I haven't thought of
yet. Not just licensed hams.
>
> But then again you are not a licensee nor are you within the amateur
> radio community.
>
Anybody can comment, propose rule changes, etc., not just hams.
However, it is a mystery why an individual who has never held an
amateur license and obviously has little interest in getting one is so
interested in changing the rules.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2419. Re: After S25.5 Goes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 17:24:14 UTC
From: Ed Norton <HeeeeyNorton@GleasonandNorton.edu>
Message-ID: <b2tq6mbeb0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 61501

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
>
> I can relate first hand to what it takes to prove that a "CB style"
> operator is operating with more than 4 watts - the following is no
> secret to anyone who has been so inspected:
>
> It takes two technically-qualified agents (engineers or
> technicians). The signal is df-ed to a particular antenna, (yes,
> for at least 25 years the FCC has had hand-held concealable
> equipment that can differentiate between two antennas on the same
> house on close-in df) and the level of the signal is noted on a
> spectrum analyzer for reference. One agent goes into the premises
> to attempt the inspection while the other agent observes the antenna
> (if it is rotatable) and the signal level. Meanwhile the inspector
> is usually kept waiting outside while the very characteristic
> "tinkle" sound of PL-259s being hastily uncoupled from equipment is
> heard inside before being admitted. The inspector measures the
> transmitter power (which by that time is at or below legal limits
> umless the operator is stupid as well as sleazy) with an in-line
> wattmeter while the other agent notes the level of the signal on the
> spectrum analyzer. From that it is easy to calculate the power of
> the original "before inspection" transmission. If the antenna is
> rotated or the spectrum analyzer moved between those readings there
> are certain "fudge factors" applied in the operator's favor.
>

> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>

Does the commission still send its employees to the
Ringling Brothers for training?

Ed Norton
"Something Stinks"

2420. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 17:47:23 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0302180947.69df98fd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61502

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E4E68EA.8FC821B7@earthlink.net>...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > In article <3E4C5F89.6049AC04@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > writes:
> >
> > >> Everyone has opinions. Problem with the PCTA Regulars
> > >> in here is that Their Opinions are the Only Truth.
> > >
> > >Would that be...ummmm...your *opinion*?
> >
> > No. It's supported by Google as well as on everyone's
> > screen.
>
> That simply isn't the case. If you disagree, how about providing some
> evidence?

C'mon, Dave, you know that's not going to happen. Proof is not one of
Len's methods. Ask the hypothetical first grade teacher whose reply
Len would ignore anyway if it did not match his expectation.

> > >There are plenty of everyday emergencies in which radio amateurs use
> > >SSB, FM and packet. Your discounting of trained amateur radio operators
> > >is beyond silly.
> >
> > What, that "everyday" emergency action was written up
> > in MAD magazine? :-)
>
> You're only here to advocate removal of morse code testing. You never
> denigrate radio amateurs and their accomplishments. Heh, heh, heh.
>
> > >That'd be "diplomat's". You keep making these errors, Len. War can be
> > >24/7. You've never been a participant for 24/7. Your 24/7 activities
> > >are pretty much limited to using oxygen and taking up space.
> >
> > Oh? You "know" about "war," defunct diplomat?
> >
> > Did you participate in Hostile Action like the Hero in the
> > poopie-suit?
>
> I spent a year of my active duty military time in Vietnam, 1970-71.
> Where my military experience differs from yours is that I was actually
> in the country where the conflict was taking place. Shall I trot out
> the N2EY quote predicting your likely behavior again? Naw, you'll see

> it below.
>
> > Wow, the diplomat-that-never-was is really milking his own
> > little definition of a common euphamism, isn't he? :-)
>
> What is the phrase "diplomat-that-never-was" supposed to mean, Leonard?
> Oh--and the word is "euphemism".
>
> > >Pssst--Jackie! He means "perceived by him".
> >
> > Don't let the cashew brandy go to your head, diplomat.
>
> N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
> No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
> amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
> Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
> slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

He just keeps proving me right.
>
> > Jackie can understand. Poor baby, you can't...
> >
> > >That'd be your opinion once again, Leonard? It really sounds like the
> > >attitude of one who is frustrated that mere radio amateurs won't give
> > >him what he feels is his due.
> >
> > Nothing is "due" me, colonel.
>
> Hey! You're finally getting the picture!

'zactly.
>
> > Problem is your chains got
> > pulled a long time ago when you innovated order-wires at
> > State in some truly third-world posting. Tsk, tsk, tsk.
>
> Any of us can make a mistake, Len. But after you've been corrected a
> number of times on this, you continue to repeat it. Just recently, I
> reposted my original statements, archived by Google. They don't bear
> out your accusation.
> You've never offered anything in the way of proof. I'm afraid that
> makes you a liar.
>
> > >Try to clean up the
> > >errors. You misspelled "noblesse".
> >
> > Yes, your haughtiness. As soon as you complete your
> > Remedial Arithmetic. Remember? 7 x 24 = 168.
>

> "Euphamism", Mr. Nobless.
>
> > "24/7" is a common American phrase that includes being
> > on call and having to work at any time when directed.
>
> Being on call isn't "working 24/7". Having to work at any time is not
> "working 24/7". At no time in your working life did you ever work 24/7.
>
> > It
> > isn't your peculiar redefinition. Sure, I typoed "noblesse,"
> > now you "oblige" by trying to be a civil human instead of
> > a hammy version of Ugly American to Americans.
> >
> > >Amateur radio isn't magic or supernatural. It has known physical
> > >properties.
> >
> > Amazing! An ex-government employee who actually
> > LEARNED something!
>
> N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
> No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
> amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
> Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
> slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."
>
>
> > >You aren't involved in it.
> >
> > With all you Nobles obleging yourselves as Ham Gods,
> > it's unlikely I would be. It wasn't on my agenda for
> > Things to Do Today. Or tomorrow.
>
> It was several years ago when you stated that you were going for the
> Extra "right out of the box". Never happened. Not likely to happen.

Hopefully.
>
> > >Then feel free to go and be of help to your nation, community or
> > >whatever.
>
> > >Quite a rant, Len old boy. I can almost see the flecks of spittle at
> > >the corners of your mouth.
> >
> > Wild imagination.
>
> I agree that your imagination is wild. You really get carried away at
> times.
>

> > Having bad dreams about "hostile action,"
> > diplomat-that-never-was? Or was that your poopie-suited
> > buddy? Have him give you one of his tranks. You need it.
>
> N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
> No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
> amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
> Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
> slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."
>
Proof after proof after proof.
>
> > >You'll still need that morse at the moment
> > >if you'd like to have HF access as a radio amateur.
> >
> > I'm not after a license, colonel.
>
> So, what you told us here just a few years ago was an untruth?

> > I'm just here advocating
> > elimination of a morse code test...and to watch you
> > up-tight anal-retentives get all upset when your thin,
> > thin skin gets bruised. :-)

In other words:

His hobby is wasting time. Your time.
>
> Now you and I know that "just" advocating elimination of the morse code
> test isn't all you're here for. That'd be another untruth.
>
> > >Uh, the Commission seems to think you'll still need to pass the exams,
> > >Leonard.
> > >It isn't just politcal hype.
> >
> > Oh, my. The "teacher" speaking or the poor ex-diplomat-
> > that-never-was and continues-to-be?
> >
> > 7 x 24 = 168, not 148.
>
> "Euphamism", Mr. Nobless. You're quite "immagure". Why don't you "Go
> such an 807 plate cap"?
>
> > >No, you'll just need to do it in order to become a participant. Until
> > >then, the only place you can indulge in dumb little games of
> > >one-upmanship through frequest mention of your professional credentials
> > >is...here.
> >
> > Poor baby. Still upset are you? The diplomat-that-never-was

> > is the one indulging in dumb little games in here.
>
> Let's go over a couple of your recent shenanigans, Leonard old boy:
>
> 1. Repeated statement that I originated the use of a CW order wire
> despite Google quotes showing that I never claimed such originality.
>
> 2. Claim that I never appeared on any Dept. of State "Key Officers"
> lists. When urls of Key Officers lists were provided, you declared them
> lists of all embassy staff.

3. Claimed that I described Amazon.com as "bankrupt" when no such
claim was ever made by me. What I actually wrote was that Amazon.com
was not making a profit, in direct opposition to Len's claim that
Amazon was a "profitable" company. I backed it up by posting links to
Amazon's financials of the time.
But Len keeps quoting me as saying Amazon was/is "bankrupt". Just
another of his untruths.

>
> Let's ask ourselves about the reason for these statements of yours. Do
> they relate to the elimination of morse code in amateur radio testing?

Nope.

> Are they simply an attempt to belittle the accomplishments of another
> who disagrees with your position?

Obviously.

> Are they based in truth?

'course not.

> Why would you
> make them in the first place?
>
His hobby is wasting time. Your time.
>
> > >N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
> > >
> > >No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> > >government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
> > >amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
> > >Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
> > >slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."
> >
> > Yes, another overly-proud BDOF who can't take return
> > fire. No doubt because he wants to hide in his
> > "undisclosed location" where he works, waving all his
> > certificates around over his collection of chassis punches.
> > :-)

In other words, Len cannot reply to my posted facts, so he does the behavior described in my quote.
>
Here, I'll answer those:

> I've asked before but you didn't respond, what is "overly proud"?

Any mention of any accomplishment by those who disagree with Len.

> Why
> does it bother you that Jim chooses not to tell you where he is
> employed?

Because it removes a whole line of possible insults from Len's NG ammo case.

> Why the silly names like "Reverend Jimmie"?

Avoids addressing the actual issue. Also, an attempt to get me to reply in kind.

> Why the comments about "undisclosed location"?

Because keeping the location undisclosed removes a whole line of possible insults from Len's NG ammo case.

> What are we to make of your comment about
> certificates and chassis punches?

Len wants to minimize the fact that I have electrical engineering degrees from major universities (Penn and Drexel, right here in Philly) and that I have designed and built much of my own ham equipment in my 35 years as a ham. Nowhere have I claimed to have designed and built all of it. That's just another of Len's misquotes.

> Why would you refer to Jim as a
> brain-dead old fart?

Direct insult in an attempt to get me to reply in kind.

> It looks as if what you have done is simply
> provide proof of his statement about your behavior.

Len does that with almost every post.

Does anybody think that posting info about my employment would result in anything from Len except more insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior? No matter what the job actually is?

Didn't think so.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2421. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 18:33:55 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <9B612AF6BFB590B9.FCBBA14B63871594.7FE87C3DB49AFB2A@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 61503

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0302180820.657b7d66@posting.google.com...
> "Jackie" <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> wrote in message
news:<Nki4a.157130$be.141628@rwcrnsc53>...
> > "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20030217211127.03532.00000536@mb-cp.aol.com...
> > > In article <20030216173704.14527.00000384@mb-cc.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
> > (N2EY)
> > > writes:
> >
> > > The epitome of US amateur radio is working DX on HF with CW.
>
> For the record, I did not write the above quote, nor have I ever
> written them. And I don't think that way, either.
> >

We who "know" you, knew that, Jim! ;-)

Kim W5TIT

2422. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 19:04:09 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E5283FE.D3A93FAE@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61504

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E5121E0.42131FD4@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >That's AN argument.
>
> Army-Navy?
>
> Sir, this isn't the US military, your lardship.

Relax, Foghorn. You aren't involved in amateur radio.

Dave K8MN

2423. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 19:06:46 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E5284A9.FBCCE9FC@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61505

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <f45722ac.0302170728.1d86203d@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >The ARGUMENT is that a CW EXAM is no longer relavant. Give CW the
> >same exam that FM, SSB, RTTY, SSTV, FSTV, PACKET, PACTOR and PSK31
> >have.
>
> As CW goes, so goes the glory of the nation...
>
> [Alien Nation]
>
> The epitome of US amateur radio is working DX on HF with CW.
>
> We've all been told by the Fearless Leaders of the Beeper
> Brigade.
>
> [or is that Feckless Leaders?]
>
> Beep, beep.

Actually, we've only been told by you and you aren't involved. You are simply a windy geezer who knows a few hams. Did they ever tell you about the epitome of U.S. amateur radio?

So much for your civil debate over the issue...

Dave K8MN

2424. Re: After S25.5 Goes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 19:17:10 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.haihsia.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 61508

On 18 Feb 2003 06:37:46 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:

>> ... Meanwhile the inspector
>> is usually kept waiting outside while the very characteristic
>> "tinkle" sound of PL-259s being hastily uncoupled from equipment is
>> heard inside before being admitted.
>
> "Tinkle?!?"
>
> Gosh, community leader, I've been familiar with Type UHF connectors
> since Army days of 1952. Never heard one "tinkle" yet, not even at
> Christmas holiday time. Same with BNC, N, TNC, C, SMA, SMB,
> and some other types. No "tinkle." Maybe a slight "click," very
> soft. I've never found PL-259s to "hastily uncouple."

When the inspector is standing outside the door, the name of the
game is to get the "leener" out of sight as fast as possible - as a
cable is removed and allowed to flop vertically, the "tinkle" sound
id heard.

You gotta be there to recognize it. Try it - back off the threaded
sleeve and let the cable flop free. Works every time with the
cheapie PL-259 knock-off connectors found in CB installations where
the sleeve backs off the connector body with only a few turns.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2425. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 19:17:11 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.haii6zc.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 61506

On Tue, 18 Feb 2003 07:56:48 -0500, Herb wrote:

>When he finally
>regained his composure, I asked him what was so funny. All he
>would say is that the Cross always sent him into peels of laughter
>and he would tell me some day why.

I'm sure that there are lots of folks out there who would agree.

But at present and for the foreseeable future, he's the one whose
hand is on the throttle.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2426. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 19:17:11 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.haihwxb.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 61507

On 17 Feb 2003 23:49:26 -0800, Brian Kelly wrote:

>A mandate to review is not a mandate to change.
>
>I assume that the all the FCC has to do to remain kosher is to log the
>review and move on if that's what they choose to do.

You understand.....

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2427. Re: ARRL DX CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 19:19:38 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b2u100uqv1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 61509

True...but its hard to tell on this medium..hi. I have a friend named Dee.
He is a retired Colonel.

Dan/W4NTI

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:tmh4a.5578$4y4.2922531@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> It's just that it bothers me when people jump to conclusions about gender.
>
> Dee Flint, N8UZE
>
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:b2s40f$d2t$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net...
> > So?
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> > news:cqg4a.5569$4y4.2912127@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> > > I'm a YL not an OM.
> > >
> > > Dee Flint, N8UZE
>
>
>

2428. Re: New Field Day Entry Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 19:22:57 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E528806.166FE13D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61510

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E513FF9.296E4C4C@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Emoticon disregarded. We're radio amateurs.
>
> No, just amateurs.
>
> >Those of us who choose to
> >use morse and participate in contests do so as we see fit.
>
> Fine.
>
> >We do it because we like it and because we choose to do so.
>
> Fine. But what are you complaining about? You have
> everything you need. Or do you need more rather than morse?
>
> Yes, that's it...CONTROL. Ultimate want. Make others obey
> your wishes. MORE, not morse.

Why should radio amateurs go along with what you want for amateur radio,
Leonard? You aren't involved at all. Could it be CONTROL? Why'd you
snip the relevant quote from you? It wasn't about morse testing. It
was about morse USE.

> >You, as a non radio amateur, may do as you can.
>
> Damn well believe it, senior.

I do believe it. That is why I wrote it. We'll operate on HF using
which ever mode strikes our fancy. You'll sit here and continue to
snipe. It is all you have.

> >You remain a sidewalk superintendant.
>
> Incorrect. I've walked on a sidewalk. I've been a superintendant.
> I've never found a sidewalk that could be supervised. Do you
> have supervisory sidewalks in the east?

No, we just have folks who know what the term means. It suits you.
You're simply an amateur radio bystander, an onlooker with an attitude.
You're probably still dumbfounded that hams don't welcome you with open
arms.

> Why are you talking about sidewalks, boss?
>
> This is an amateur radio newsgroup full of the regular newsgroupies
> with the PCTAs full of it.

Sure is an amateur radio newsgroup, mostly filled with radio amateurs. There are some long time hams, there are a few new hams. Then there is the non-ham who knows what is best for amateur radio, knows that a minimum age for radio amateurs should be established, plunks rocks at the ARRL. That windy fellow has contemplated entering amateur radio for several decades. It could only be funnier if you were a fellow thinking about getting into a swimming pool for that long.

> Please keep to the program.

I've been with the program for nearly forty years. You're still making up your mind.

Dave K8MN

2429. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 19:45:44 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E528D5D.1886246A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61511

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E5141FB.3E185308@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <v50k145bv3ppe1@corp.supernews.com>, "KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
> >> >news:20030216185049.10587.00000315@mb-bk.aol.com...
> >> >> From: "KB9TMP"
> >>
> >> >> I don't want to learn the code, okay?
> >> >
> >> >I didn't WANT to either but I did because that is the requirement!
> >>
> >> Following orders like a good little soldier? :-)
> >>
> >Didn't you follow orders when you were a little soldier?
>
> Amateur radio is NOT a military unit or auxilliary.

Good. I didn't write that it was. I asked if you followed orders when
you were a little soldier? After all, you brought up the "good little
soldier" stuff. It wasn't written by you as a compliment to someone who
set out to meet the requirements for upgrading his amateur license.

[auxiliary is still spelled with one "L"]

> No soldier, sailor, or airman can "argue" the UCMJ.

No one can obtain an HF access as a radio amateur without passing the
little five word per minute morse exam.

> The regulations for US amateur radio are US law set by
> a federal agency. Those CAN be argued.

You've "argued". The current regs set a 5 wpm code test for HF access.

> Why does the colonel wish to stop discussions about
> US law?

No discussions have been stopped. I've not attempted to stop such
discussions, Foghorn.

> >Lemme clue you in: You won't be getting that "Extra right out of the
> >box" any time soon.
>
> "Lemme clue YOU in," Herr Robust. That isn't the subject.

It is certainly a subject. You told us you were going for it. THAT was a subject. You haven't done so. THAT was a subject. You've told us that you were only here for civil debate on removal of morse code testing. THAT was a subject. That you have not limited yourself to that discussion and that you haven't been civil--THAT has been a subject.

> >There is a *requirement* of 5 wpm morse for HF
> >access in ham radio.
>
> There is a REGULATION about it, dumass. See appropriate
> sub-parts of Part 97.

That's right, Windy. The regulation sets the requirement. What is it about that you don't understand?

> >The current five word per minute test is less than what would be
> >considered "marginally proficient".
>
> No problem, Herr Robust, your orders and commands are
> marginally nonsense items better left to dialogue in the TV
> sitcom "Hogan's Heroes." You are a distempered Werner
> Klemperer character, a Klink without a clink.
>
> Gutt nacht, Herr Oberst. Gruss gott.

About the only parts of N2EY's profile of your behavior missing in this one are the excessive emoticons and references to my former job. Have you yet noticed that the only times you get the "Foghorn" and "Windy" treatment is when you start with the cutesy names? If you like, I can repost the urls so you can re-familiarize yourself with the Foghorn Lenhorn wave file and jpeg. Now be a good little Foghorn Lenhorn and play nicely with others.

Dave K8MN

2430. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 20:04:52 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0302181204.164b3a0f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61512

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hah3wf7.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> On 17 Feb 2003 12:15:27 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
> >Another possibility, though less probable, would be for FCC to restart the
> >whole restructure process yet again. It's been 5 years since they began the
> >last one!
>
> My gut feeling is that after the last Congressionally-ordered
> "vaudeville fire drill" that's the last thing that Bill Cross wants
> to do.

I agree 100%.

The way I see it, about the only way we'd get a big change in Part 97
is to come up with a comprehensive proposal that makes FCC's life a
lot easier, AND which has demonstrated widespread support in the
amateur community. IOW, a complete package that the FCC can just sign
off and be done with.

I place the chances of such a package being created and the necessary
support being shown somewhere between very slim and none.
>
> You didn't think that the FCC wanted to do that exercise on its
> own, did you?
>
I dunno, Phil. I do know that FCC isn't staying up nights worried
about the future of the ARS, or how to fine-tune the rules to improve
it.

Way back in 1997, somebody posted here that FCC was going to simplify
the ARS rules in a big way. Three classes of license, 5 wpm code, no
more waivers, massive simplification across the board. They said it
was a "done deal" and we'd just have to get used to it. I thought the
poster was way off target and said so. 'Specially after the ARRL
proposal and the 4-class NPRM

But it turned out that the R&O more closely resembled that old post
than any proposal which came after.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2431. Re: From rec.radio.amateur.policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 20:10:41 UTC
From: Scott <scott@scotti.sh!t>
Message-ID: <k3KdnWwpOd3fDs-jXTWcow@comcast.com>
Source record: 61519
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"... - - - ..." (SOS) wrote:
>
> Yeah thats some funny shit watching moped, troll around on rec.radio.policy,
> Randy ask him if he has a ham license and why is he there?

George, do you have a CB radio, or do you just use your amateur
radio on the citizens band frequencies?

2432. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 21:04:16 UTC
From: PC <noway@nowhere.com>
Message-ID: <kdx4a.190164$i73.41007497@twister.neo.rr.com>
Source record: 61513

"Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
news:BA773D19.EE04%stewart@say.net...
> "Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com" wrote:
> >
> > Do you still post from Google as Aaron Voobner?
>
>
> You must be thinking of someone else, my friend. I have never posted as
> Aaron Voobner, nor have I ever posted from Google. In fact, I have never
> posted using anything other than my own name.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

That's what Paul K5PF (aka QRM2000 aka YRAC) said too. I just hope a
European version of Aaron V. doesn't show up when you are settled in.

2433. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 21:24:12 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302181324.4048be8b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61514

"Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now> wrote in message
news:<Xns93264F10DC65Cpookster@216.168.3.50>...
> Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net> wrote in
> news:BA773A91.EE02%stewart@say.net:
>
> > You seem focused on the driver's license/learner's permit concept
> > when neither compares to a ham license. There is no "regular" ham
> > license -
>
> Maybe I didn't make it clear. I am proposing a new license structure
> where there are only two classes: learner's and regular.

I agree with a two-license structure. Limited, and Full.

> I never said the present license structure does not accomplish these
> things. I said the present license structure is overly complex and
> focuses on the wrong things for beginners. We have too many hams now
> with General and above who exhibit poor understanding of the basics of
> operating. I'd like to see that changed. The other, more technical
> items can come later.

I think the current Technician license is a bizarre abstraction of
what a learners permit should be, what an entry level license should
be, and is wholly unsuitable in priveleges granted, i.e., dangerous
levels of rf radiation, repeater trustee, etc. Those are not entry
level items.

Don't forget that the Technician license was once the door prize for
those who passed the General written exam, without passing the 13 WPM
code exam. The General license is no beginners license, and neither
is the Technician, no matter what has been done to it in the
intervening years.

Brian/N0iMD

2434. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 21:25:53 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302181325.4b013ee4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61515

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030218104109.27607.00000594@mb-mj.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
> >From: "W5TIT" seventythree@eightyeight.net
> >Date: 2/18/03 8:19 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id:
> ><EC2B60EE18D70CE6.B6410AAE1D36E578.9CA527C97AC83034@lp.airnews.net>
>
> >With all due respect :) In actuality what anyone finds relevant *does*
> >matter, if they are a voting citizen.
>
> Point taken, Kim...Let me change it to "that you find it irrelevent is in
> itself irrelevent since the state of international treaties to which the United
> States is signatory requires it. Unitl the treaty is changed, what YOU find
> "relevent" IS irrelevent".

Didn't we just break the START treaty with Russia?

2435. Re: After S25.5 Goes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 21:31:32 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302181331.5f4b9557@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61516

"Lloyd" <TinyTenna@SWLhq14313.net> wrote in message news:<b2t9shbls0@pita.alt.net>...
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
>
> > The last time that -I- busted a licensed ham for overpower was
> > the oiperator at the Peoples Temple in San Francisco. Remember
> > them - the stateside terminal of the Jonestown settlement of
> > Massacre fame in 1978.
> > However, unlicened "CB style" operators get busted routinely when
> > the complaint volume gets great enough and there are extrinsic
> > factors involved to warrant assigment of the necessary crew.
>
> > 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
> >
> Now I know why I quit going to the VFW. Too many old
> men telling tall tales of yesteryear, and always tales in which they are
> the hero.
>
> Lloyd

The older they get, the better they was.

2436. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 22:07:01 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030218170701.25433.00000420@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 61517

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/15/03 5:15 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030215181525.09808.00000851@mb-fk.aol.com>

>Flight suits, one-piece coveralls, commonly called "poopie-suits"
> by those who wear them.

By the way, Lennie...Found your source of "poopie-suit" reference.

"Poopie suit" is NOT the one piece flight suit (CWU27/P) as you claim, but was a 1950's era immersion suit used in the Korean Conflict.

Figgers...Why am I not surprised that your reference was over 50 years old?

The only other "colloquial" use of that term is by the United States Navy Submarine Service in reference to thier blue and purple jumpers worn while submerged.

Close, Lennie. A 1950's item and stuff used by submariners...Guess you picked the use up in a Clancy or Koontz novel.

Same old Putz, Lennie. I can always count on you!

Steve

2437. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-18 22:23:27 UTC
From: tiffanyanderson2u@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <fa32d4fb.0302181423.601d6774@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61518

According to Mark Furman on Fox News, you need a seperate search warrant for the new truck. He felt the search warrant on the new truck was MORE important than the house.

To go before a judge, you have to have some kind of evidence, observance of potential crime, to cause a search warrant to be issued on the new truck.

Mark surmized that the detectives must have, under surveilance, seen something, (suspicious?) regarding that truck, to warrant, a search warrant of a truck that Scott has only had for just a few weeks.

What do you think about this:

http://lacipeterson.20m.com/Laci.htm

2438. Re: Net Tonight

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-19 00:13:56 UTC
From: Jackie <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com>
Message-ID: <8%z4a.167673$HN5.704975@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 61520

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:b2t96g22sa0@enews3.newsguy.com...
> Could be something as simple as unchecking the "mute" box underneath the
> slider in the audio control panel.....

If ONLY it were that simple... that was the first thing I checked... then, when I discovered that I had the soundcard configured correctly, I had a major go-around with Windows Sound Recorder before I discovered that the mic input was shot. I'm picking up the new soundcard this weekend. Apparently this was not uncommon in the soundcards that they supplied with my computer. Easy fix.

Jackie KC0ODY

2439. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-19 00:55:51 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030218195551.23700.00000015@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 61521

In article <9B612AF6BFB590B9.FCBBA14B63871594.7FE87C3DB49AFB2A@lp.airnews.net>,
" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>news:c2356669.0302180820.657b7d66@posting.google.com...
>> "Jackie" <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> wrote in message
>news:<Nki4a.157130$be.141628@rwcrnsc53>...
>> > "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>> > news:20030217211127.03532.00000536@mb-cp.aol.com...
>> > > In article <20030216173704.14527.00000384@mb-cc.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>> > (N2EY)
>> > > writes:
>> >
>> > > The epitome of US amateur radio is working DX on HF with CW.
>>
>> For the record, I did not write the above quote, nor have I ever
>> written them. And I don't think that way, either.
>> >
>
>We who "know" you, knew that, Jim! ;-)
>
Thanks, Kim!

Hope you're feeling better.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2440. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-19 01:33:13 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030218203313.14629.00000003@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 61525

In article <BA77445F.EE07%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
writes:

>"N2EY" wrote:
>>
>> The thing that really bugged me about the blue
>> dress incident was the bald faced lying
>> connected with it.
>
>
> I absolutely agree, Jim. But this is something Clinton and his supporters
>would rather we not focus on - the bad boy screwing around image is better
>than the liar image.

Yep - scary.
>
> Furthermore, I was never comfortable with the fact that Clinton was having
>a sexual relationship with a subordinate on the job - something that would,
>for many reasons, almost certainly get a regular employee of the government
>fired instantly.

Or an employee of many private companies as well.

I was willing to give Clinton the benefit of the doubt about the whole mess
until the lying was exposed. (After all, he's hardly the first politician to
fool around. That's not an excuse, just reality). But the fact that he looked
the camera in the eye and lied about it was simply too much.

The odd part is that if he'd just come out and said "Yeah, we did, big deal,
get over it", the whole thing might have blown over in two weeks.
>
> And, to prevent this thread from getting too far out, I'll end my comments
>about that with this message.
>
Same here. Between the Iraq, North Korea and Orange Alert situations, the blue
dress seems kinda quaint.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2441. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-19 01:33:14 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030218203314.14629.00000005@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 61522

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hah3dq5.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 17 Feb 2003 02:04:47 GMT, Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
>>In fact, I would like to change the Vanity call sign program to
>>eliminate the ability to request out-of-district call signs, with the
>>retroactive cancellation of any which have already been assigned!
>
> Are we going through this hoo-hah-hah again?
>
> Don't hold your breath, man - you don't look good in blue.
>
Hmmm...such a change would mean that you and I would have to give up our
current callsigns, Phil.

On second thought, maybe I could keep mine, because it's not a vanity callsign
anyway.

73 de Jim, N2EY (since 1977)

2442. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-19 01:33:14 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030218203314.14629.00000004@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 61524

In article <BA773DB8.EE05%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
writes:

>"Kim" wrote:
>
>> The attractiveness of administrative reductions?
>> Budgetary constraints/reductions? Wouldn't less
>> licenses and less testing make it easier and less
>> expensive (or "taxing" to the public...heh heh)
>> to regulate?
>
>
> Adding another license, or even replacing one with another, would have no
>effect on any of that.

Actually, I think it does have an effect. The more license classes there are,
the more admin work FCC has to do. Even though the paperwork is highly
automated, it still requires some human intervention, which costs resources.

For example, when the license term was doubled from 5 years to 10 years in
1984, one of the main benefits to the FCC was an admin work savings estimated
at 1000 person-hours/year. Yes, that's maybe one person's job for six months,
but it was worth it to FCC to make the change.

Under the old system, a new ham who went from no license to Extra could "cost"
FCC as many as 5 interactions (new license, upgrade to Tech Plus, upgrade to
General, upgrade to Advanced, upgrade to Extra) even if no tests were failed
and no CSCEs issued. Under the current system, the total is reduced to 3
interactions (new license, upgrade to General, upgrade to Extra). Multiply
that by the number of new hams and upgrades and the saving is considerable.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2443. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-19 01:33:15 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030218203315.14629.00000006@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 61523

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hah3wf7.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 17 Feb 2003 12:15:27 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
>>Another possibility, though less probable, would be for FCC to restart the
>>whole restructure process yet again. It's been 5 years since they began the
>>last one!
>
> My gut feeling is that after the last Congressionally-ordered
> "vaudeville fire drill" that's the last thing that Bill Cross wants
> to do.

I hear ya, Phil

> You didn't think that the FCC wanted to do that exercise on its
> own, did you?
>
Heck no! In fact, I think if the Commision had its druthers, it would have left the whole system alone until after S25.5 was gone. Then do all the changes at once.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2444. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-19 04:05:00 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <F172B951A6E11322.4406F5C67FB9AB85.E9F7BB3E1CCFCDC8@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 61528

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030218203314.14629.00000004@mb-cc.aol.com...
> In article <BA773DB8.EE05%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart
<stewart@say.net>
> writes:
>
> >"Kim" wrote:
> >
> >> The attractiveness of administrative reductions?
> >> Budgetary constraints/reductions? Wouldn't less
> >> licenses and less testing make it easier and less
> >> expensive (or "taxing" to the public...heh heh)
> >> to regulate?
> >
> >
> > Adding another license, or even replacing one with another, would have
no
> >effect on any of that.
>
> Actually, I think it does have an effect. The more license classes there
are,
> the more admin work FCC has to do. Even though the paperwork is highly
> automated, it still requires some human intervention, which costs
resources.
>
> For example, when the license term was doubled from 5 years to 10 years in
> 1984, one of the main benefits to the FCC was an admin work savings
estimated
> at 1000 person-hours/year. Yes, that's maybe one person's job for six
months,
> but it was worth it to FCC to make the change.
>
> Under the old system, a new ham who went from no license to Extra could
"cost"
> FCC as many as 5 interactions (new license, upgrade to Tech Plus, upgrade
to
> General, upgrade to Advanced, upgrade to Extra) even if no tests were
failed
> and no CSCEs issued. Under the current system, the total is reduced to 3
> interactions (new license, upgrade to General, upgrade to Extra).
Multiply
> that by the number of new hams and upgrades and the saving is
considerable.
>

> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Yessiree...and in today's world of budget cut-budget cut-budget cut, it's got to be at least an attractive thought in the minds of Congress and maybe even the FCC. I know if I was the head of the organization and I was told to look for deep cuts, I'd be considering what could be done in the world of radio services.

Kim W5TIT

2445. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-19 04:06:53 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <42417B8467706ADE.4AB085624CDF6AB0.A69D90266C49EF3B@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 61527

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030218195551.23700.00000015@mb-fz.aol.com...
> In article
<9B612AF6BFB590B9.FCBBA14B63871594.7FE87C3DB49AFB2A@lp.airnews.net>,
> " <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> >news:c2356669.0302180820.657b7d66@posting.google.com...
> >> "Jackie" <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> wrote in message
> >news:<Nki4a.157130$be.141628@rwcrnsc53>...
> >> > "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> >> > news:20030217211127.03532.00000536@mb-cp.aol.com...
> >> > > In article <20030216173704.14527.00000384@mb-cc.aol.com>,
n2ey@aol.com
> >> > (N2EY)
> >> > > writes:
> >> >
> >> > > The epitome of US amateur radio is working DX on HF with CW.
> >>
> >> For the record, I did not write the above quote, nor have I ever
> >> written them. And I don't think that way, either.
> >> >
> >
> >We who "know" you, knew that, Jim! ;-)
> >
> Thanks, Kim!
>
> Hope you're feeling better.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

:) Oh, I am feeling just fine, Jim. I am still off work, but don't think
that will last much longer. I think since "this" year began, I have worked
a total of about two weeks! And, never been out sick in nearly 20 years! I
guess I made up for it real well...LOL

Kim W5TIT

2446. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-19 04:13:23 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b2v0d5hpv1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 61526

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030218040732.03273.00000564@mb-mb.aol.com...
> In article <b2ri9evpe1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> >The renewal process is pretty much
> >automated (my renewal was done via ARRL and it was processed
> >in less than 10 days earlier this month. Now I'm just waiting for
> >the hard copy to
> >show up in the mail which is probably computer generated and mailed.
>
> Been that way quite a while. Last time I did a modification (late '99) I
just
> downloaded the PDF for Form 605, printed one, filled it out, sent it to
the
> FCC. Computer printed license showed up a few weeks later.
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

My hard copy arrived today. I mailed the ARRL renewal formback
to ARRL about 2/5/03. Not bad, total elapsed time from my
mailing to hardcopy was only 13 days.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2447. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-19 04:27:52 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b2v18d$11n$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 61529

"Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
news:BA77445F.EE07%stewart@say.net...
> "N2EY" wrote:
> >
> > The thing that really bugged me about the blue
> > dress incident was the bald faced lying
> > connected with it.
>
> I absolutely agree, Jim. But this is something Clinton and his
supporters
> would rather we not focus on - the bad boy screwing around image is better
> than the liar image.
>
> Furthermore, I was never comfortable with the fact that Clinton was
having
> a sexual relationship with a subordinate on the job - something that
would,
> for many reasons, almost certainly get a regular employee of the
government
> fired instantly.

It would certainly get almost ANY employee of any company fired
these days...not just government employees.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2448. Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-19 04:35:35 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0302182035.417a07ff@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61530

Just as the "fight" between the North and the South, to see who would "win the battle" of becoming the last living Civil War Veteran, became a national obsession in the last century... could the ongoing battle between Advanced and Novices to see who will be the last surviving member of those two classes breath exciting new life into the hobby?

With the Advanced presently holding about an 85,000 to 36,000 advantage, and with the Novice numbers dropping more precipitously, at first glance one would think that the Advanced folks are a "shoe-in".

But - the same thing could be said of the North/South numbers around the beginning of the last century. The North held a HUGE advantage in initial numbers; but, the South had an ace up its sleeve - there were loads of barefoot 13-year-old Southerners manning the trenches along with the grey-bearded warriors at Richmond in the waning days of the war. Yes - it is my contention that the Novice ranks also contain some of these "aces" as well... barefoot 13-year-old Puerto Rican Novices. I predict that sometime around the year 2040, there will be more Novices than Advanced... with about 2,000 left from each category... then, around the year 2050, with only about 500 left in each bracket, things will start to get REALLY interesting... The suspense is killing me - I can HARDLY WAIT.

2449. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-19 05:09:57 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BA787BD4.F253%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 61531

"Bill, W7TI" wrote:

> (snip) We have too many hams now with General
> and above who exhibit poor understanding of
> the basics of operating. (snip)

Beyond what is required by the rules, there are no "basics of operating."
Most are simply conventions which evolve with time and technology.
Therefore, enforcing and/or teaching convention is not exactly high on the
FCC's agenda.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2450. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-19 05:27:29 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BA787FF0.F255%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 61532

"PC" wrote:
>
> That's what Paul K5PF (aka QRM2000 aka YRAC)
> said too. I just hope a European version of
> Aaron V. doesn't show up when you are settled
> in.

I don't know Paul. I do remember an Aaron who posted here some time back, but don't remember much about him (only read his messages in passing).

Anyway, I'm not exactly just now settling in to this newsgroup. While I haven't been very active over the last year or so, I've been posting in this newsgroup under various email addresses (stewart@sc.rr.com, stewart@sccoast.net, stewartx@sccoast.net, stewart@amouse.net, and so on) for perhaps ten years. However, whatever the email address, I've always used my real name.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2451. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-19 05:58:27 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BA788732.F257%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 61533

"... - - - ..." wrote:

> Don't mind this Guy Moparhed he trolls
> around in rec.radio.cb

I've never "trolled around in rec.radio.cb." Yes, I've posted messages there. I have a CB in my truck, so I've posted in that newsgroup. I also have a scanner and shortwave and have posted to those newsgroups. I also have a Macintosh, so I've posted in the Mac newsgroups. I've owned PCs, so I've posted in the PC/Windows newsgroups. I own a boat, so I've posted to the boating newsgroups. In fact, I've posted to a large number of newsgroups over the years. However, I'll repeat again, I've never posted with anything other than my own name. And, unless you're one of those people who think anything posted that disagrees with your own position is a troll, I don't troll. And that is the end of my comments about this nonsense.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2452. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-19 07:30:49 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b303cu71ncr@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 61540

Awww C'mon Jim, give me a freakin' break, name one politician that has not lied! In the camera, or in person, every politician has done that.

Waaaa, Waaaa he lied. Big deal. Every single person I know and have ever met or will ever meet has told a lie (or many).

I am not downplaying the sex issue nor am I am fan of the democrats or of Billybob Clinton, but that statement you made below could not stand on its own.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

>
> I was willing to give Clinton the benefit of the doubt about the whole mess
> until the lying was exposed. (After all, he's hardly the first politician to
> fool around. That's not an excuse, just reality). But the fact that he looked
> the camera in the eye and lied about it was simply too much.
>
> The odd part is that if he'd just come out and said "Yeah, we did, big deal,
> get over it", the whole thing might have blown over in two weeks.
> >

2453. Re: Net Tonight

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-19 07:33:02 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b303cu81ncr@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 61541

Got it. Thats why I buy the parts singlely and assemble the PC's myself.
Don't ever buy those motherboards where the sound or video card is "built
in" the motherboard!!!!!!!

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

"Jackie" <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> wrote in message
news:8%z4a.167673$HN5.704975@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net...
>
> "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net> wrote in message
> news:b2t96g22sa0@enews3.newsguy.com...
> > Could be something as simple as unchecking the "mute" box underneath the
> > slider in the audio control panel.....
>
> If ONLY it were that simple... that was the first thing I checked... then,
> when I discovered that I had the soundcard configured correctly, I had a
> major go-around with Windows Sound Recorder before I discovered that the
mic
> input was shot. I'm picking up the new soundcard this weekend. Apparently
> this was not uncommon in the soundcards that they supplied with my
computer.
> Easy fix.
>
> Jackie KC0ODY
>
>

2454. Ahoy! This ham, who befriended us in India, needs CQ, QST & 73s (long)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-19 10:04:49 UTC
From: bigfatcircle@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <7f5bef7c.0302190204.1fdc36e9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61534

Ahoy Friends, Boaters and Hams...

My name is Cap'n Fatty Goodlander. I'm a marine journalist who is sailing around the world on a 38 foot sloop named Wild Card. (See www.cruisingguides.com/fattygoodlander/fatfacts.htm or punch in my name on Amazon.com or do a 'google' internet search of both web pages AND 'groups' for more information on me).

In any event, a lot of people have been very nice to us along the way----but none nicer than an Indian ham (VU2ITI) named T.K. Mani who lives in Cochin, India.

He helped us out tremendously by fixing our SSB radio aboard Wild Card----and refused all payment.

Once we started hanging out with him we discovered what a wonderful guy he truly is. (See story which follows).

...could you do me a small favor for a very good cause?

Mani and his entire radio club are in need of any-and-all-types of amateur radio magazines... like CQ, QST, or 73.

Is there is any chance that you could collect some of these magazines... or contact some local amateur radio group to do so... and mail them to the address which follows?

...I know it would take a little time and some money----but, believe me, it would be greatly appreciated by the amateurs of India.

It doesn't matter how old or ripped up the mags are... they'll read whatever you send them to tatters!

Thanks so much.

Here's the address:

T.K. Mani
Department of Electronics
Cochin University of Science and Technology
THRIKKAKARA Kochi 682022
Kerala, India

Thanks again.

Cap'n Fatty Goodlander, author of Chasing the Horizon
Sailing Yacht WILD CARD
Cochin, India

Indian Ocean
Earth

On Radios, Indian Friends and Electronic Heros
Copyright 2003 by Cap'n Fatty Goodlander

In the last few years, we've sailed to dozens of counties, many of which are reputed to be the friendliest in the world. Nowhere, however, have we made more wonderful friends quicker than in India.

Take electronic guru and university professor T. K. Mani as example: once he heard there was a visiting American yacht '...stranded without a radio,' he dropped everything and rushed down to the Cochin harbor to help.

My wife Carolyn and I happened to be away traveling inland at the time, so he kept returning day after day until he found us aboard----despite the hour-long, heavy-traffic commute.

I was, frankly, somewhat suspicious of him at first. Without even looking at the radio, he assured us he could fix it. His only question was, "Do you need it back tomorrow, or can I have a couple of days?"

To dampen his optimism, I warned him that the radio had not work since we'd been hit by lightening and that I had no idea what was wrong with it, no schematic diagram, no parts list, etc.

He just shrugged.

I didn't know it at the time, but T.K. Mani had every right to be confident.

About thirty years ago, when he was a teenager, he saw a newspaper ad for a small radio receiver for 10 rupees, about twenty cents American. He wanted that radio so bad he could taste it, and began bugging his hardworking-but-nearly-penniless father day after day. His family was VERY poor and often hungry----and his father told him repeatedly that it was too expensive. But Mani wanted it, wanted it, wanted it.... so badly that his father ultimately relented and gave Mani the 10 rupees.

Mani sent away for the radio, and waited. And waited. And is still waiting. "It was a rip off... a scam," he told me. "I never got the radio. I was furious. My father said, 'I told you so..!'"

Mani could not believe it. His chance to own a radio and to hear beyond the front door of his tiny rural shack... was gone forever.

Or was it?

Mani decided to build his own radio. He collected old television sets and gutted them for parts. He went to the library and read dozens of books on amateur radio. He visited every radio repair shop within hiking distance of his house----and silently watched/questioned the technicians hour after hour after hour.

"One old radio guy lent me what we both thought were enough parts to build a radio----but we were wrong. Dozens of times, I put it together... and nothing. It was discouraging. I spent all my spare time working on it, soldiering different parts together... testing my circuits. Then I got a new carton of used stuff... transformers and tubes and copper windings... and exactly two years after I started... I heard a faint signal through my headphones! I'd done it. I'd built a radio."

No one has ever built a radio in Mani's village before----or even heard of anyone doing so. Mani immediately became famous. He soon built a transmitter...

"It was supposed to be two watts," he said, "but it was actually a little less than one. But I had my amateur radio license (VU2ITI) by then, and I made a lot of contacts with that crude little x-mitter.."

Suddenly, Mani's world was huge. Every day he talked to sophisticated, educated people from around the world----and was taken seriously by them.

It dawned on him that electronics could be his ticket out of the grinding poverty of his youth.

Mani ceaselessly built radio after radio... all from scratch, with salvaged parts... and soon headed off to college to study electronic theory. Eventually he got his master's degree, a teaching job at the local university, and now, when I meet him, is only a few short months away from receiving his doctorate.

Along the way he invented the 'acoustical ocean rain gauge' which remotely monitors the amount and location of rainfall at sea-----a very important device in drought-stricken India.

Anyway, Mani knows his stuff----and proved it by returning to Wild Card a couple of days later with the repaired radio... and installing it in such a manner that its output was radically higher than ever!

"How much do I owe you," I asked.

"How 'bout," he said with a sly smile, "the privilege of your company at my home for a traditional Kerala feast?"

How do you repay such a person... a total stranger in a completely foreign land... for such a kindness? For not only fixing something important for you, but also welcoming you into his heart, home and life?

It was a challenge. Since Mani refused all payment, we made a sizable donation to his amateur radio club----for an upcoming ham fest.

After meeting his lovely wife Sheela and partaking of her wonderful food-----we returned the invitation and had them both aboard Wild Card for a 'typical American meal' of meat-and-mash-potatoes and, of course, hot apple pie.

Learning that Mani was involved with fund-raising for a school for children with 'special needs,' Carolyn and I decided to sponsor a deserving child by paying a year's tuition.

But most of all, we just enjoyed each other's company. Mani was very interested in our voyage, and Carolyn and I were very interested in his life. He stopped by Wild Card almost daily, and introduced us to his entire family, many friends----and even roped me into giving an hour long lecture on marine electronics to his eager students.

One of Mani's teaching assistants was getting engaged, and we had a seat of honor at the day-long party----during which one hundred people taught us to eat with our hands... amid much laughter and love. (The marriage was an 'arranged' one: the groom's parents had found the bridge via a newspaper advertisement and this was only the third time she and the groom had ever met... always with both sets of parent's present, of course!)

Perhaps the nicest moment came when I held his lovely, laughing daughter Krishna (she's mentally challenged) in my arms and sang 'Sweet Adeline' and 'On Moonlight Bay' and 'Old Man River' to her.

In essence, we became fast friends. We relaxed and luxuriated within each other's presence. Mani showed us his world, we showed him ours. Sure, we mostly talked----but after awhile the pauses were as comfortable as the conversation.

That's the very best part of sailing around the world... meeting wonderful people like T.K. Mani of Cochin, India.

2455. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-19 11:11:44 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030219061144.25651.00000506@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 61535

>Subject: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran
>From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart)
>Date: 2/18/03 10:35 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <5f4fe4c2.0302182035.417a07ff@posting.google.com>

>Just as the "fight" between the North and the South, to see who would
>"win the battle" of becoming the last living Civil War Veteran, became
>a national obsession in the last century... could the ongoing battle
>between Advanced and Novices to see who will be the last surviving
>member of those two classes breath exciting new life into the hobby?

Would it be too much to ask "who cares" and what relevence it has to ANY
thing?

I seriously doubt thre are ANY "active" Novices on the air. Most are
probably kids (or were kids) who got the license as part of school projects,
quickly forgotten when the class was over and the grades assigned.

>The North held a HUGE advantage in
>initial numbers; but, the South had an ace up its sleeve - there were
>loads of barefoot 13-year-old Southerners manning the trenches along
>with the grey-bearded warriors at Richmond in the waning days of the
>war.

It's a horrific fact that innocence is the first tragedy of war. Your
attempt to humorously anaolgize it to Amateur Radio is sick.

>Yes - it is my contention that the Novice ranks also contain
>some of these "aces" as well... barefoot 13-year-old Puerto Rican
>Novices.

A bigoted and stereotyped analogy at that.

>I predict that sometime around the year 2040, there will be
>more Novices than Advanced... with about 2,000 left from each
>category... then, around the year 2050, with only about 500 left in
>each bracket, things will start to get REALLY interesting... The
>suspense is killing me - I can HARDLY WAIT.

Athrosclerosis will kill you before the suspense will.

Getting lonely calling CQ on 151.82, Stew?

Steve, K4YZ

2456. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-19 12:45:20 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302190445.72d1c55e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61536

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E5121E0.42131FD4@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030216173704.14527.00000384@mb-cc.aol.com>...
> >
> > > --
> > >
> > > Think about how many stations you've heard on the air this weekend, all using
> > > CW. Consider that there are lots more out there you can't hear due to
> > > propagation, antenna limitations, etc. Also those you won't hear because
> > > they're mostly in hunt'n'pounce mode rather than calling CQ.
> > >
> > > Remember all those stations next time somebody says or writes that CW has no
> > > relevance in ham radio today, or that nobody uses it anymore.
>
> > Welp, if you say you can't hear a CW station, then you just shot down
> > the Morse Myth that CW always gets through.
>
> Those cans will work better if you plug them in.

Tell Jim. He's the one making the claims.

> > As far as CW having no relevance, that's just not true. Lots of hams
> > enjoy using it.
>
> Please advise your friend Mr. Anderson.

Mr. Anderson, "cans" work better if you plug them in. Hearing the
other station makes it much more fun and enjoyable.

> > The ARGUMENT is that a CW EXAM is no longer relavant. Give CW the
> > same exam that FM, SSB, RTTY, SSTV, FSTV, PACKET, PACTOR and PSK31
> > have.
>
> That's AN argument.

Yes, Dave, that's what I said it was.

Anything else you would like me to pass on to Len?

2457. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-19 13:05:15 UTC
From: Lloyd <Lloyd@birminghaamcommscom.org>
Message-ID: <b2vvda$150$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 61537

There are many husband-wife duos around. Meaning the OM
made his xyl get a Novice license just before the Novice license
was transferred to the VEC program. Before the Novice license
was transferred to the VEC program, all it took was to get two of
your willing old CB buddies (now hams, gen. class or higher) to
sign off on a 610 for your old lady to get her Novice license. Lots
of guys even went so far as to get all their kids licenses the same
way. It is easy to spot these couples. The xyl is restricted to 10m
and 220 mhz and does not know the code, even though 5 wpm was
required. The OM, even though he knows better, will make excuses
for his old lady's lack of operating ability by making excuses like,
"she forgot the code already" "she's does not want to upgrade"
etc. It is even more obvious when his old lady says things on the
air like, "What was that beep beep sound on the repeater?"
(Repeater ID). Even worse is when the OM thinks he can get
away with operating on 2m with his old lady, as that is a violation
of the rules. Then when they get caught by local hams, the OM
starts harassing the guys who caught them. Bottom Line: Ham radio
today has all kinds of nuts and psychos. Don't believe it? Go to any
hamfest!

Lloyd

"stewart" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:5f4fe4c2.0302182035.417a07ff@posting.google.com...
> Just as the "fight" between the North and the South, to see who would
> "win the battle" of becoming the last living Civil War Veteran, became
> a national obsession in the last century... could the ongoing battle
> between Advanced and Novices to see who will be the last surviving
> member of those two classes breath exciting new life into the hobby?
>
> With the Advanced presently holding about an 85,000 to 36,000
> advantage, and with the Novice numbers dropping more precipitously, at
> first glance one would think that the Advanced folks are a "shoe-in".
>
> But - the same thing could be said of the North/South numbers around
> the beginning of the last century. The North held a HUGE advantage in
> initial numbers; but, the South had an ace up its sleeve - there were
> loads of barefoot 13-year-old Southerners manning the trenches along
> with the grey-bearded warriors at Richmond in the waning days of the
> war. Yes - it is my contention that the Novice ranks also contain
> some of these "aces" as well... barefoot 13-year-old Puerto Rican
> Novices. I predict that sometime around the year 2040, there will be
> more Novices than Advanced... with about 2,000 left from each
> category... then, around the year 2050, with only about 500 left in

> each bracket, things will start to get REALLY interesting... The
> suspense is killing me - I can HARDLY WAIT.

2458. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-19 14:17:10 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302190617.4444d0da@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61538

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E4EC7AE.D79650D5@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030215000402.23360.00000291@mb-da.aol.com>...
> > > >Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
> > > >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> > > >Date: 2/14/03 4:33 PM Central Standard Time
> > > >Message-id: <20030214173314.25546.00000786@mb-me.aol.com>
>
> > > >Heh, it is de facto a state-sanctioned militia except those
> > > > "brigades" don't play sojer in da woods. They meet once a
> > > > month or so and play sojer, wear uniforms, look very manly
> > > > and fierce, while pretending to be some military police
> > > > auxilliary.
> > >
> > > We once again get to see Lennie the Lame "diss" yet another form of
> > > volunteer service.
> > >
> > > This one predominantly staffed by the very same Veterans that Lennie
> > > claims "others" show disrespect to.
> >
> > Dave said that he's never seen a bigger group of people with their
> > hands out than veterans.
>
> He did? Under what circumstances was such a statement ever made by me?
> Maybe you read it between a couple of lines somewhere.
>
> > Do you agree? Is it just a fact, or did he insult someone when he
> > said that?
>
> Specifics, if you please.
>
> Dave K8MN

From: Dave Heil (K8MN@cats-net.com)
Subject: Re: FRS/GMRS as gateway to Amateur Service
View: Complete Thread (129 articles)
Original Format
Newsgroups: alt.radio.family, rec.radio.amateur.policy, rec.radio.amateur.misc
Date: 2000/03/19

Brian wrote:
>

> Dave Heil wrote:
>
> > You could suggest places he could take his equipment for service. You
> > could suggest that he invest in some snap-on ferrite chokes for his line
> > cords, audio and video cabling. You could just stay off the air and
> > lump it. It's your choice.
>
> Its also his choice, isn't it? I was going to wrap up his cords (and yes, I have split torroids to put on
> them). He didn't want me to mess with them.

Yeah, it's his choice. WWII vet and *former* POW aside, he could repair
his TV or live with TVI. You can lead a vet to water but he'll probably
want cognac.

2459. Q: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-19 14:36:12 UTC
From: lbudney-google@nb.net
Message-ID: <417b917a.0302190636.e464c20@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61539

Hello,

I'm not a ham, but my parents are: AB2OA and AB2OB. I'd like to get the general opinion of the group about callsigns.

Later this year I'll be getting my "nickle extra". Despite the lowly, dumbed down status of the Extra ticket today, I'm thinking about getting a 1x2 callsign. :-)

But some questions come to mind:

1. Any opinions about region? It seems like cheating to get a W3 call when I live in 2-land.

2. What about waiting times? The FCC enforces a two-year wait, but it feels a little tacky to ask for the call of a silent key who died only two years ago.

3. Related to #2, is there a good way to find out about the previous owner, especially if he died several years ago? It seems respectful to at least get to know the fellow whose call you're inheriting.

4. Similarly to #3, it would seem like a nice idea to learn about the general status of the previous owner. If W2ZZ was the best-loved old fellow in all of 2-land, it doesn't seem like a great idea to go asking for his call. Thoughts?

5. Is getting a 1x2 call just begging for harassment? A large part of my interest in amateur radio is historical, so it seems like a natural move. Can folks comment, especially from a historical perspective, on the idea of getting a 1x2 or a 2x1 call, etc?

Thanks!
Len.

2460. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-19 15:20:25 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030219102025.25398.00000220@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 61542

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 2/19/03 8:17 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0302190617.4444d0da@posting.google.com>

>Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3E4EC7AE.D79650D5@earthlink.net>...
>> Brian wrote:
>> >
>> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
>news:<20030215000402.23360.00000291@mb-da.aol.com>.

SNIPPED

>From: Dave Heil (K8MN@cats-net.com)
>Subject: Re: FRS/GMRS as gateway to Amateur Service
>View: Complete Thread (129 articles)
>Original Format
>Newsgroups: alt.radio.family, rec.radio.amateur.policy,
>rec.radio.amateur.misc
>Date: 2000/03/19

SNIPPED

>Yeah, it's his choice. WWII vet and *former* POW aside, he could repair
>his TV or live with TVI. You can lead a vet to water but he'll probably
>want cognac.

This was your reply (I assume) to Dave's request that you prove where he ever said anything about veteran's allegedly being the biggest group of folks with thier hand's out.

Please try and explain your logic here, and how did you get ANYthing from this about vet's having "thier hand's out" over a couple of TVI chokes?

Steve, K4YZ

2461. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-19 15:25:22 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E53A231.357CC0B8@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61544

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5121E0.42131FD4@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030216173704.14527.00000384@mb-cc.aol.com>...
> > >
> > > > --
> > > >
> > > > Think about how many stations you've heard on the air this weekend, all using
> > > > CW. Consider that there are lots more out there you can't hear due to
> > > > propagation, antenna limitations, etc. Also those you won't hear because
> > > > they're mostly in hunt'n'pounce mode rather than calling CQ.
> > > >
> > > > Remember all those stations next time somebody says or writes that CW has no
> > > > relevance in ham radio today, or that nobody uses it anymore.
> > >
> > > Welp, if you say you can't hear a CW station, then you just shot down
> > > the Morse Myth that CW always gets through.
> > >
> > Those cans will work better if you plug them in.
>
> Tell Jim. He's the one making the claims.

No, he did not jump to the conclusion you came to. Don't forget to turn
the equipment on, Brian. That'll help too.

> > > As far as CW having no relevance, that's just not true. Lots of hams
> > > enjoy using it.
> > >
> > Please advise your friend Mr. Anderson.
>
> Mr. Anderson, "cans" work better if you plug them in. Hearing the
> other station makes it much more fun and enjoyable.

One simple request and you couldn't get it right.

> > > The ARGUMENT is that a CW EXAM is no longer relavant. Give CW the
> > > same exam that FM, SSB, RTTY, SSTV, FSTV, PACKET, PACTOR and PSK31
> > > have.
> > >
> > That's AN argument.
>

> Yes, Dave, that's what I said it was.

No, you said it was "the" argument.

> Anything else you would like me to pass on to Len?

No, you'd likely get it screwed up too.

Dave K8MN

2462. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-19 15:25:50 UTC
From: Aspiring Elmer <elmer@nowhere.com>
Message-ID: <2mN4a.53666$Rx3.2151954@news1.west.cox.net>
Source record: 61543

"Len Budney" <lbudney-google@nb.net> wrote in message
news:417b917a.0302190636.e464c20@posting.google.com...
> Hello,
>
> I'm not a ham, but my parents are: AB2OA and AB2OB. I'd like to get
> the general opinion of the group about callsigns.
>
> Later this year I'll be getting my "nickle extra". Despite the lowly,
> dumbed down status of the Extra ticket today, I'm thinking about
> getting a 1x2 callsign. :-)

Hey if you pass the current test for extra-- you are an extra period. Ignore
any comments about extra lite, etc
>
> But some questions come to mind:
>
> 1. Any opinions about region? It seems like cheating to get a W3 call
> when I live in 2-land.
Lots of folks do this as they can't get the desired prefix or suffix in
their area. So common as NOT TO WORRY
>
> 2. What about waiting times? The FCC enforces a two-year wait, but it
> feels a little tacky to ask for the call of a silent key who died only
> two years ago.
He won't know
>
> 3. Related to #2, is there a good way to find out about the previous
> owner, especially if he died several years ago? It seems respectful to
> at least get to know the fellow whose call you're inheriting.
Once you get the new callsign -- check past Callbooks and ask a club near
where he lived. Asking relatives may get a little dicey.
>
> 4. Similarly to #3, it would seem like a nice idea to learn about the
> general status of the previous owner. If W2ZZ was the best-loved old
> fellow in all of 2-land, it doesn't seem like a great idea to go
> asking for his call. Thoughts?
If you don't get it some one else will. Not to worry
>
> 5. Is getting a 1x2 call just begging for harassment? A large part of
> my interest in amateur radio is historical, so it seems like a natural
> move. Can folks comment, especially from a historical perspective, on
> the idea of getting a 1x2 or a 2x1 call, etc?
Can't imagine someone harrassing you for a reassigned call. Ignore

While you are at it --- some suffixes are nice for CW -- others catchy on p
hone. N2NY for new York. K2L? your initails. Good luck on getting a call
with the suffix DX.
DXers favor calls with letters that have sylabiance --- S, K, T as it
enhances intelligibilty in weak signal work, etc.
>
> Thanks!
> Len.

--
Caveat Lector - Ya All
I Doubt, Therefore I Might Be
73 From AC6V, who is QBF most of the time !!
Rod In Oceanside, CA
Home Page http://ac6v.com
DX Book http://ac6v.com/DXSAMPLE.htm

2463. Re: Q: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-19 15:32:01 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030219103201.25398.00000221@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 61546

>Subject: Q: Callsign etiquette?
>From: lbudney-google@nb.net (Len Budney)
>Date: 2/19/03 8:36 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <417b917a.0302190636.e464c20@posting.google.com>

>1. Any opinions about region? It seems like cheating to get a W3 call
>when I live in 2-land.

It's legal, whatever anyone else says about it.

If you ever choose to participate in contests, though, it's considered
good ettiquette to sign the slant bar and your district (if in CW) or say
"stroke" and your district in voice.

>2. What about waiting times? The FCC enforces a two-year wait, but it
>feels a little tacky to ask for the call of a silent key who died only
>two years ago.

If you can get the signature of an immediate blood relative authorizing
it, the FCC will immediately reissue the call you, even if the box isn't nailed
shut yet, otherwise family members get first dibs.

>3. Related to #2, is there a good way to find out about the previous
>owner, especially if he died several years ago? It seems respectful to
>at least get to know the fellow whose call you're inheriting.

There ae some fellows who offer such a service but for a fee. You can
always try to find old copies of the callbook and look up a previous address
and then write a letter "To The Family Of..." if you wanted to.

>4. Similarly to #3, it would seem like a nice idea to learn about the
>general status of the previous owner. If W2ZZ was the best-loved old
>fellow in all of 2-land, it doesn't seem like a great idea to go
>asking for his call. Thoughts?

Sure it would. Some folks might take offense, but then if he was that
revered, someone probably scooped up his call for themselves or for a club
call.

And on the otherhand, what if the guy was a ....uhhhhh......well, LESS
than respected...?!?! You might not want to show up on the air with his old
call either ! ! ! =)

>5. Is getting a 1x2 call just begging for harassment?...(SNIP)

Only from unlicensed ex-radio technicians in Southern California.

>A large part of
>my interest in amateur radio is historical, so it seems like a natural
>move. Can folks comment, especially from a historical perspective, on
>the idea of getting a 1x2 or a 2x1 call, etc?

There's a LOT of histroy behind a lot of calls. A lot of them ae already back on the air...W1AW, W1BB, W1FB, W6AM, etc...

I chose my 1 x 2 for two reasons...One was that it was the MODEX call of a USMC helo unit I was assigned to at one time, and two because the "YZ" is distinctive in CW. I never did know the previous owner other than to have received some old QSL's from the buro when I filed an envelope.

73

Steve, K4YZ

2464. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-19 15:32:59 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E53A3A0.F0D0C082@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61545

```
Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E4EC7AE.D79650D5@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030215000402.23360.00000291@mb-da.aol.com>...
> > > > >Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
> > > > >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> > > > >Date: 2/14/03 4:33 PM Central Standard Time
> > > > >Message-id: <20030214173314.25546.00000786@mb-me.aol.com>
> > >
> > > > > >Heh, it is de facto a state-sanctioned militia except those
> > > > > > "brigades" don't play sojer in da woods. They meet once a
> > > > > > month or so and play sojer, wear uniforms, look very manly
> > > > > > and fierce, while pretending to be some military police
> > > > > > auxilliary.
> > > > > >
> > > > > We once again get to see Lennie the Lame "diss" yet another form of
> > > > > volunteer service.
> > > > > >
> > > > > This one predominantly staffed by the very same Veterans that Lennie
> > > > > claims "others" show disrespect to.
> > > > >
> > > > Dave said that he's never seen a bigger group of people with their
> > > > hands out than veterans.
> > >
> > He did? Under what circumstances was such a statement ever made by me?
> > Maybe you read it between a couple of lines somewhere.
> > >
> > > > Do you agree? Is it just a fact, or did he insult someone when he
> > > > said that?
> > >
> > Specifics, if you please.
> > >
> > Dave K8MN
> >
> ------------------------
> From: Dave Heil (K8MN@cats-net.com)
> Subject: Re: FRS/GMRS as gateway to Amateur Service
> View: Complete Thread (129 articles)
> Original Format
> Newsgroups: alt.radio.family, rec.radio.amateur.policy, rec.radio.amateur.misc
```

> Date: 2000/03/19
>
>
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > > You could suggest places he could take his equipment for service. You
> > > could suggest that he invest in some snap-on ferrite chokes for his line
> > > cords, audio and video cabling. You could just stay off the air and
> > > lump it. It's your choice.
> >
> > Its also his choice, isn't it? I was going to wrap up his cords (and yes, I have split
torroids to put on
> > them). He didn't want me to mess with them.
>
> Yeah, it's his choice. WWII vet and *former* POW aside, he could repair
> his TV or live with TVI. You can lead a vet to water but he'll probably
> want cognac.

You may want to get some tutoring for that reading comprehension problem
of yours. What part of the above quote do you believe states the
interpretation you've put on it?

You're becoming more peculiar, Brian.

Dave K8MN

2465. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-19 15:38:05 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030219103805.25398.00000222@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 61547

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 2/19/03 9:32 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3E53A3A0.F0D0C082@earthlink.net>

>You may want to get some tutoring for that reading comprehension problem
>of yours. What part of the above quote do you believe states the
>interpretation you've put on it?
>
>You're becoming more peculiar, Brian

Easy to understand when you're trying to view the world from your
belly-button, Dave!

73

Steve, K4YZ

2466. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-19 15:44:11 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0302190744.66836ac5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61548

horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) wrote in message
news:<5f4fe4c2.0302182035.417a07ff@posting.google.com>...
> Just as the "fight" between the North and the South, to see who would
> "win the battle" of becoming the last living Civil War Veteran, became
> a national obsession in the last century... could the ongoing battle
> between Advanced and Novices to see who will be the last surviving
> member of those two classes breath exciting new life into the hobby?

HAW! that's a good one!
>
> With the Advanced presently holding about an 85,000 to 36,000
> advantage, and with the Novice numbers dropping more precipitously, at
> first glance one would think that the Advanced folks are a "shoe-in".

Nope.
>
> But - the same thing could be said of the North/South numbers around
> the beginning of the last century. The North held a HUGE advantage in
> initial numbers; but, the South had an ace up its sleeve - there were
> loads of barefoot 13-year-old Southerners manning the trenches along
> with the grey-bearded warriors at Richmond in the waning days of the
> war. Yes - it is my contention that the Novice ranks also contain
> some of these "aces" as well...

[ethnic stereotype removed]

> I predict that sometime around the year 2040, there will be
> more Novices than Advanced... with about 2,000 left from each
> category... then, around the year 2050, with only about 500 left in
> each bracket, things will start to get REALLY interesting... The
> suspense is killing me - I can HARDLY WAIT.

Total pointless trivia, Stew.

You've also overlooked factors that work against your prediction:

1) Civil War veteran status doesn't expire. Ham licenses do. If a
current Novice or Advanced lets the license lapse for more than 2
years, he/she cannot get it back.

2) Novices have far more to gain in privileges by upgrading than
Advanceds.

3) There's no telling what FCC may do in the future wrt license
classes and grandfathering.

FCC closed off the Advanced to new issues at the end of 1952. I imagine there was similar speculation then about who would be the "last man standing" with the old Class A/Advanced ticket. Then in 1965 as part of an incentive licensing package, FCC proposed demoting existing Advanceds to General, but fortunately that idea was never enacted. Finally in 1967 the Advanced was reopened to new issues. I held Advanced from 1968 to 1970.

Given factors 1 and 2, and possibly 3, it's more likely that the last Novice license will be gone from the database before the last Advanced.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2467. Re: After S25.5 Goes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-19 16:12:15 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0302190812.7c5ab3ec@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61549

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hah2wb4.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> On 17 Feb 2003 06:13:39 -0800, Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> >Fuhgeddit. Power level regs are beyond useless. When was the last
> >time any ham in the ham bands got busted for running over the legal
> >limit??
>
> The last time that -I- busted a licensed ham for overpower was
> the oiperator at the Peoples Temple in San Francisco. Remember
> them - the stateside terminal of the Jonestown settlement of
> Massacre fame in 1978.

I sure do remember the Jonestown disaster, 900 dead . . ? Hideous.

I'd put ham radio aside by 1978 and this is the first I've heard that
they had an "HQ communications department" in SF. He was a damned
sight better off getting spanked by you in SF than he would have been
if he was with the rest of the whackies. If that's the way it went.

> However, unlicened "CB style" operators get busted routinely when
> the complaint volume gets great enough and there are extrinsic
> factors involved to warrant assigment of the necessary crew.

The more the better if for no other reason than to demonstrate that
the FCC swat teams are still alive. Somewhere.

>
> ---
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

w3rv

2468. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-19 17:28:51 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0302190928.4a593b47@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61550

Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net> wrote in message news:<BA787BD4.F253%stewart@say.net>...
> "Bill, W7TI" wrote:
>
> > (snip) We have too many hams now with General
> > and above who exhibit poor understanding of
> > the basics of operating. (snip)
>
>
> Beyond what is required by the rules, there are no "basics of operating."
> Most are simply conventions which evolve with time and technology.
> Therefore, enforcing and/or teaching convention is not exactly high on the
> FCC's agenda.

I don't think conventions are what Bill's talking about, Dwight. I think he's more concerned with operating concepts that are covered by the rules, or by "good operating practice".

Here's an example: working split on HF. It's common for DX stations to transmit and receive on different freqs, particularly when things get busy. This keeps the QRM off the DX station so it's easier for the pile to hear him. On 'phone, it's common for the DX to be outside the US phone band.

Yet it's also common to hear US hams calling the DX on his transmitting frequency, even though the DX keeps announcing that he's listening elsewhere. If the US hams are using 'phone outside the US 'phone band, that's a violation, but even if not, calling a DX station on his xmt freq while he's working split does nothing but add to the QRM. It's technically a rules violation because it deviates from good amateur practice, which is to operate in such a way as to minimize avoidable interference. The root cause is almost always clueless newbie syndrome.

Another example of what Bill (and I) are concerned about is basic misunderstanding of certain aspects of the rules. For example, there are hams who think they have a right to use any repeater, in any way they see fit, regardless of the repeater owner's wishes. (There's a good editorial on this subject in the current 'Worldradio' mag). Of course FCC rules say just the opposite - the repeater licensee ultimately decides how a repeater is to be used, and bears the responsibility for it.

The concern for all this stems from the fact that violations of the type described above are much more common today than technical violations.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2469. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-19 18:22:44 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0302191022.5c413a7a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61551

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030214173313.25546.00000785@mb-me.aol.com>...
> In article <c2356669.0302140714.67c920a3@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> (writes:
>
> >Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
> >From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
> >Date: 14 Feb 2003 07:14:15 -0800
> >
> >Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >news:<3E4C5F89.6049AC04@earthlink.net>...
> >> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >> >
> >> > In article <7xD2a.91351$be.68029@rwcrnsc53>, "Jackie"
> >> > <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> writes:
> >> >
> >> > >"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> >> > >news:20030212210738.09921.00001844@mb-md.aol.com...
> >> > >
> >> > >> Jackie, you've not been in here for a long time.
> >
> >Len has been here for a very long time, under a variety of screen
> >names.
>
> ANOTHER SERMON ON THE ANTENNA MOUNT
> by Right Reverend Jimmie Callsign,
> the Pedantic Parson of the Newsgroup

Typical Len behavior - start off with an insult.
>
> Of course, AOL allows 7 screen names.

And you have used "nocwtest", "lenof21", "averyfine", "averyfineman"
and "lenover21" to post to this newgroup over the past 5 years. In at
least some cases it was clear that you were trying to disguise your
identity by doing so.

> Isn't that just a "bad" thing, though? :-)

Tell us why you need different screen names to post here.
>
> >Do you really expect a serious answer, Dave?
>
> "Dave" the defunct diplomat wants openings for his sharp,
> sarcastic little retorts (actually broken chemistry glass-

> ware) so that he can play a Prussian Oberst issuing orders.

Let's see...you insulted Dave's job and ethnicity in one sentence. No
smiley for you.

> >I don't think anybody takes Len seriously. I sure don't.
>
> Sure you do.

No, I don't.

> According to the message header, the Parson's
> Posting was done close to midnight local downtown Philly
> time.

Here's a clue, Len: Time of posting is not necessarily the time a post
is written.

> Isn't that rather late for workers at an undisclosed
> location who do early runs at 5 AM? :-)

Here's another clue, Len: You don;t know how to do time conversions
very well.
>
> All notice how the Pedantic Parson has quit responding
> directly.

Isn't that just a "bad" thing, though? :-)

> >Actually, the use of CW by hams in traffic handling and emergencies
> >has been well documented here in the past few years. By first hand
> >accounts. The accounts show it to be a once-in-a-great-while sort of
> >thing. I for one have repeatedly stated that the idea that all hams
> >MUST know code because they MIGHT need it in an emergency is simply
> >not reasonable.
>
> Morsemanship is the Prime Directive of amateur knowledge,
> the ne plus ultra of radio achievement, used worldwide as
> the "common language" for 599 exchanges.

Typical Len non-response.
>
> >The important point is that hams do not use utility, police or fire
> >HTs. And amateur radio emergency and public service comms go far
> >beyond using an HT.
>
> Just another opinion. Not supported by fact.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. See SHARES. It is documented.

So? Nobody is denying that govt. agencies have their own
communications facilities.

You seem to be saying that hams do not play a role in any emergency.
>
> >Was Hurricane Floyd (1999) a "real emergency"? Ask KT4ST. How about
> >the ice storms of the winter of 1998?
>
> Yeah, how about those hurricanes of the east and the ice
> storms of the north? Real emergencies, right?

"You cannot answer a question with another question". Your own words,
Len.
>
> How about the Loma Prieta and Northridge earthquakes?
> Little local "left coast" piddly things? Of course.

Who said that? Not me.

> The only
> sanctified, official emergencies are what Newington defines
> on "activating a net" and sounding very public-service-like.

Typical diversion by Len. Examples of CW use by hams in real
emergencies are given, but he continues to deny they exist. There are
none so blind as those who will not see.

> >You missed the point, Dave.
> >
> >Ham radio is not part of the military. Soldiers don't have to buy
> >their own radios. Hams do. End of story.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk...someone who has NEVER been IN the military
> "knows all about military communications." :-)

Tell ya what, Len...I'll think about not posting here about military
communications when you stop posting about amateur radio.

> >Note that what constitutes "1930s status quo" is not defined in any
> >way.
>
> Having trouble understanding euphamisms and aphorisms?

No. You have trouble writing clearly, though.
>
> Try some remedial reading classes. They should be available
> in night classes at your local downtown PA undisclosed location.
> Some of you BDOFs need remedial arithmetic. :-)
>
>
> >Sounds a lot more like Len's behavior here ;-)
>
> Oh, oh, an EMOTICON!

Isn't that just a "bad" thing, though? :-)

> >Translation: Len's been around a long time, therefore he can dictate
> >policy.
>
> Translation: Little Jimmie can't reply directly, has to attempt
> sinking barbs in a roundabout way.

I can reply directly. I usually choose not to.

> >The important thing is that Len presents his non-amateur experience as
> >proof. It isn't.
>
> Oh! "PROOF!" Well, ham radio is DIFFERENT than all other
> radio, right?

Actually, yes. That's why there are different radio services. If
amateur radio were the same as some other type of radio, it would not
need its own spectrum or its own rules and regulations.

> HF communications is DIFFERENT if done by
> non-ham equipment versus ham equipment, right?

The goals and resources are different. That's obvious to almost
everyone but you, Len.
>
> Oh, wow...NON-ham is nothing, ham is everything! :-)

You said that - I didn't.
>
> >The main reason hams do ham radio is because it's fun. Len wants to
> >dictate what we should think is fun.
>
> Oh? Can you "prove" that with Google Quotes? :-)

Sure ;-)
>
> How does advocacy of removal of a morse code test consitute
> DICTATING WHAT HAMS SHOULD DO FOR FUN?

You tell us, Len.

btw, FCC removed not just "a" morse code test but two of them.

Your posts here go far beyond advocating removal of a morse code test.
You play a game best described as "spoil the party".
>
> You are getting STRANGE, Rev. Jimmie. Very strange.

I'm not the one calling people names and commenting endlessly on a
radio service I'm not involved in.
>
> >The point is that Len repeatedly minimizes and dismisses the help and
> >public service performed by hams using ham radio.
>
> Hello? Is your reading comprehension THAT bad, Jimmie?

No, it's that good. Also my memory.
>
> I've been MINIMIZING the selective editing and propagandizing
> of ARRL...NOT the US amateur radio service.

BULL.

> Wake up, boy.

Interesting. First you call me an old fart, now you call me boy. Is
that part of advocating removal of a morse code test?
>
> >There was a first-hand account posted here about the search efforts
> >for Columbia wreckage and the role hams played in supplying
> >communication. Factual, clear, and concise.
>
> Yes, and...?

And it showed how hams aided in providing communications for the
effort.
>
> Thousands and thousands of unlicensed-in-amateur-radio folks
> were out hunting for wreckage. Over a thousand pieces have
> been found so far...and some remains of the seven astronauts
> who perished. All of that has been in the newspapers for a week
> and a half, "factual, clear, and concise." Newspapers aren't
> mentioning amateur radio, though, so regular journalism can't
> be as "factual, clear, and concise" as ARRL, huh?

The post I refer to was not done by ARRL. It was written by a ham who
was there, part of the search. Documented the service given by amateur
radio communications. Were YOU there, Len? I don't think so.

The fact that you reply the way you just did above is proof that you
minimize and dismiss the help and ublic service performed by hams
using ham radio.

And that's a fact.

> >Most of the pejorative-hurling has been done by Len, though.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. Go live in Google for a while, Jimmie, search
> for "Putz" and "Creep" and who posted it as a "signature."
> :-)

You're saying that pejoratives hurled by another justify your
behavior. Sounds like the classic "BUT MOMMY! STEVIE DID IT FIRST!!!"
that I would expect from a four-year-old.

I would not accept such a lame excuse from a four-year-old. Nor from
you. Live with it.
>
> >We have all heard that story many, many times. What has not been
> >explained is how it makes Len an expert on amateur radio, or amateur

> >radio policy.
>
> Oooo! Jimmie and Davie need "experts!" Only "experts" can
> comment on federal regulations?

No, anyone can comment.
>
> Hello? The First Amendment hasn't been waived. HF radio is
> still HF radio regardless of the allocated radio service using it.

Does that mean all of HF radio should be governed by the same rules?
>
> Does the periodical name "Ham Radio" magazine strike a bell?

Yup. A defunct little fanzine that was pretty good in its day.

> (or beep your BFO?) About 50,000 printings every month for
> 22 years before sale to CQ Communications.

And no more new issues in over a decade.

> Yup, that wasn't
> about ham radio at all, was it? :-)

Doesn't make your faulty logic here any less faulty.
>
> >It also does not prove any of Len's arguments for or
> >against anyhting connected with amateur radio policy.
>
> Of course not, in order to discuss getting IN to amateur radio
> one has to ALREADY be in amateur radio and do everything
> that those already IN did.

Who wrote that? Not me.

> Everyone understands your words.

You're the only one who attaches that meaning to them.
>
> >Suppose someone who is older than Len and more experienced than Len
> >shows up and says Len is all wrong in his amateur radio policy views -
> >simply because that 'someone' has more time-on-the-planet and
> >time-in-radio than Len. Does that prove Len is wrong? Of course not.
> >Neither does Len's time-on-the-planet and time-in-radio prove any of
> >his opponents to be wrong.
>
> ...and who is this genius-level methuselah? :-)

Same person as your hypothetical first-grade teacher.
>
> HF radio works the same as it did a half century ago.
> US hams
> use HF predominantly, according to these newsgroupie BDOFs.
>

> Tsk, tsk. Ham radio HF use is rather the same as it was 50
> years ago except there are far more SSB voice cuesoes now
> and some more HF bands. The major difference is that ham
> radios are using solid-state devices that came into the market
> in the early 1960s.

You are advocating that the rules be the same as 50 years ago, then.

> Old-timer Mr. N2EY got solid-stated with
> his K2 at the turn of the Millennium. :-)

Not at all. But it's typical that you would put down the
accomplishments of others.
>
> Poor baby. Must really get your goat to know that someone
> actually worked HF comm NOT in ham radio before you were
> born, ey?

Not at all. But it sure does seem to get your goat that hams get on
the air without paying proper homage to you and your accomplishments.
Live with it.

> Worked at 1.8 GHz way back then.

Who did?

> Lots of ham
> bands above 1.8 GHz, Jimmie, you ever operate any up there?

Sure.

> No?

Yes.

> We all thought you were a ham guru, old timer. Tsk, tsk,
> you're only an "expert" on HF, right?

I never claimed to be an expert at anything.

> >Does Len's time-on-the-planet and time-in-radio somehow give him the
> >right to hurl pejoratives the way he does, even against those who do
> >not reply in kind?
>
> Awwww...too bad, sweetums. :-)

Sounds like you think it does.
>
> Hmmm...the only "replies in kind" seem to be from the LICENSED
> poopie-suit wearer, the ace of the TN CAP...like "Putz" and
> "Creep."

I'm not him. I've asked him to stop calling you names, btw, but you
ignore that fact.

> Or the defunct diplomat who thinks State Dept. comm
> is an offshoot of ham radio.

Who would that be? Can't be K8MN - he's not defunct.

> Or the guy who works at an
> undisclosed location after doing 5 AM morning runs... :-)

Is that a bad thing?
>
> >You forgot the most important part:
> >
> >"His hobby is wasting time. Your time."
>
> Of course, always.

Well, there you have it.

> >> > Morsemanship
> >> > wasn't relevant to the needs of the rest of the radio world of
> >> > fifty years ago
> >
> >Really? Back in 1953 there was no use of morse code in radio outside
> >of ham radio?
>
> No, little Jimmie (not yet born in 1953), such skills were NOT
> RELEVANT TO THE NEEDS OF THE REST OF THE RADIO
> WORLD.

That's just wrong. You are mistaken, Len.

> Hello?

Goodbye.

> The REST OF THE RADIO WORLD was busy with
> voice and teleprinter communications just beginning to be
> the overwhelming majority of message transmission.

Do you have an accurate count of how many radio messages were handled,
per mode, to make that announcement?

The fact of the matter is that back in 1953, and for decades after,
Morse code was used by many radio services besides the ARS. Of course
such use was declining, but morse and morse skills were still very
relevant in 1953 and for many years afterwards. In amateur radio,
those skills are still relevant.

That relevancy doesn't prove that such skills must be tested for a
license. But to say those skills were not relevant is simply untrue.
>
> >A lot of historical accounts say that's just plain wrong.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. Jimmie's "lot" is confined to ARRL publications.

Nope. Not at all.
>
> >Sure, the
> >use of Morse code by non-amateur radio services has steadily decreased
> >since the end of WW2. But to say it "wasn't relevant to the needs of
> >the rest of the radio world of fifty years ago" simply doesn't mathc
> >the facts.
>
> Well, little Jimmie WAS THERE, wasn't he? :-)

You obviously weren't.
>
> Duly authorized and experienced in long-distance communications
> before satellites, before troposcatter, before fiber optic cable under
> the sea. All through the grant of an AMATEUR license much later.

Who?
>
> Gosh, someone who can't research the start of TV broadcasting
> and TV techniques correctly shouldn't proclaim hisself some
> kind of "expert" on the REST OF THE RADIO WORLD.

Talking about yourself again, Len. Typical.
>
> >Point is, an amateur radio license is or amateur radio, not "the rest
> >of the radio world". Test or no test, hams use Morse code. Len thinks
> >that's bad.
>
> Hello?

Goodbye.

> Len thinks the morse code TEST is a nonsense
> requirement.

We know.

> Len doesn't think much of old, slow morse
> code, either, and doesn't care if some BDOFs want to
> Defend Morsemanship To The Death. BDOFs have lost
> touch with both reality and the future.

You just proved my point. Again.

> >Ahh, now we get to what really bothers Len. It's not just the test.
> >It's the idea of hams using Morse code at all.
>
> No.

Yes.

> It's the BDOFs who insist on status-quoing
> everything frozen to the times of their youth so they
> can act like superior BDOFs today. :-)

Try writing plainly for a change.
>
> >Notice how Len denies the help provide by hams in things like
> >hurricanes, ice storms, and searches for shuttle parts.
>
> Bad Len, evil Len...Len go sit in the corner at Newington.
> :-)

Still a fact.
>
> >Yet Len insists on calling me a whole string of names he made up. He
> >even went to the database to find out my last name. Is that the action
> >of a mature individual whom we hams should look to for guidance,
> >advice, and policy?
>
> Heavens no, Mr. Serious.

Well, there you have it.

N2EY

2470. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-19 20:04:29 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3E53E34D.388A7EF6@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 61552

KC8PMX wrote:

> Awww C'mon Jim, give me a freakin' break, name one politician that has not
> lied! In the camera, or in person, every politician has done that.
>
> Waaaa, Waaaa he lied. Big deal. Every single person I know and have ever
> met or will ever meet has told a lie (or many).

I don't care about him having done it in the White House, but he did lie
under oath in a court of law, which did bother me. He shoulda' fessed up, and
it would have
blown over in a month.

2471. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-19 20:08:06 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b30o6l$1fo$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 61553

Since you are interested in the history and traditions of Amateur Radio
please accept these opinions from me.

A W/K one by 2 or one by 3 at one time were considered 'prefered calls'.
This all went out the door when the fcc got lazy and went to a whole bunch
of new callsign blocks and refused to break into the new program and
re-issue ANYTHING.

That being said....from that point on (late 70s or so) a bunch of strange
callsigns came about. Still having trouble with some of them...hi. The
concept of 'prefered calls' have been lost. Then the FCC in another stroke
of insanity basically vacated the call districts that served a useful
purpose.

Basically what Im saying is its open season and I don't like it. But
neither do a lot of others, which means squat. You obviously have a good
mind and Im sure you can work out the way to go.

Enjoy and have a nice life.

Dan/W4NTI

"Len Budney" <lbudney-google@nb.net> wrote in message
news:417b917a.0302190636.e464c20@posting.google.com...
> Hello,
>
> I'm not a ham, but my parents are: AB2OA and AB2OB. I'd like to get
> the general opinion of the group about callsigns.
>
> Later this year I'll be getting my "nickle extra". Despite the lowly,
> dumbed down status of the Extra ticket today, I'm thinking about
> getting a 1x2 callsign. :-)
>
> But some questions come to mind:
>
> 1. Any opinions about region? It seems like cheating to get a W3 call
> when I live in 2-land.
>
> 2. What about waiting times? The FCC enforces a two-year wait, but it
> feels a little tacky to ask for the call of a silent key who died only
> two years ago.
>
> 3. Related to #2, is there a good way to find out about the previous
> owner, especially if he died several years ago? It seems respectful to
> at least get to know the fellow whose call you're inheriting.
>

> 4. Similarly to #3, it would seem like a nice idea to learn about the
> general status of the previous owner. If W2ZZ was the best-loved old
> fellow in all of 2-land, it doesn't seem like a great idea to go
> asking for his call. Thoughts?
>
> 5. Is getting a 1x2 call just begging for harassment? A large part of
> my interest in amateur radio is historical, so it seems like a natural
> move. Can folks comment, especially from a historical perspective, on
> the idea of getting a 1x2 or a 2x1 call, etc?
>
> Thanks!
> Len.

2472. Re: Net Tonight

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-19 20:11:01 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3E53E4D5.45D536D6@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 61554

W5TIT wrote:

> EchoLink. I do know the
> software for this can be had at http://www.echolink.org/el/ as well as other
> web locations. In fact, once the software is installed, with a computer
> microphone, you may ragchew with other hams all 'cross the world.

I installed it and had some fun with Echolink last night. One qso was
with a ham in Japan. He was mobile and I was linked to a repeater
in his town. At first he thought I was in his town, but I described
the echolink system, and he enjoyed it. I logged it in the log book
as "echolink" under "frequency" and "mode". Of course it wouldn't
count for "wallpaper" awards but it was fun.

2473. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-19 20:22:14 UTC
From: "Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now>
Message-ID: <Xns93277DD73E71Dpookster@216.168.3.50>
Source record: 61555

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in news:c2356669.0302190928.4a593b47
@posting.google.com:

> The concern for all this stems from the fact that violations of the
> type described above are much more common today than technical
> violations.
>

Thank you, Jim. You expressed my (our) concerns perfectly.

--
Bill, W7TI

2474. Re: Q: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-19 20:35:19 UTC
From: "Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now>
Message-ID: <Xns9327800F438B7pookster@216.168.3.50>
Source record: 61556

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in
news:20030219103201.25398.00000221@mb-cb.aol.com:

> If you ever choose to participate in contests, though, it's considered
> good ettiquette to sign the slant bar and your district (if in CW) or
> say "stroke" and your district in voice.
>

This is often mandated by the contest rules if the call districts are the
actual multipliers. If the whole country counts as a single multiplier
or if the multipliers are states, there is no need to add the /something.

I used to add the /6 for ragchewing but gave it up as rather pointless
since the FCC no longer requires it. I just say W7TI located in Southern
California, and let 'em figure it out.

--
Bill, W7TI

2475. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-19 20:41:58 UTC
From: "Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now>
Message-ID: <Xns9327812F65D0Dpookster@216.168.3.50>
Source record: 61557

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in news:b30o6l$1fo$1
@slb0.atl.mindspring.net:

> Then the FCC in another stroke
> of insanity basically vacated the call districts that served a useful
> purpose.
>

I'm trying to think of a useful purpose that served. If ham call signs had been issued without regard to district from day one what would have been the harm? That's what's happening now, in effect, and ham radio goes on just fine it appears. Where am I wrong?

You used the word "insanity" so I'm expecting a pretty convincing reply. Something more than "I don't like it".

--
Bill, W7TI

2476. Re: Q: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-19 22:18:12 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0302191418.37a53326@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61558

lbudney-google@nb.net (Len Budney) wrote in message
news:<417b917a.0302190636.e464c20@posting.google.com>...
> Hello,
>
> I'm not a ham, but my parents are: AB2OA and AB2OB. I'd like to get
> the general opinion of the group about callsigns.

There wonderful things to have.
>
> Later this year I'll be getting my "nickle extra".

I've never seen one of those. Just Amateur Extras.

> Despite the lowly,
> dumbed down status of the Extra ticket today, I'm thinking about
> getting a 1x2 callsign. :-)

Just do it. Or a 2x1
>
> But some questions come to mind:
>
> 1. Any opinions about region? It seems like cheating to get a W3 call
> when I live in 2-land.

It's not cheating at all, but it does cause a bit of confusion because
folks think you are from somewhere else. I got my present call when I
lived in Wayne County NY back in 1977, and kept it when I moved back
to the Phila. PA area in 1979 because FCC would not have reissued it
to somebody else.

If I were you, I'd get a call that matches where you live if there are
any available. But it's not a big deal.
>
> 2. What about waiting times? The FCC enforces a two-year wait, but it
> feels a little tacky to ask for the call of a silent key who died only
> two years ago.

Not tacky at all. The two-year wait gives the family plenty of time to
go after it if they want. It also prevents the loss of a call if
somebody forgets to renew (the two years is same as the grace period
for renewal).

Also remember that not all families report SKs to the FCC. If nothing
is reported, the license stays in effect, and the callsign
unavailable, until two years after the license runs out. It's possible
for a ham to have been dead for 12 years before his/her call is
available for vanity request (ham sends in renewal papers, dies soon

after, nobody tells FCC).
>
> 3. Related to #2, is there a good way to find out about the previous
> owner, especially if he died several years ago? It seems respectful to
> at least get to know the fellow whose call you're inheriting.

I don't know of a foolproof way of doing that.
>
> 4. Similarly to #3, it would seem like a nice idea to learn about the
> general status of the previous owner. If W2ZZ was the best-loved old
> fellow in all of 2-land, it doesn't seem like a great idea to go
> asking for his call. Thoughts?

Famous calls are almost always spoken for by the family before the 2
years is up.
>
> 5. Is getting a 1x2 call just begging for harassment?

Yes, but don't let it get ya. As long as the call is not
obscene/profane/indecent, go for it.

> A large part of
> my interest in amateur radio is historical, so it seems like a natural
> move.

Nearly all 1x2s that start with W or K have had previous holders - in
some cases, several previous holders. OTOH, 1x2s beginning with N and
2x1s often have few or even no previous holders.

> Can folks comment, especially from a historical perspective, on
> the idea of getting a 1x2 or a 2x1 call, etc?

First off, be aware that there's no guarantee you'll get the one you
want, so the FCC encourages that you submit a list.

Second, some 1x3 calls are actually more "historic" than some 1x2s.
Like W9MWC.

Third, the big advantage to a short call is that it speeds things up
in contesting and dxing.

Yes, there was a time when a 1x2 or even a 1x3 meant you were an
experienced oldtimer. And there was a time when the numeral in your
callsign always matched your location. Those times are long gone, and
they'll probably not return.

Good luck!

73 de Jim, N2EY

2477. the best selected amateur software & many more!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-19 22:45:27 UTC
From: cor <corholland@wanadoo.nl>
Message-ID: <3e540906$0$23900$8fcfb86b@news.wanadoo.nl>
Source record: 61559

Hello Everyone,

I made a selection for amateur software.

MMTTY 1.64
AGWE 2002.10
UIVIEW 2.39
WINPSK 212
WINPACK 6.8
MSCAN

Links to all amateur factories, and antenna's

DX cluster from HF to SHF!

many more!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Just look at:

http://www.qsl.net/pd0rkc

73's Cor

2478. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-19 23:07:39 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030219180739.24452.00000014@mb-fw.aol.com>
Source record: 61564

In article <3E5284A9.FBCCE9FC@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Actually, we've only been told by you and you aren't involved. You are
>simply a windy geezer who knows a few hams. Did they ever tell you
>about the epitome of U.S. amateur radio?
>
>So much for your civil debate over the issue...

Gotta love the dismissive attitude, Herr Robust. :-)

Herr Robust "knows" all hams? :-)

Of course, all the regular Three Morseketeers in here do!
They don't hesitate to tell everyone "who belongs" and
"who doesn't belong." To the hilt (their blades fell off some
time ago but they wave their hilts around anyway). :-)

Gruss gott. <clik>

2479. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-19 23:07:42 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030219180742.24452.00000015@mb-fw.aol.com>
Source record: 61577

In article <Nki4a.157130$be.141628@rwcrnsc53>, "Jackie"
<buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030217211127.03532.00000536@mb-cp.aol.com...
>> In article <20030216173704.14527.00000384@mb-cc.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>> writes:
>
>> The epitome of US amateur radio is working DX on HF with CW.
>
>Despite your ardent insistence to the contrary, Len, there is no "one" mode
>of communication that epitomizes amateur radio. That's one of the things
>that makes it interesting.

Not in here... :-)

>While you might continue to insist that a REAL ham must worship at the altar
>of CW so that others in the hobby might consider them worthy (which I still
>don't get, since I've never heard anyone say such a thing on the air, but
>ONLY off the air), the facts are out there if you bother to listen...

I tried to point that out to the Merrie Morsemen in here,
Jackie but all their master switches are in Off position.

>I turn
>the VFO knob up and down the bands and hear the dits and dahs of Morse, the
>bleep-bloops of RTTY and other digital modes, lots of tinny, untuned
>vocalizations of SSB (if I don't tune explicitly to every QSO I hear) plus
>many other weird noises that I cannot yet identify.

Really? :-) "Weird noises?" Oh, my, you mean there are
real "weird noises" out there? I haven't heard any "weird noises"
for a long time since I can identify all of them as various modes
carrying information. Used to generate and send some of those
modes and modulations...most of those not allowed in the
amateur radio bands on HF.

>Some ops may prefer one
>mode, and some may work multiple modes.

Ahem...there's only ONE acceptible mode to the Three
Morseketeers in here, the one that shows Mastery of Radio.
Can you guess what that mode might be? [the familiar
acronym can also stand for "conventional wisdom." :-)]

>The only thing that I think
>"epitomizes" amateur radio communications is that there IS no "one" way of
>communicating.

I keep trying to point that out in here and the Three
Morseketeers shout, holler, weep, and wave their sword
hilts around when not waving their morsemanship plumes.

>Those who insist that Morse is an onerous, backwater mode of communication
>and who don't want to be forced to learn it in order to upgrade will
>probably see their position vindicated soon by the powers that be.

Ah, yes, good old "international LAW." :-)

Tsk, tsk, tsk. What MIGHT be discussed in June in Geneva
(WRC-03) is a total rewrite of all of S25, not just S25.5. Don't
bank anything on that, it is a minor matter as far as ALL of
this world's radio. Many, many, many items of non-amateur
radio to take up by the administrations in summer Switzerland.

What be this "vindication?" In FCC 90-53 the FCC stated that
it didn't consider a morse code test to be worthwhile for its
task on determining any amateur applicant's qualifications for
an amateur radio license. That was in 1990. 13 years ago.
FCC said it again in NPRM 98-143. 5 years ago. The IARU
took a position against the morse code test nearly 2 years ago.
ARRL still hasn't made up its mind, won't take a stand either
way (they say the speak for all US amateurs).

How soon is the "soon" you mention? :-)

>I don't
>care one way or the other about Morse testing going away, so long as it's
>not outlawed as a communication method (some people will always want to work
>it-- so what).

You aren't arguing any minority view, Jackie. That's a good view,
flexible, adaptable to change and new conditions.

In this newsgroup it's a Very Different condition. The Three
Morseketeers (and their aging bus driver buddy, Dartisgone)
keep commanding "IT'S THE LAW!!!" as if they are authorized
amateur kops. :-)

Remember the old mantra, "CW gets through when nothing else
will?" :-) Dates from the 1930s and the official pages of QST.
Morsemanship is EVERYTHING about the radio expert to them.

>That certainly won't happen.

Not a good statement. Nobody knows what will happen, despite
what the Three Morseketeers "knowing what will happen."

>It will be interesting to see
>what happens when it's time to decide what privileges the new Techs will get

>on HF if E1 is done away with. However, I will certainly not be whining for
>one nanosecond if/when the new Techs get HF privileges without taking E1. I
>don't consider this anything to get my undies in a bunch over.

Is that like the Churchillian (?) statement "up with which I will
not put?" :-)

>I think that the key to the future of AR does not reside in any one mode,
>but rather in the people who're attracted to it in the first place.

The "attractiveness" has become less with age and the refusal
of so many to adapt to change. Some of the BDOFs do a
bad parody of the famous closing scene of the film "Sunset
Boulevard" (Gloria Swanson announcing she is ready for her
close-up).

>With
>some exceptions (and there are always exceptions), the type of people that
>are attracted to this hobby are technically oriented and fascinated by
>technical/scientific stuff that the general public finds mostly
>undecipherable, and therefore many (if not most) of us who're initially
>interested are plenty capable of keeping this hobby alive via the sheer
>force of our curiosity and willingness to experiment.

Ahem. One of the Three Morseketeers has already Given
Orders (!) in here that interest-in-radio MUST be shown by
a grant of an amateur radio license! No arguments allowed!

[must be some addictive property of cashew nuts...]

>Such experiments have
>borne the fruits of advancement in RF communication.

Like SSB? First "fruit" in wireline long-distance telephony? :-)

>There are many new
>digital modes that've come out in the past couple of decades; there are many
>new, state-of-the-art, tiny, yet cheap commercial rigs, and there are many,
>many design plans on the Internet for antennas, transceivers, etc. etc.

Except for PSK31, innovated by G3PLX, a clever Brit who has
not hesitated to innovate since the 1970s, all those "new digital
modes" were born and borne in the commercial world of radio.
Spread spectrum was given its impetus by the militaries.

The inventiveness and innovations of Japanese electronics gave
rise to the "state of the amateur art" in HF, VHF, and UHF ham
equipment. That's shown by the history of hamvertising in the
official periodicals of ARRL.

A singular, elegant new innovation is the "Tayloe detector" by
Dan Tayloe. Only a terribly small percentage of today's US
radio amateurs would recognize it in its original form, a
switched commutating filter using a low-On-resistance, low-

noise CMOS IC. Dan Tayloe saw it where hardly anyone did
and got a US patent on it as a mixer. Well-deserved patent
grant but all the "ham experts" seem to recognize is that it
makes a neat QRP rig. :-)

>But
>no matter how hard we yell to get the word out about AR, only some will be
>inclined, indeed able to hear-- and, more importantly, understand-- the
>value of this hobby.

Gosh! Really? How about the Corpse of Morseketeers who
should "It's a SERVICE!" while waving their morsekets? :-)

>If you've got an amateur radio license, use the privileges you have and have
>maximum fun with them. Don't let the jackass know-it-alls tell you what is
>fun.

As you might have noticed, I do NOT let the jackass braying of
the morseketeers "telling me what is fun!" :-) :-) :-)

Oh, and I've had a commercial (first class, one test) license
since 1956...47 years ago. That certificate sits in a safety
deposit box since it isn't needed in retirement. One or the
other of the Three Morseketeers keep reminding me that "it isn't
lawful for the amateur bands" over and over and over and over
and over and over again. [gotta love it! :-)]

>As a human being that has reached adulthood, YOU get to decide what is
>fun about your hobbies.

I sort of came to that conclusion some time ago.... :-)

>I've got my HF privileges and rig set up now, but I
>still can't wait to get a 6 meter SSB transceiver and try out the "Magic
>Band" before the sunspots disappear. A new Tech licensee can do this from
>the get-go, no code required.

That's nice. :-) I have a little familiarity with VHF...and UHF...
and the microwave region...and MF...and LF...and VLF.

But, I MUST take a code test to "get on HF legally" (in the
ham bands) because "It's the LAW!" Haw.

>Life's too short to not have as much fun as
>you can in your hobbies of choice.

Er, I don't think the Three Morseketeers and Dartisgone
allow "fun" on a personal choice. All must do Their kind
of "fun" or it is not "fun!" "It's a SERVICE!" "CW gets
through when nothing else will!" Etc., etc., etc. :-)

One of the Three Morseketeers keeps insisting I must
(no, MUST, all-caps imperative) take a morse test for an
amateur radio license to properly show my "interest in

radio!" That after a bit more than half a century of
involvement professionally and militarily and avocationally
as a technical hobbyist. :-)

Those oh-so-serious order-givers are the Cultists. :-)

>"The middle-age temptation to get serious about everything is Satan's
>handiwork." - Berke Breathed (cartoonist, "Bloom County")

"Time flies like the wind but fruit flies like bananas." - anon tagline

"Why is the word 'abbreviation' so long?" - another anonymous tagline

2480. Re: After S25.5 Goes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-19 23:07:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030219180744.24452.00000016@mb-fw.aol.com>
Source record: 61570

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.haihsia.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 18 Feb 2003 06:37:46 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>>> ... Meanwhile the inspector
>>> is usually kept waiting outside while the very characteristic
>>> "tinkle" sound of PL-259s being hastily uncoupled from equipment is
>>> heard inside before being admitted.
>>
>> "Tinkle?!?"
>>
>> Gosh, community leader, I've been familiar with Type UHF connectors
>> since Army days of 1952. Never heard one "tinkle" yet, not even at
>> Christmas holiday time. Same with BNC, N, TNC, C, SMA, SMB,
>> and some other types. No "tinkle." Maybe a slight "click," very
>> soft. I've never found PL-259s to "hastily uncouple."
>
> When the inspector is standing outside the door, the name of the
> game is to get the "leener" out of sight as fast as possible - as a
> cable is removed and allowed to flop vertically, the "tinkle" sound
> id heard.
>
> You gotta be there to recognize it. Try it - back off the threaded
> sleeve and let the cable flop free. Works every time with the
> cheapie PL-259 knock-off connectors found in CB installations where
> the sleeve backs off the connector body with only a few turns.

Thank you for the information on sound effects from cheapie
PL-259 knock-off connectors. I only connect to UHF type
connectors with adapters to other series. Type UHF went out
a very long time ago in military, avionic, and commercial radio.
Only amateurs and CBers seem to use those. :-)

2481. Re: New Field Day Entry Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-19 23:07:45 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030219180745.24452.00000017@mb-fw.aol.com>
Source record: 61562

In article <3E528806.166FE13D@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> Please keep to the program.
>
>I've been with the program for nearly forty years. You're still making
>up your mind.

Which means you are past re-runs and past syndication?

:-)

2482. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-19 23:07:45 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030219180745.24452.00000018@mb-fw.aol.com>
Source record: 61566

In article <c2356669.0302181204.164b3a0f@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>Way back in 1997, somebody posted here that FCC was going to simplify
>the ARS rules in a big way. Three classes of license, 5 wpm code, no
>more waivers, massive simplification across the board. They said it
>was a "done deal" and we'd just have to get used to it. I thought the
>poster was way off target and said so. 'Specially after the ARRL
>proposal and the 4-class NPRM
>
>But it turned out that the R&O more closely resembled that old post
>than any proposal which came after.

"There ya have it..." :-)

Is everyone waiting in suspense, anxious to find out who made that old post, old postman? :-)

2483. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-19 23:07:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030219180746.24452.00000019@mb-fw.aol.com>
Source record: 61574

In article <c2356669.0302180920.6d0ef744@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
>news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hah4ji9.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
>> On 17 Feb 2003 17:53:32 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> > "Wide ranging support in the amateur radio community" is invalid
>> > for any federal regulation applying to ALL citizens.
>>
>> Tell that to Bill Cross and the other staff members who decide when
>> to make revisions and what they should be. He's not going to do
>> anything unless there is a consensus WITHIN the amateur community.
>> That's part of the "self policing" that the Commish' expects from
>> the licensees in the ARS.
>>
>> He said so in Dayton two years ago.
>
>Since I'm the one who wrote the phrase "Wide ranging support in the
>amateur radio community" in the first place, let me clarify what it
>was intended to mean.

Oh, did you fail to get a Trademark on it? :-)

>I intended 'amateur radio community' to mean all parties interested in
>the good of the amateur radio service. That includes hams of all
>license classes, people in the process of getting a ham license,
>people thinking about getting a ham license, amateur radio
>organizations ranging from NCI and ARRL to your local radio club,
>amateur radio publishers and equipment manufacturers, regulatory
>agencies like the FCC, and probably some others I haven't thought of
>yet. Not just licensed hams.

United you stand? :-)

>Anybody can comment, propose rule changes, etc., not just hams.
>However, it is a mystery why an individual who has never held an
>amateur license and obviously has little interest in getting one is so
>interested in changing the rules.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, it's a mystery to me why someone who is an
amateur will hide his profession. :-)

Must be some schizoid fantasy thing going around... :-)

2484. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-19 23:07:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030219180747.24452.00000020@mb-fw.aol.com>
Source record: 61561

In article <20030216102315.03444.00000169@mb-mb.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Attilla the Ham) writes:

> Never once did I take any "flak" over BEING a "Novice".

That's because you've never been anything but a novice in human interrelations. :-)

2485. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-19 23:07:48 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030219180748.24452.00000021@mb-fw.aol.com>
Source record: 61573

In article <3E528D5D.1886246A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <3E5141FB.3E185308@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >>
>> >> In article <v50k145bv3ppe1@corp.supernews.com>, "KB9TMP"
><kb9tmp@juno.com>
>> >> writes:
>> >>
>> >> >"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
>> >> >news:20030216185049.10587.00000315@mb-bk.aol.com...
>> >> >> From: "KB9TMP"
>> >
>> >> >> I don't want to learn the code, okay?
>> >> >
>> >> >I didn't WANT to either but I did because that is the requirement!
>> >>
>> >> Following orders like a good little soldier? :-)
>> >
>> >Didn't you follow orders when you were a little soldier?
>>
>> Amateur radio is NOT a military unit or auxilliary.
>
>Good. I didn't write that it was. I asked if you followed orders when
>you were a little soldier?

I never answered you. You don't deserve an answer. :-)

I was adult size in the US Army, not "little." :-)

Prove I did NOT follow orders. Begin with NARA.

>No one can obtain an HF access as a radio amateur without passing the
>little five word per minute morse exam.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. I had HF access just three months ago from
a moored 35-footer in a Ventura, CA, marina. Nice little
SGC 2020 (made in the USA). No amateur radio license
required. In fact, an amateur radio license would not be
authorization at that particular frequency, even with alleged

State Department control! :-)

>You've "argued". The current regs set a 5 wpm code test for HF access.

Yes, yes, your extreme Robustness. No one is arguing
breaking any law. The talk is about CHANGING THE LAW.

Hello? Are you still doing a bad Otto Preminger imitation?

>No discussions have been stopped. I've not attempted to stop such
>discussions, Foghorn.

You couldn't, not even with a blaring foghorn. :-)

>It is certainly a subject. You told us you were going for it.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Jimmie Miccolis said I "make frequent errors."

Don't you want to use that to damn me? :-)

You PCTAs are an uncommunicative bunch who lack
steerage way and a compass needle. :-)

>That's right, Windy. The regulation sets the requirement. What is it
>about that you don't understand?

What is it about free speech and talking about changing laws
that YOU don't understand, Herr Robust?

You've either forgotten some US Constitution amendments or
can't understand them. <shrug>

>> >The current five word per minute test is less than what would be
>> >considered "marginally proficient".
>>
>> No problem, Herr Robust, your orders and commands are
>> marginally nonsense items better left to dialogue in the TV
>> sitcom "Hogan's Heroes." You are a distempered Werner
>> Klemperer character, a Klink without a clink.

Gutt nacht, Herr Oberst. Gruss gott. [see you in syndication]

2486. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-19 23:07:50 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030219180750.24452.00000022@mb-fw.aol.com>
Source record: 61576

In article <c2356669.0302180947.69df98fd@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3E4E68EA.8FC821B7@earthlink.net>...
>> Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >
>> > In article <3E4C5F89.6049AC04@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> > writes:

>C'mon, Dave, you know that's not going to happen. Proof is not one of
>Len's methods. Ask the hypothetical first grade teacher whose reply
>Len would ignore anyway if it did not match his expectation.

How does anyone "prove" a hypothesis?

Issue a hypothetical document of hypothetical reference?

>He just keeps proving me right.

No, poor baby, you are only proving you are growing as sick
as Sgt. Putz.

>Proof after proof after proof.

Have you been drinking?

>In other words:
>
>His hobby is wasting time. Your time.

Then why all the posting to others speaking about another?

Tsk, tsk, tsk. You must be wasting time.

>3. Claimed that I described Amazon.com as "bankrupt" when no such
>claim was ever made by me. What I actually wrote was that Amazon.com
>was not making a profit, in direct opposition to Len's claim that
>Amazon was a "profitable" company. I backed it up by posting links to
>Amazon's financials of the time.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. That was ONLY under what I mentioned about
ARRL charging anyone extra shipping charges for publications
ordered directly from Newington. Amazon.com did not charge
extra for a minimum order and it resells all ARRL publications
at the same price as any retail outlet store. :-)

Those who follow business trends other than "official" ARRL
"news" would have known that Amazon.com was already
breaking even three quarters ago and nearly three weeks ago
announced (in national news) that it had two PROFITABLE
past quarters. Amazon.com still has the minimum-quantity
NO SHIPPING CHARGES offer. ARRL still charges extra
for shipping. :-)

>But Len keeps quoting me as saying Amazon was/is "bankrupt". Just
>another of his untruths.

My apologies, parson. I was equating mental and emotional
bankruptcy toward ARRL criticsm with financial bankruptcy
of a real business. :-)

>His hobby is wasting time. Your time.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. No one is holding any weapon to the parson's
head to force him into replying (by third-person means),
writing long and anguished critiques that read as sermons.

"If thine eye offend thee, cast it out..."

>In other words, Len cannot reply to my posted facts, so he does the
>behavior described in my quote.

I will pick and choose replies to statements called "facts"
which are simply lore, mythos, nonsense or personal
opinions of the self-righteous. The self-righteous think their
sermons are "fact" since they perceive themselves as
never being wrong. :-)

>Here, I'll answer those:
>
>> I've asked before but you didn't respond, what is "overly proud"?
>
>Any mention of any accomplishment by those who disagree with Len.

When the parson receives a Nobel Prize, I will cheer him.
:-)

>Because it removes a whole line of possible insults from Len's NG ammo
>case.

Translation: FEAR. :-)

>> Why the silly names like "Reverend Jimmie"?
>
>Avoids addressing the actual issue. Also, an attempt to get me to
>reply in kind.

Those who act like prissy pedantic parsons get what
they deserve. :-)

>Because keeping the location undisclosed removes a whole line of
>possible insults from Len's NG ammo case.

Translation: Fear of the unknown. :-)

>Len wants to minimize the fact that I have electrical engineering
>degrees from major universities (Penn and Drexel, right here in
>Philly) and that I have designed and built much of my own ham
>equipment in my 35 years as a ham. Nowhere have I claimed to have
>designed and built all of it. That's just another of Len's misquotes.

Tsk, tsk, tsk..."much" is the new morph of the original "all."

Let's grab the chassis punches and design another one!
:-)

>Direct insult in an attempt to get me to reply in kind.

"Brain dead old fart" is a phrase used by Jim Kehler, KH2D
(a definitive PCTA) over five years ago and still being used
by him on his website. :-)

>> It looks as if what you have done is simply
>> provide proof of his statement about your behavior.
>
>Len does that with almost every post.

Every single one? :-)

In order to qualify that quantitatively you would have to post
EVERY ONE of my posts in here and show the tally.
Go ahead, make everyone's day by posting ALL of them.
:-)

>Does anybody think that posting info about my employment would result
>in anything from Len except more insults, ridicule, name-calling,
>factual errors, ethnic slurs, excessive emoticons and general
>infantile behavior? No matter what the job actually is?
>
>Didn't think so.

Translation: He is fearful and worried about the unknown! :-)

2487. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-19 23:07:51 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030219180751.24452.00000024@mb-fw.aol.com>
Source record: 61560

In article <20030218095651.27607.00000591@mb-mj.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Attilla the Ham) writes:

> Running out of other "perjoratives", Your Scuminess?
>
> Ya Putz.

You can't make any point so you use profanity and epithets. :-)

temper fry, murine

2488. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-19 23:07:51 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030219180751.24452.00000023@mb-fw.aol.com>
Source record: 61578

In article <20030218103429.27607.00000593@mb-mj.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Attilla the Ham) writes:

>>Wow! For that they need cammies and meetings every month
>> to discuss military matters using old US Army manuals?
>
> No...They discuss military matters using CURRENT US Army manuals...The same
>one's that pertain to the active Army, the Reserves AND the National Guard.

Not current. The current training doctrine Field Manuals of the US Army are available from the Army Doctrine and Training Command Digital Library (named in honor of General Dennis Reimer, previous Chief of Staff US Army) and state guard units (none affiliated with National Guard units) can only receive public-disclosure documents same as any citizen or anyone accessing their website. A number of documents are restricted to authorized personnel and authority must be verified after first registering. The tennessee state guard is not on the approval list.

> More insults of veterans and veterans who volunteer.

> Scum from the scumbag. What did I expect from a coward who makes his
>"fame" from hiding behind Army KIA's for newsgroup glory?

> Sure I do. Been playing THIS game a lot longer than you have, Your
>Putziness!

> I am not the one dishonoring those men, LennieH. You are. Every time
>you recount their deaths so taht you can hide behind them.

> I "damn" you for being a coward and a liar. You have yet to prove
>otherwise. The above quoted passage yet another attempt to hide your own
>misdeeds.

> I DARE you to quote ONE sentence where I said ONE disrespectful thing
>about those Men, Lennie. I am only sorry that a disgusting coward like you
>can hide behind "Freedom of Speech" when you invoke their memory for your own
>gain.

> I have not damend the Army, Lennie, and you are again tasked to provide
>the quote wherein you say I did.
>
> And I have "damned" only ONE veteran. That would be you. I still call
>you a liar and a coward. That's MY right under the Freedom of Speech".

You are one sick person. Get help.

2489. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-19 23:07:53 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030219180753.24452.00000026@mb-fw.aol.com>
Source record: 61563

In article <20030218092328.29188.00000429@mb-fy.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Attilla the Ham) writes:

>>The mythical instrument is the "rittysnitch," not the 'readysnitch.
>
> Thanks for the correction AND for making my "point". Who cares about
>them? I don't.

If you don't care, why did you bother mentioning them and
then failing to spell them correctly? Illogical.

You attempted some ARRL jargon as some one-upmanship
and got one up yours. :-)

Temper fry, murine

2490. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-19 23:07:53 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030219180753.24452.00000025@mb-fw.aol.com>
Source record: 61575

In article <20030218095245.27607.00000590@mb-mj.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Attilla the Ham) writes:

>>> No, Lennie, I asked what were the effective dates of the awards...for
>>>WHAT PERIODS were they awarded for?
>>
>> As long as the unit is organized. Presidential Unit Citations
>> are awarded to a unit. Hello? Can you read, dumass? Do
>> you need the ARs (Army Regulations) or SRs (Special
>> Regulations) for a non-amateur-radio-related subject and
>> for incessant arguing in here? You lose either way.
>
> More arrogant refusal to specify for what periods of time the awards were
>earned...Which only leads me to beleive this is yet another Leonard H.
>Anderson claim to an award won without his input.

Irrelevant material for an amateur radio newsgroup.

Presidential Unit Citations and other honors have no specified
"period." Once awarded they stay with the unit. If a unit is
disbanded, honors stay with a military branch historical unit.
If a unit is reformed, the honors are once again the unit's own.

> I read fine, Lennie. As for the adjective, I have asked you three
>different ways to tell us from what day to what day the PUC's to which you
>lay claim were awarded.

Irrelevant for any amateur radio policy newsgroup.

A Presidential Unit Citation is not some "soldier of the month"
thing. It is an honor bestowed on ALL members of the unit
receiving the award.

For further disputes about US Army matters, take your
grievance to the Adjutant General, United States Army.

> Lennie is once again dodging the question because he knows that if he
>reveals the periods over which the PUC's for his unit were awarded, we will
>know that he was NOT in the unit for the periods cited.

There is no "dodge" or "lie." The Far East Command Signal
Service Battalion received two Presidential Unit Citations
during my 35-month assignment there. All 1200 members of
the Battalion were entitled to wear the emblem of a laurel
wreath with a numeral "2" on the lower right full-dress uniform
right sleeve. We did in 1955. The year before all 1200 members
of the Battalion wore just the laural wreath with no numeral.

My assignment to the Battalion was from February, 1953, to
January, 1956.
.
The award information, all details, is available from the
National Archives and Records Administration (they have
a website giving information request instructions) and is
on file with the US Army Historical Center. In the following
years there was reorganization of all US Army units in
Japan. The 78th Signal Service Battalion is the current
signal unit whose unit ancestry includes the FEC Sig Svc
Bn. The 78th is based at Camp Zama, Japan, and is
under the command of the 516th Signal Brigade at Fort
Shafter, Hawaii, as part of USARPAC, the US Army Pacific.
The callsign of USARPAC Headquarters is ADA, the very
same callsign used by the FEC Sig Svc Bn a half century
past.

> In other words, he did not contribute to the character of the service for
>which the award was made...He did not contribute...(as if we didn't already
>know...)

False. The entire Battalion received both Presidential Unit
Citations. We wore that proudly.

For details, contact NARA or the US Army Historical Center.
For disputes about unit awards and honors, go to the
Adjutant General, United States Army.

For better mental health, contact your local psychiatrist and
get treatment.

This is an amateur radio newsgroup, not a playground for
deranged individuals with distinctive unit insignia.

2491. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-19 23:07:54 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030219180754.24452.00000027@mb-fw.aol.com>
Source record: 61571

In article <20030218090230.04848.00000762@mb-cs.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Attilla the Ham) writes:

>>You ARE one vindictive little son of a beeper, Attilla. You
>> will make fun and ridicule against anyone who goes out of
>> their way to learn something. [see the attempted defamation
>> of "15 years of night school" as a pejorative in here often
>> enough]
>
> Nope...not vindictive at all, Lennie, unless you call punching holes in
>your's and Vippy's stories "vindictive".
>
> You've tried your OWN form of "vindictive(ness)" and had it spoon fed
>back to you. retty bitter, eh, Oh Putzy One...?!?!

Gosh yes..."vindictiveness" is defined by PCTAs as the
definition du jour about disliking the morse code test. :-)

"Punching holes?!?" Mighty macho morseman you couldn't
punch holes in wet tissue...:-)

>>The only "contradiction" Attilla the Ham makes is attempting
>> to pass hisself off as a civil human being who knows something
>> about radio
>
> I know enough to be a current FCC licensee. Where's your's, Lennie?

General Radiotelephone...was a First Class Radiotelephone,
first obtained in 1956. :-)

>>Steamy, you've lost it again, sitting on standby, garbled
>> modulation, and your electrolytics are all leaking out. Go
>> wipe up the mess with some of your extra certificates. Get
>> a better human disguise, alien, your echoes are long delayed
>
> Whew. Colorful stuff! Get this watching Spongebob or Catdog re-runs
>again, Lennie?

No. The home facility for Nickelodeon is right across Olive in
Burbank, opposite Community Chevrolet. Are you missing
some episodes in your fine arts collection? Are you asking
for freebies?

I know a couple people who work at Nickelodeon. Do you want
a job there as a purchasing agent? I could ask for you... :-)

Anything to help...

2492. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-19 23:07:55 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030219180755.24452.00000029@mb-fw.aol.com>
Source record: 61568

In article <20030218084828.04848.00000760@mb-cs.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Attilla the Ham) writes:

>>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>>Date: 2/17/03 6:51 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20030217195136.04532.00000253@mb-fx.aol.com>
>
>>Someone else claimed it. I agree with it. If you have a General class license,
>>it shows you learned the code. This is a waste of time for technical skills.
>
> Why?

Absolutely NOTHING of radio technical knowledge is imparted
by manual morse code training, sending, or receiving. NOTHING
but morsemanship.

> Is it your assertion that no one can learn more than one thing or be
>proficient at more than one skill? or perhaps you mean no one BUT you...?!?!

Absolutely NOTHING of radio technical knowledge is imparted
by manual morse code training, sending, or receiving. NOTHING
but morsemanship.

Temper fry, murine.

2493. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-19 23:07:55 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030219180755.24452.00000028@mb-fw.aol.com>
Source record: 61572

In article <20030218085721.04848.00000761@mb-cs.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Attilla the Ham) writes:

>>You've flipped out, lost it, switched off, drifted off frequency
>> a long time ago and live in a world of fantasy, certificatism,
>> and uniforms with distinctive unit insignia.
>
> Yep...I do.

Okay on that, you agree that you've flipped out, lost it, switched off, drifted off frequency a long time ago and live in a world of fantasy, certificatism and uniforms with distinctive unit insignia. Roger that. :-)

> I live in a world where I am proud to be serving in some capacity. My
>"service" has, on more than one occassion, meant that someone went home alive
>that might not have otherwise had that option had I and other like-minded
>volunteers not been there.

Oh, my, those high-sounding words and then he comes in here and throws it all away!!! :-)

> Uniforms come in all shapes, sizes and origins. Some were uniforms of
>military origin. Others were from EMS service and no connection to the Armed
>Forces at all.

Green scrubs is a uniform. Sometimes there is even a distinctive unit insignia... :-)

> That you disdain uniforms is obvious. That you try and discredit the
>people who wear them for your own selfish reasons is ugly.

Yes to people that only want their picture taken in uniform, like the ones never smiling and showing teeth... :-)

You have any teeth or did you volunteer yours to another?

> You're a putz.

Not at all. You might try not using Jewish-ethnic pejoratives. I know it will be a new experience for you, but try it anyway.

:-)

2494. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-19 23:07:56 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030219180756.24452.00000030@mb-fw.aol.com>
Source record: 61567

In article <20030218084539.04848.00000759@mb-cs.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>>Date: 2/17/03 6:41 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20030217194106.04532.00000252@mb-fx.aol.com>

> That you don't consider the benefits of what you would obtain in return
>for the effort to learn the code "worth it" is YOUR opinion, suited to YOUR
>lifestyle and choices.

There is NO "law" that forbids another, differing opinion of anything.

Try reviewing the United States Constitution and what all of it means, including all amendments.

> Your demeaning and denigrating remarks about those who DO expend the
>effort are spiteful and selfish.

Poor baby, murine.

> Period.

No one is concerned about your "period." Your problems with PMS (Powerful Marine Syndrome) are your personal concern, do not reflect on the USMC, CAP, TNSG, or those in uniform having distinctive unit insignia.

2495. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-19 23:07:57 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030219180757.24452.00000031@mb-fw.aol.com>
Source record: 61565

In article <20030218084539.04848.00000759@mb-cs.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Attilla the Ham) writes:

> As of today, Fevruary 18th 2003, a Morse Code test IS relevent to the >operation of an Amateur Radio station authorized to operate below 30 mHz.

There is no such date as "Fevruary 18th 2003" as there is no month named "Fevruary." The correct syntax and punctuation should be "February 18, 2003" or "18 February 2003."

There are no amateur bands below 30 milliHertz. The lowest ITU-R allocation recommendations stop at 9 KHz and go no lower.

> That's the law.

No, you wrote a number of errors and mistakes. It would be correct if the suggestions and recommendations were made.

2496. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-19 23:07:57 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030219180757.24452.00000032@mb-fw.aol.com>
Source record: 61569

In article <20030218084539.04848.00000759@mb-cs.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Attilla the Ham) writes:

>>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>>Date: 2/17/03 6:41 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20030217194106.04532.00000252@mb-fx.aol.com>
>
>>I can learn code. I don't find Morse code fun or relevant to the higher
>>license class.
>
> It's not what YOU find relevent, Vippy. It's what the FCC and Congress
>find relevent.

Note: R-E-L-E-V-A-N-T Outrage causes typos. Do not vent the relevant.

You have no authority here, are not a moderator, do not control content despite hundreds of epithets hurled at others.

If anyone disagrees with your opinions, then bear up to it instead of acting the arrogant barbarian.

> It is impossible to provide a cite where it is NOT related to Amateur
>Radio.

You are not a legal person, not a law clerk, are not a judge of anything in here. This is not a court where you can order cites from your bench.

The phrase "state of the art" applies to nearly all crafts, technical fields, medical practice, etc., etc. It is common American English, widely used. You have absolutely no authority to redefine phrases to fit your disordered little picture of anything.

2497. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-19 23:07:58 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030219180758.24452.00000033@mb-fw.aol.com>
Source record: 61579

In article <20030218084014.04848.00000758@mb-cs.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Attilla the Ham) writes:

>>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>>Date: 2/17/03 5:50 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20030217185042.04532.00000243@mb-fx.aol.com>
>
>>Please provide a sentence where "radio art" is used to mean non-technical
>>achievement, from an unbiased source
>
> Vippy, this is an Amateur Radio NG, occupied by Radio Amateurs.

Then stop trying to start a verbal battle over Army unit honors.

> Your assertion is based upon wording of Amateur Radio related
>regulations in the Code of Federal Regulations.

In Title 47, Code of Federal Regulations. Try to focus on the correct title since there are many CFRs.

> Any "reference" I provide is going to be ABOUT Amateurs from Amateur
>Radio related sources.

Then stop all the jabbering about Army unit honors, Civil Air Patrol, Maxwell AFB, and all things NOT amateur radio.

> We are discussing (on occassion, anyway...) AMATEUR PRACTICE...Not
>commercial, military or any other form of excitation of the ether.

This newsgroup was created originally to discuss the US amateur radio license morse code test, to avoid over-burdening of rec.radio.amateur.misc newsgroup.

You are not a moderator of this newsgroup, have no authority to moderate it, cannot change it despite all the hundreds of epithets you have posted here.

>> Therefore any reference to the use of the term "radio art" is going to be
>as it is applied to Amateur Radio...NOT how the IEEE or any other source refers
>to it.

You are not a moderator of this newsgroup, have no authority to moderate it, cannot change it despite all the hundreds of epithets you have posted here.

Temper fry, murine

2498. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-19 23:34:58 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hakgbh1.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 61580

On Tue, 18 Feb 2003 23:13:23 -0500, Bill Sohl wrote:

>My hard copy arrived today. I mailed the ARRL renewal formback
>to ARRL about 2/5/03. Not bad, total elapsed time from my
>mailing to hardcopy was only 13 days.

Could you have renewed on line instead?

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2499. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 00:27:24 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b317cpekh1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 61581

The purpose of the districting of ham radio calls were two fold.

1. Allow the issue of many more calls with the same suffix. I.E. W1AW, W2AW...etc.

2. Provide a easy means of locating the station for the FCC monitoring that actually used to go on.

By REQUIRING hams to sign PORTABLE (district) made it much easier to tell where the station was. Making it a lot easier for contest operators and general ops by knowing which way to point the beam...etc.

To you these reasons may make little to no sense. Considering your obvious smart ass response ... fire away.

Dan/W4NTI

----- Original Message -----
From: "Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now>
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2003 2:41 PM
Subject: Re: Callsign etiquette?

> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in news:b30o6l$1fo$1
> @slb0.atl.mindspring.net:
>
> > Then the FCC in another stroke
> > of insanity basically vacated the call districts that served a useful
> > purpose.
> >
>
> _____
>
> I'm trying to think of a useful purpose that served. If ham call signs
> had been issued without regard to district from day one what would have
> been the harm? That's what's happening now, in effect, and ham radio
> goes on just fine it appears. Where am I wrong?
>
> You used the word "insanity" so I'm expecting a pretty convincing reply.
> Something more than "I don't like it".
>
> --
> Bill, W7TI

"Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now> wrote in message
news:Xns9327812F65D0Dpookster@216.168.3.50...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in news:b30o6l$1fo$1

> @slb0.atl.mindspring.net:
>
> > Then the FCC in another stroke
> > of insanity basically vacated the call districts that served a useful
> > purpose.
> >
>
> ----------
>
> I'm trying to think of a useful purpose that served. If ham call signs
> had been issued without regard to district from day one what would have
> been the harm? That's what's happening now, in effect, and ham radio
> goes on just fine it appears. Where am I wrong?
>
> You used the word "insanity" so I'm expecting a pretty convincing reply.
> Something more than "I don't like it".
>
> --
> Bill, W7TI

2500. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 00:59:16 UTC
From: "Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now>
Message-ID: <Xns9327ACCF9AB97pookster@216.168.3.50>
Source record: 61582

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in
news:b317cpekh1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net:

> The purpose of the districting of ham radio calls were two fold.
>
> 1. Allow the issue of many more calls with the same suffix. I.E.
> W1AW, W2AW...etc.

Nonsense. W1AW, W2AW, etc. could have all been in the same town if
there were no districts.

> 2. Provide a easy means of locating the station for the FCC
> monitoring that actually used to go on.

More nonsense. The bad guys, whom the FCC is really interested in, will
not give their correct call or portable designator anyway, and besides,
if it's a *real* call, all the FCC has to do is look it up in their
database. If you're an FCC monitor and you hear W4NTI breaking a
rule, do you *know* he's in the 4th call district? Of course not. And
would it matter if you did? You just mail the pink slip to his address,
don't you?

>
> By REQUIRING hams to sign PORTABLE (district) made it much easier to
> tell where the station was. Making it a lot easier for contest
> operators and general ops by knowing which way to point the
> beam...etc.

A good point for contesting, but I assure you the districting system was
not created for the benefit of contesters. I'm still wondering why it
was created at all. I suspect the original plan was to administer each
district separately, but that either never happened or was abandoned
early on. And of course, the FCC eventually abandoned the strict
district system anyway since it proved to have little or no value.

> To you these reasons may make little to no sense. Considering your
> obvious smart ass response ... fire away.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

My original response wasn't intended to be a smart ass one, believe it
or not, but since you invited me, this one will have to do.

--
Bill, W7TI

2501. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 01:31:05 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E542FCD.D26FF257@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61583

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E5284A9.FBCCE9FC@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Actually, we've only been told by you and you aren't involved. You are
> >simply a windy geezer who knows a few hams. Did they ever tell you
> >about the epitome of U.S. amateur radio?
> >
> >So much for your civil debate over the issue...
>
> Gotta love the dismissive attitude, Herr Robust. :-)

Why'd you snip your great statement, Foghorn Lenhorn? What would you expect but a dimissive attitude toward one who makes such an unsubstantiated statement? What would you know of what HF amateur radio is all about? You aren't a particpant in amateur radio. You aren't proficient in morse. You aren't a DXer. Except for those minor details, you da man!

> Herr Robust "knows" all hams? :-)

I didn't write that I know all hams. I wrote that you know a few hams.

You aren't a radio amateur. I've been an active radio amateur for nearly forty years. Statistically, who'd be more likely to know a greater number of hams, you or me? Who'd be more likely to know about what goes on in amateur radio, you or me?

> Of course, all the regular Three Morseketeers in here do!
> They don't hesitate to tell everyone "who belongs" and
> "who doesn't belong." To the hilt (their blades fell off some
> time ago but they wave their hilts around anyway). :-)
>
> Gruss gott. <clik>

I see your usual drivel but I don't see a defense of your statement.

Dave K8MN

2502. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 01:37:58 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030219203758.10560.00000012@mb-ma.aol.com>
Source record: 61584

In article <c2356669.0302190744.66836ac5@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) wrote in message
>news:<5f4fe4c2.0302182035.417a07ff@posting.google.com>...
>> Just as the "fight" between the North and the South, to see who would
>> "win the battle" of becoming the last living Civil War Veteran, became
>> a national obsession in the last century... could the ongoing battle
>> between Advanced and Novices to see who will be the last surviving
>> member of those two classes breath exciting new life into the hobby?
>
>HAW! that's a good one!
>>
>> With the Advanced presently holding about an 85,000 to 36,000
>> advantage, and with the Novice numbers dropping more precipitously, at
>> first glance one would think that the Advanced folks are a "shoe-in".
>
>Nope.
>>
>> But - the same thing could be said of the North/South numbers around
>> the beginning of the last century. The North held a HUGE advantage in
>> initial numbers; but, the South had an ace up its sleeve - there were
>> loads of barefoot 13-year-old Southerners manning the trenches along
>> with the grey-bearded warriors at Richmond in the waning days of the
>> war. Yes - it is my contention that the Novice ranks also contain
>> some of these "aces" as well...
>
>[ethnic stereotype removed]
>
>> I predict that sometime around the year 2040, there will be
>> more Novices than Advanced... with about 2,000 left from each
>> category... then, around the year 2050, with only about 500 left in
>> each bracket, things will start to get REALLY interesting... The
>> suspense is killing me - I can HARDLY WAIT.
>
>Total pointless trivia, Stew.

Total pointless pedantry, parson. Lighten up, boy.

>You've also overlooked factors that work against your prediction:

Oh, oh, here's where the parson sermonizes again...sigh.

>1) Civil War veteran status doesn't expire. Ham licenses do. If a
>current Novice or Advanced lets the license lapse for more than 2
>years, he/she cannot get it back.

The last American Civil War veteran expired several years ago.
The last widow of an American Civil War veteran expired a
few weeks ago.

Sigh...some folks is just sooooo serious!

>2) Novices have far more to gain in privileges by upgrading than
>Advanceds.

Certainly, considering there are no more new Novice or
Advanced class licenses being issued... :-)

Did that require a prestigious degree from an ivy-league
place to figure out? :-)

>3) There's no telling what FCC may do in the future wrt license
>classes and grandfathering.

Whoa! You don't KNOW?!?!? Gosh, don't you really KNOW
these things about the FCC anymore?

I'm disappointed.

2503. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 01:38:00 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030219203800.10560.00000013@mb-ma.aol.com>
Source record: 61585

In article <20030219061144.25651.00000506@mb-fm.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran
>>From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart)
>>Date: 2/18/03 10:35 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <5f4fe4c2.0302182035.417a07ff@posting.google.com>
>
>>Just as the "fight" between the North and the South, to see who would
>>"win the battle" of becoming the last living Civil War Veteran, became
>>a national obsession in the last century... could the ongoing battle
>>between Advanced and Novices to see who will be the last surviving
>>member of those two classes breath exciting new life into the hobby?
>
> Would it be too much to ask "who cares" and what relevence it has to ANY
>thing?

Yeah!! No relevance!!! Just like CAP, TN SG, and seven hostile actions!!! Yeah! Yeah!

> I seriously doubt thre are ANY "active" Novices on the air. Most are
>probably kids (or were kids) who got the license as part of school projects,
>quickly forgotten when the class was over and the grades assigned.

Oh, dear, oh dear...where have all the Elmers gone?

Like all those long-timers who Elmered many a newcomer!

:-)

>>The North held a HUGE advantage in
>>initial numbers; but, the South had an ace up its sleeve - there were
>>loads of barefoot 13-year-old Southerners manning the trenches along
>>with the grey-bearded warriors at Richmond in the waning days of the
>>war.
>
> It's a horrific fact that innocence is the first tragedy of war. Your
>attempt to humorously anaolgize it to Amateur Radio is sick.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...A-N-A-L-O-G-I-Z-E.

The Confederacy lost...

>>Yes - it is my contention that the Novice ranks also contain
>>some of these "aces" as well... barefoot 13-year-old Puerto Rican
>>Novices.
>

> A bigoted and stereotyped analogy at that.

Ooooo! A Civil Rights Advocate from the hobby whose
principle demographic profile is male and white!

>>I predict that sometime around the year 2040, there will be
>>more Novices than Advanced... with about 2,000 left from each
>>category... then, around the year 2050, with only about 500 left in
>>each bracket, things will start to get REALLY interesting... The
>>suspense is killing me - I can HARDLY WAIT.
>
> Athrosclerosis will kill you before the suspense will.

Oooo...a new medical term, doctor?

Isn't it "arteriosclerosis?" Let's hear it for the "medical pro" in
here!

2504. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 01:38:01 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030219203801.10560.00000014@mb-ma.aol.com>
Source record: 61590

In article <f45722ac.0302190445.72d1c55e@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3E5121E0.42131FD4@earthlink.net>...
>> Brian wrote:
>> >
>> > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20030216173704.14527.00000384@mb-cc.aol.com>...
>> >
>> > > --
>> > >
>> > > Think about how many stations you've heard on the air this weekend, all
>using
>> > > CW. Consider that there are lots more out there you can't hear due to
>> > > propagation, antenna limitations, etc. Also those you won't hear
>because
>> > > they're mostly in hunt'n'pounce mode rather than calling CQ.
>> > >
>> > > Remember all those stations next time somebody says or writes that CW
>has no
>> > > relevance in ham radio today, or that nobody uses it anymore.
>>
>> > Welp, if you say you can't hear a CW station, then you just shot down
>> > the Morse Myth that CW always gets through.
>>
>> Those cans will work better if you plug them in.
>
>Tell Jim. He's the one making the claims.
>
>> > As far as CW having no relevance, that's just not true. Lots of hams
>> > enjoy using it.
>>
>> Please advise your friend Mr. Anderson.
>
>Mr. Anderson, "cans" work better if you plug them in. Hearing the
>other station makes it much more fun and enjoyable.

Thank you very much, Mr. Burke! Appreciate the tip.

I tried out some small cans. The V-8 ran down my collar
and the string got caught on the front panel knobs. Nothing
to plug in anywhere. Please advise.

>> > The ARGUMENT is that a CW EXAM is no longer relavant. Give CW the
>> > same exam that FM, SSB, RTTY, SSTV, FSTV, PACKET, PACTOR and PSK31
>> > have.
>>
>> That's AN argument.
>
>Yes, Dave, that's what I said it was.
>
>Anything else you would like me to pass on to Len?

He could send a bag of cashews... :-)

2505. Re: After S25.5 Goes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 01:38:02 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030219203802.10560.00000015@mb-ma.aol.com>
Source record: 61589

In article <d22b54c3.0302190812.7c5ab3ec@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
>news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hah2wb4.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
>> On 17 Feb 2003 06:13:39 -0800, Brian Kelly wrote:
>>
>> >Fuhgeddit. Power level regs are beyond useless. When was the last
>> >time any ham in the ham bands got busted for running over the legal
>> >limit??
>>
>> The last time that -I- busted a licensed ham for overpower was
>> the oiperator at the Peoples Temple in San Francisco. Remember
>> them - the stateside terminal of the Jonestown settlement of
>> Massacre fame in 1978.
>
>I sure do remember the Jonestown disaster, 900 dead . . ? Hideous.
>
>I'd put ham radio aside by 1978 and this is the first I've heard that
>they had an "HQ communications department" in SF. He was a damned
>sight better off getting spanked by you in SF than he would have been
>if he was with the rest of the whackies. If that's the way it went.

Gosh, old timer, your TV set busted back then?

CBS News had video of the middle California cult station
in operation with sound. Before the "spanking." Used what
looked like ham gear...old SSB transceiver (imported).

>> However, unlicened "CB style" operators get busted routinely when
>> the complaint volume gets great enough and there are extrinsic
>> factors involved to warrant assigment of the necessary crew.
>
>The more the better if for no other reason than to demonstrate that
>the FCC swat teams are still alive. Somewhere.

SWAT at the FCC! Special Wireless and Tinkling? :-)

Hey! That could be a great one-hour series in prime time!

2506. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 01:38:06 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030219203806.10560.00000017@mb-ma.aol.com>
Source record: 61586

In article <20030219103805.25398.00000222@mb-cb.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Attilla the Ham) writes:

> Easy to understand when you're trying to view the world from your >belly-button, Dave!

Attilla KNOWS this! :-)

2507. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 01:38:06 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030219203806.10560.00000016@mb-ma.aol.com>
Source record: 61591

In article <c2356669.0302191022.5c413a7a@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
>Date: 19 Feb 2003 10:22:44 -0800
>
>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20030214173313.25546.00000785@mb-me.aol.com>...
>> In article <c2356669.0302140714.67c920a3@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
>> (writes:
>>
>> >Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>> >From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
>> >Date: 14 Feb 2003 07:14:15 -0800
>> >
>> >Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>> >news:<3E4C5F89.6049AC04@earthlink.net>...
>> >> Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >> >
>> >> > In article <7xD2a.91351$be.68029@rwcrnsc53>, "Jackie"
>> >> > <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> writes:
>> >> >
>> >> > >"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>> >> > >news:20030212210738.09921.00001844@mb-md.aol.com...
>> >> > >
>> >> > >> Jackie, you've not been in here for a long time.
>> >
>> >Len has been here for a very long time, under a variety of screen
>> >names.
>>
>> ANOTHER SERMON ON THE ANTENNA MOUNT
>> by Right Reverend Jimmie Callsign,
>> the Pedantic Parson of the Newsgroup
>
>Typical Len behavior - start off with an insult.

"Insult?!?" Did I name names?!? :-)

>> Of course, AOL allows 7 screen names.
>
>And you have used "nocwtest", "lenof21", "averyfine", "averyfineman"
>and "lenover21" to post to this newgroup over the past 5 years.

You betcha, parson. Got more screen names you haven't seen!

>In at
>least some cases it was clear that you were trying to disguise your
>identity by doing so.

It WAS?!?!? Oh, the horror of the thought! Capital Crime
Against the State!!! Heresy!!! Sacreligious!!!

Me do a disguise?!? :-) As WHAT? :-)

As a "retired Army colonel whose 'son' was 'behind enemy lines'
in Iraq during the Gulf War sending out intel by CW?" No, not me.

As one of several pseudonyms of a 2x2 in here saying he was
"suddenly activated to Afghanistan from under a NYC bridge?"
No, not me.

As a play-doctor who claimed "seven hostile actions" but didn't
name, identify, or otherwise elaborate locations, etc.? Nope.

How about as a parsimonous pastor working in stealth along-
side the vice-president at an undisclosed location? Definitely
not me. :-)

How about as a long-time AOL subscriber with a surname in
multiple use by many who can't use his full name because it
is too close to someone else's screen name? Now that would
be most definitely true!

Yeah, and how about a former staff member of Ham Radio
magazine whose full name and postal address was printed
with every article? Yup, that's very true!

>> Isn't that just a "bad" thing, though? :-)
>
>Tell us why you need different screen names to post here.

Hello? Didn't I just do that? Are you sight-disadvantaged?

Must be. I've posted my full name and mailing address in
here several times. A bit hard to "sense" who is writing
in here, pedantic parson? Lighten up, boy. :-)

HEY!!! Look up at the top of this post and see what the
screen name of the parson says. Does it identify his
real name? No. The real name in parenthesis is just
a mister N2EY, the same as the screen name. Single
name style. Nobody else has a surname like that. Can
that be a real real name? [does anyone care? :-)]

>Let's see...you insulted Dave's job and ethnicity in one sentence. No
>smiley for you.

Awww... No smiley! Tsk, tsk, tsk. :-(Boo-hoo.

>Here's a clue, Len: Time of posting is not necessarily the time a post
>is written.

Here's another clue, Jimmie: Your posts do not represent
Ultimate Truths. [strange but true...]

>> Isn't that rather late for workers at an undisclosed
>> location who do early runs at 5 AM? :-)
>
>Here's another clue, Len: You don;t know how to do time conversions
>very well.

Of course, with 7 time zones in the USA and only five fingers
on each hand, the arithmetic is very complex? :-)

The parson didn't write something about running at 5 AM?
Oh, my!

>> Morsemanship is the Prime Directive of amateur knowledge,
>> the ne plus ultra of radio achievement, used worldwide as
>> the "common language" for 599 exchanges.
>
>Typical Len non-response.

Okay, have it your way, take away the Gold Star on my
report card along with the smiley...

>So? Nobody is denying that govt. agencies have their own
>communications facilities.

They do? You KNOW this? Wow.

>You seem to be saying that hams do not play a role in any emergency.

Wow...a black-and-white parson in a color world!

I'm saying that hams don't play the role written by ARRL to
that big an extent. Hello? ARRL self-congratulatory praise
errs by omission. As often as it can get away with it.

>> How about the Loma Prieta and Northridge earthquakes?
>> Little local "left coast" piddly things? Of course.
>
>Who said that? Not me.

Your buddy, Attilla the Ham said that, many times. A few others.

Gosh, Rev. Jimmie, we readers don't really talk behind just
your back when we are off the computers...

>Typical diversion by Len. Examples of CW use by hams in real
>emergencies are given, but he continues to deny they exist. There are
>none so blind as those who will not see.

Temporary blindness from the exaggerated prose pole-axes
by ARRL. :-)

>Tell ya what, Len...I'll think about not posting here about military
>communications when you stop posting about amateur radio.

You've posted about military radio?!? Were you activated to
Afghanistan from under a NYC bridge too?

>No. You have trouble writing clearly, though.

C-L-E-A-R-L-Y. There. I wrote it.

Should I type in "slow English" like the VOA broadcasts?

>I can reply directly. I usually choose not to.

No courage? Amateur extras must show their dedication
and resolve to the amateur community many ways, one
of which is trying to destroy skeptics and those without
the Right Attitude! Courage and Resolve!

Kill the Infidels! :-)

>Actually, yes. That's why there are different radio services. If
>amateur radio were the same as some other type of radio, it would not
>need its own spectrum or its own rules and regulations.

Wow. All that with an ivy-league sheepskin education?

Now, now, one of your buds already said that anyone without
a license CANNOT KNOW ANYTHING about amateur radio!
I do wish you Three Morseketeers (with Dartisgone) would get
your acts together.

>> HF communications is DIFFERENT if done by
>> non-ham equipment versus ham equipment, right?
>
>The goals and resources are different. That's obvious to almost
>everyone but you, Len.

Including all of radio physics, pedantic professor? :-)

Is that anything like software-defined radio that changes
function just be reprogramming? You know, like some
regulator makes a regulation and suddenly everything in
radio physics changes because of human intervention?

>Your posts here go far beyond advocating removal of a morse code test.
>You play a game best described as "spoil the party".

Mighty morsemen of the elite amateurs done spoiled a
"party" a long time ago, long-timer. They managed to mold
amateur radio into something they could do and then
established a hierarchial system of "superiors" and "inferiors"
based on morsemanship. They managed to convince the
FCC of older times that this was truth, but the FCC saw it
was being duped by 1990 (see 90-53).

Jimmie, boy, you've assumed guruism and some kind of
Voice of Truth in just repeating ARRL mythos and lore that
was installed before your time. Not anyone's fault but your

own.

>I'm not the one calling people names and commenting endlessly on a
>radio service I'm not involved in.

There you go again...good old saw equations about
"involvement" (through licensing). :-)

>> I've been MINIMIZING the selective editing and propagandizing
>> of ARRL...NOT the US amateur radio service.
>
>BULL.

Nope. You are a Believer in ARRL, Jimmie. It's Total.
They can't do anything wrong. Anyone who is against
ARRL is against you (and probably all of mankind).

>> Wake up, boy.
>
>Interesting. First you call me an old fart, now you call me boy. Is
>that part of advocating removal of a morse code test?

I call you a sermonizer and a pedant, too.

I won't call you when supper is ready, though...

>The post I refer to was not done by ARRL. It was written by a ham who
>was there, part of the search. Documented the service given by amateur
>radio communications. Were YOU there, Len? I don't think so.

YOU weren't out here for the Loma Prieta or Northridge
earthquakes, either. Come to think of it, amateur radio
during the 1994 Northridge earthquake was conspicuously
absent. Was that because nobody from ARRL was directing
the earthquake aftermath?

>The fact that you reply the way you just did above is proof that you
>minimize and dismiss the help and ublic service performed by hams
>using ham radio.

When hams do ublic service, I'll be the first to say something.

Before I do that, what the heck is a "ublic service?" :-)

>You're saying that pejoratives hurled by another justify your
>behavior. Sounds like the classic "BUT MOMMY! STEVIE DID IT FIRST!!!"
>that I would expect from a four-year-old.

Four-year-olds can pass amateur radio license tests. :-)

I've never taken an amateur radio license test.

>I would not accept such a lame excuse from a four-year-old. Nor from
>you. Live with it.

Awwww. Jimmie getting beligerant in here? Tsk, tsk, tsk.

>> Hello? The First Amendment hasn't been waived. HF radio is
>> still HF radio regardless of the allocated radio service using it.
>
>Does that mean all of HF radio should be governed by the same rules?

Is that your understanding of it?

Gosh, I think you are standing too far under it to see it...

>> Does the periodical name "Ham Radio" magazine strike a bell?
>
>Yup. A defunct little fanzine that was pretty good in its day.

Sorry, that is "Electric Radio." I was talking about a
news stand publication available nationally and in print
for 22 years. One that existed solely on advertising
revenue without having an entire membership organization
to subsidize them.

>> (or beep your BFO?) About 50,000 printings every month for
>> 22 years before sale to CQ Communications.
>
>And no more new issues in over a decade.

Incorrect. CQ bought Communications Technology, Inc., and
with it all the rights of HR and HR Horizons, the HR Bookstore,
etc. CQ used that base for Communications Quarterly, a
(guess what) quarterly periodical also sold nationally and
internationally at retailers.

>Doesn't make your faulty logic here any less faulty.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, are you going to argue that CQ did
NOT buy out HR? Are you saying that HR was
NOT about ham radio?

>> Everyone understands your words.
>
>You're the only one who attaches that meaning to them.

Incorrect again. Even if you cannot understand your words,
all the readers can fully understand your words.

>Same person as your hypothetical first-grade teacher.

Are you going to do a Battle of Google again? :-)

Tsk, tsk, tsk, you already mentioned four-year-olds.

>You are advocating that the rules be the same as 50 years ago, then.

No, I am saying directly that YOU want to live in that
world, old-timer, along with the other BDOFs. Live with it.

>Not at all. But it's typical that you would put down the
>accomplishments of others.

Building a K2 from a kit is an "accomplishment?"

>> Poor baby. Must really get your goat to know that someone
>> actually worked HF comm NOT in ham radio before you were
>> born, ey?
>
>Not at all. But it sure does seem to get your goat that hams get on
>the air without paying proper homage to you and your accomplishments.
>Live with it.

I HAVE lived with it from the mighty macho morsemen,
especially the Three Morseketeers (with Dartisgone).
No homage and lots of fromage from them.

>I never claimed to be an expert at anything.

Oooo...is THAT statement going to come back and haunt
you! :-)

>I'm not him. I've asked him to stop calling you names, btw, but you
>ignore that fact.

heh heh heh hehehehehehehehe. Really worked, didn't it?

>> Or the defunct diplomat who thinks State Dept. comm
>> is an offshoot of ham radio.
>
>Who would that be? Can't be K8MN - he's not defunct.

Mentally...well....

>> Or the guy who works at an
>> undisclosed location after doing 5 AM morning runs... :-)
>
>Is that a bad thing?

You said I had trouble with time-zone conversions. Does
that mean you DON'T run at 5 AM?

>That's just wrong. You are mistaken, Len.

>> The REST OF THE RADIO WORLD was busy with
>> voice and teleprinter communications just beginning to be
>> the overwhelming majority of message transmission.
>
>Do you have an accurate count of how many radio messages were handled,
>per mode, to make that announcement?

Each and every one? No. :-)

What do YOU know of the rest of the radio world?

>The fact of the matter is that back in 1953, and for decades after,
>Morse code was used by many radio services besides the ARS.

Are you going to name each one of those "many radio services"
like you demand of others? :-)

>Of course
>such use was declining, but morse and morse skills were still very
>relevant in 1953 and for many years afterwards.

How can you KNOW this? You don't know much of the
rest of the radio world.

>In amateur radio, those skills are still relevant.

Only the mighty macho morsemen are "relevant." :-)

Yes, yes, we know your drill, just one morseman alive
and "morse is still relevant." :-)

>That relevancy doesn't prove that such skills must be tested for a
>license. But to say those skills were not relevant is simply untrue.

Primus inter pares. ["first among equals"]

Sorry, but, right now, morsemanship MUST be tested for an
amateur radio license having below-30-MHz privileges.

"It's the LAW!" :-)

Law is relevant, is it not?

>> >Sure, the
>> >use of Morse code by non-amateur radio services has steadily decreased
>> >since the end of WW2. But to say it "wasn't relevant to the needs of
>> >the rest of the radio world of fifty years ago" simply doesn't mathc
>> >the facts.
>>
>> Well, little Jimmie WAS THERE, wasn't he? :-)
>
>You obviously weren't.

Sorry, little Jimmie, you didn't exist but I was already an adult
and working on HF fifty years ago. You were not there.

>Try writing plainly for a change.

The Cleveland Plain Dealer isn't hiring and they don't have
classes. :-)

>> >Yet Len insists on calling me a whole string of names he made up. He
>> >even went to the database to find out my last name. Is that the action
>> >of a mature individual whom we hams should look to for guidance,
>> >advice, and policy?
>>
>> Heavens no, Mr. Serious.
>
>Well, there you have it.

Yes, there we've had another Sermon on the Antenna Mount.

Ol' Marty L. had the right idea. Nailing up those theses on the Church Door was fun!

Amen.

2508. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 01:38:07 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030219203807.10560.00000018@mb-ma.aol.com>
Source record: 61587

In article <3E53A3A0.F0D0C082@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>You're becoming more peculiar, Brian.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, and Herr Robust holding to form, very official. :-)

Is this going to be another of your Crimes Against Ham-anity,
your worship? Has the Tribunal begun?

Gruss gott. <clik>

2509. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 01:38:08 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030219203808.10560.00000019@mb-ma.aol.com>
Source record: 61588

In article <20030219102025.25398.00000220@mb-cb.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Attilla the Ham) writes:

> This was your reply (I assume) to Dave's request that you prove where he >ever said anything about veteran's allegedly being the biggest group of folks >with thier hand's out.
>
> Please try and explain your logic here, and how did you get ANYthing from >this about vet's having "thier hand's out" over a couple of TVI chokes?

Tsk, tsk, tsk..."...thier hand's..."

Plurals do not require possessive punctuation.

Remember: E before I except over Cs. :-)

2510. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 01:38:09 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030219203809.10560.00000020@mb-ma.aol.com>
Source record: 61592

In article <c2356669.0302190928.4a593b47@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
>news:<BA787BD4.F253%stewart@say.net>...
>> "Bill, W7TI" wrote:
>>
>> > (snip) We have too many hams now with General
>> > and above who exhibit poor understanding of
>> > the basics of operating. (snip)
>>
>> Beyond what is required by the rules, there are no "basics of operating."
>> Most are simply conventions which evolve with time and technology.
>> Therefore, enforcing and/or teaching convention is not exactly high on the
>> FCC's agenda.
>
>I don't think conventions are what Bill's talking about, Dwight. I
>think he's more concerned with operating concepts that are covered by
>the rules, or by "good operating practice".

Gosh seer sir, since you know all these things you are
going to tell everyone what they really mean?

>Here's an example: working split on HF. It's common for DX stations to
>transmit and receive on different freqs, particularly when things get
>busy. This keeps the QRM off the DX station so it's easier for the
>pile to hear him. On 'phone, it's common for the DX to be outside the
>US phone band.

In present-day FCC regulations, there are NO specific
license exam question subjects, only a required total
number of questions per test element and a minimum
score of correct answers.

>Yet it's also common to hear US hams calling the DX on his
>transmitting frequency, even though the DX keeps announcing that he's
>listening elsewhere. If the US hams are using 'phone outside the US
>'phone band, that's a violation, but even if not, calling a DX station
>on his xmt freq while he's working split does nothing but add to the
>QRM. It's technically a rules violation because it deviates from good
>amateur practice, which is to operate in such a way as to minimize
>avoidable interference. The root cause is almost always clueless
>newbie syndrome.

In present-day FCC regulations, there are NO specific
license exam question subjects, only a required total

number of questions per test element and a minimum
score of correct answers.

>Another example of what Bill (and I) are concerned about is basic
>misunderstanding of certain aspects of the rules. For example, there
>are hams who think they have a right to use any repeater, in any way
>they see fit, regardless of the repeater owner's wishes. (There's a
>good editorial on this subject in the current 'Worldradio' mag). Of
>course FCC rules say just the opposite - the repeater licensee
>ultimately decides how a repeater is to be used, and bears the
>responsibility for it.
>
>
>The concern for all this stems from the fact that violations of the
>type described above are much more common today than technical
>violations.

Ooooo...is that a preview of coming sermons? "Things were
better when I was younger <harumphhh>!" go the BDOFs.

2511. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 01:45:43 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030219204543.08956.00000736@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 61593

from K4YZ:
>>> I wrote:
Please provide a sentence where "radio art" is used to mean non-technical
>>>achievement, from an unbiased source
>>
then K4YZ responded:
>> Vippy, this is an Amateur Radio NG, occupied by Radio Amateurs.

Thats good to know.

>> Any "reference" I provide is going to be ABOUT Amateurs from Amateur
>>Radio related sources.

Okay, but the definition of radio art does not depend on amateur radio. Radio amateurs, Hams, EEs, military, others may all use the term "radio art" and it will mean the same thing.

>> We are discussing (on occassion, anyway...) AMATEUR PRACTICE...Not
>>commercial, military or any other form of excitation of the ether.

<other snipped stuff>

>>> Therefore any reference to the use of the term "radio art" is going to
>be
>>as it is applied to Amateur Radio...NOT how the IEEE or any other source
>refers
>>to it.

There is no reason the definition of "radio art" should change for amateur practice.

> This newsgroup was created originally to discuss the US
> amateur radio license morse code test, to avoid over-
> burdening of rec.radio.amateur.misc newsgroup.

Morse code is one topic of policy. Policy may include other things besides Morse code.

2512. Re: After S25.5 Goes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 01:59:01 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hakq1o2.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 61594

On 19 Feb 2003 23:07:44 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:

> Thank you for the information on sound effects from cheapie
> PL-259 knock-off connectors. I only connect to UHF type
> connectors with adapters to other series. Type UHF went out
> a very long time ago in military, avionic, and commercial radio.
> Only amateurs and CBers seem to use those. :-)

We WERE talking about CB installations. Time to change the
between-the-ears filter?

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2513. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 01:59:02 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hakrso3.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 61595

On Wed, 19 Feb 2003 14:08:06 -0600, Dan/W4NTI wrote:

>Since you are interested in the history and traditions of Amateur Radio
>please accept these opinions from me.
>
>A W/K one by 2 or one by 3 at one time were considered 'prefered calls'.

Correction - the 1x2 was a "preferred" call. 1x3s were the
"regular" call signs issued until they started to run out in the
early '60s. Heck, when I was first licensed, my buddies were
getting the last of the W2s and I was "stuck" with a "non-preferred"
early K2. It's all relative.

I'm sure that at one time the 1x2 was a "regular" issue call sign.

>This all went out the door when the fcc got lazy and went to a whole bunch
>of new callsign blocks and refused to break into the new program and
>re-issue ANYTHING.

You are entitled to your opinion, of course, but it didn't take
into account the factual reason why the sequential call sign
system, as rigid as it was 'sposed to be, came about. It had
absolutely nothing to do with laziness and everything to do
with cleaning house and setting up safeguards after a call sign
selling scandal.

>
>That being said....from that point on (late 70s or so) a bunch of strange
>callsigns came about. Still having trouble with some of them...hi.

That's your problem, not the FCC's. Most of us don't have any
problem whatsoever recognizing "those" call signs as amateur call
signs.

>The concept of 'prefered calls' have been lost.

If that was true, the "vanity" program would not have found many
takers.

>Then the FCC in another stroke of insanity basically vacated the call
>districts that served a useful purpose.

It no longer served any useful purpose to the FCC and was therefore
relaxed. It still "lives" in the initial call sign assignment to a
new licensee, and one can still get a new "area" call sign when one
moves into another call sign area - it's a "check the box" option on
the modification application.

The relaxation that you decry was a very welcome move to those of us who wanted to retain our current call sign if or when moving from place to place.

You have my deepest sympathies if it makes your contesting or award-seeking more difficult.

>Basically what Im saying is its open season and I don't like it. But >neither do a lot of others, which means squat.

That's the bottom line, Dan.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2514. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 02:15:59 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0302191815.db4b44b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61596

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030219061144.25651.00000506@mb-fm.aol.com>...
> >Yes - it is my contention that the Novice ranks also contain
> >some of these "aces" as well... barefoot 13-year-old Puerto Rican
> >Novices.
>
> A bigoted and stereotyped analogy at that.
>

Don't be so quick to dismiss the great significance of the Puerto Rican Novice... a true statistical aberration, if there ever was one. Indeed, if you peruse the FCC database, you will not find any other State/Psuedostate of the Union where Novices actually outnumber Generals(no others even come CLOSE)... In fact the Ns outnumber the Gs almost 2 to 1 in PR - whereas it is typically about a 1 to 5 ratio in other other place. Nowhere else is the Novice Class so important as "down there - thataway".

I would not put it past the Puerto Ricans to attempt to secede from the Union if the government even considered eliminating the Novice Class license... but that is another Civil War analogy better left for another day.

- Stewart (KB0HED)

2515. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 03:04:48 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3E5445D0.71774F76@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 61597

N2EY wrote:

>
> Given factors 1 and 2, and possibly 3, it's more likely that the last
> Novice license will be gone from the database before the last
> Advanced.

If a novice bothers to renew, he is just as likely to go to the trouble (not a lot of trouble, though) to upgrade to tech with code or to general. Novices can't do much on the air, and any interested in staying hams will likely upgrade.

Advanced's are less likely to upgrade, as they only lack a few hundred KHz of sub bands to play in.

2516. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 03:09:10 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302191909.5448b921@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61598

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hakgbh1.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> On Tue, 18 Feb 2003 23:13:23 -0500, Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> >My hard copy arrived today. I mailed the ARRL renewal formback
> >to ARRL about 2/5/03. Not bad, total elapsed time from my
> >mailing to hardcopy was only 13 days.
>
> Could you have renewed on line instead?
>
> ---
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

Phil, I thought I heard on WLW last week that there's some idea of a bill that, concerning the filling out of government forms, that only the individual signing the form, or an attorney, is allowed to fill them out. I wonder where that would put tax preparers and VEC's if the "bill" should pass.

Have you heard any such noise?

2517. Re: Q: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 03:18:38 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3E54490D.F406C8DC@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 61599

>
> Yes, but don't let it get ya. As long as the call is not
> obscene/profane/indecent, go for it.
>

Well, the FCC has issued suffixes like "Tango India Tango",
"Kilo zero charlie kilo" (the zero looks like an "O"),
"kilo lima one tango", and such. Though I doubt that
they'll let you have x# fox-trot uniform kilo or charlie. :-)

2518. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 03:18:41 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302191918.52d72040@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61600

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E53A231.357CC0B8@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5121E0.42131FD4@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030216173704.14527.00000384@mb-cc.aol.com>...
> > > >
> > > > > --
> > > > >
> > > > > Think about how many stations you've heard on the air this weekend, all using
> > > > > CW. Consider that there are lots more out there you can't hear due to
> > > > > propagation, antenna limitations, etc. Also those you won't hear because
> > > > > they're mostly in hunt'n'pounce mode rather than calling CQ.
> > > > >
> > > > > Remember all those stations next time somebody says or writes that CW has no
> > > > > relevance in ham radio today, or that nobody uses it anymore.
>
> > > > Welp, if you say you can't hear a CW station, then you just shot down
> > > > the Morse Myth that CW always gets through.
> > >
> > > Those cans will work better if you plug them in.
> >
> > Tell Jim. He's the one making the claims.
>
> No, he did not jump to the conclusion you came to. Don't forget to turn
> the equipment on, Brian. That'll help too.

You conclude that "cans" are involved, yet none were mentioned. Now
you think Jim's radio isn't turned on. Why do you do that? You must
have needed the exercise.

> > > > As far as CW having no relevance, that's just not true. Lots of hams
> > > > enjoy using it.
> > >
> > > Please advise your friend Mr. Anderson.
> >
> > Mr. Anderson, "cans" work better if you plug them in. Hearing the
> > other station makes it much more fun and enjoyable.
>
> One simple request and you couldn't get it right.

So now unplugged cans makes it more enjoyable? Dave, give him the
message yourself.

> > > > The ARGUMENT is that a CW EXAM is no longer relavant. Give CW the
> > > > same exam that FM, SSB, RTTY, SSTV, FSTV, PACKET, PACTOR and PSK31
> > > > have.
> > > >
> > > That's AN argument.
> >
> > Yes, Dave, that's what I said it was.
>
> No, you said it was "the" argument.

It is around here.

> > Anything else you would like me to pass on to Len?
>
> No, you'd likely get it screwed up too.

Just like you to jump to conclusions.

2519. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 03:49:27 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9327E82D4DACCelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 61701

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in
news:f45722ac.0302191909.5448b921@posting.google.com:

> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hakgbh1.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
>> On Tue, 18 Feb 2003 23:13:23 -0500, Bill Sohl wrote:
>>
>> >My hard copy arrived today. I mailed the ARRL renewal formback
>> >to ARRL about 2/5/03. Not bad, total elapsed time from my mailing to
>> >hardcopy was only 13 days.
>>
>> Could you have renewed on line instead?
>>
>> ---
>> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
> Phil, I thought I heard on WLW last week that there's some idea of a
> bill that, concerning the filling out of government forms, that only
> the individual signing the form, or an attorney, is allowed to fill
> them out. I wonder where that would put tax preparers and VEC's if
> the "bill" should pass.
>
> Have you heard any such noise?
>

I hope not. I'm a patent agent, and such a bill would wipe me out too.

2520. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 04:12:11 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E54559B.50100@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 61709

And paying any attention to Larry and his holier-than-thou
attitude is a waste of your time. If you are an Extra class you
are an Extra class and as you probably don't have the
I-am-more-superion-than-you attitude Larry does, you will even be
a more superior Extra than Larry.

Larry TRoll K3LT wrote:
> In article <2mN4a.53666$Rx3.2151954@news1.west.cox.net>, "Aspiring Elmer"
> <elmer@nowhere.com> writes:
>
>
>>"Len Budney" <lbudney-google@nb.net> wrote in message
>>news:417b917a.0302190636.e464c20@posting.google.com...
>>
>>>Hello,
>>>
>>>I'm not a ham, but my parents are: AB2OA and AB2OB. I'd like to get
>>>the general opinion of the group about callsigns.
>>>
>>>Later this year I'll be getting my "nickle extra". Despite the lowly,
>>>dumbed down status of the Extra ticket today, I'm thinking about
>>>getting a 1x2 callsign. :-)
>>
>>Hey if you pass the current test for extra-- you are an extra period. Ignore
>>any comments about extra lite, etc
>
>
> Len:
>
> You've just been given bad advice. You ARE a "dumbed down Extra Lite" and
> have achieved your privileges under a licensing regime which is significantly
> reduced, compared to the one experienced by Pre-Restructuring Extras who were
> tested under a much more challenging and comprehensive set of requirements.
> Moreover, you have not been required to learn one of Amateur Radio's most
> practical, effective, efficient, and universal communications modes at a useful
> proficiency level (Morse/CW). You ARE an Extra Lite, and always will be, and
> you have the whining and complaining of lots of your fellow Extra Lites to
> thank for your newfound insignificance.
>
>
>>>But some questions come to mind:
>>>
>>>1. Any opinions about region? It seems like cheating to get a W3 call
>>>when I live in 2-land.

>>
>
> Yes, it is cheating. Get a call sign which properly reflects the Call Sign
> District in which you actually live.
>
>
>>Lots of folks do this as they can't get the desired prefix or suffix in
>>their area. So common as NOT TO WORRY
>
>
> Yes, I'd worry about it if I were you! These idiots with the out-of-district
> Vanity Call signs demonstrate nothing more than selfish self-interest and have
> no concern for how they appear to fellow amateurs on-the-air. It is just plain
> frustrating for a ham like myself, trying to complete a basic Worked All States
> award, to work a W2 and find out that he, like virtually every other W2 he's
> worked, has a QTH of Florida, Texas, or California! You can go a long way to
> reducing the personal impact of your dumbed-down Extra Lite status by at least
> choosing a proper call sign with the right District number.
>
>
>>>2. What about waiting times? The FCC enforces a two-year wait, but it
>>>feels a little tacky to ask for the call of a silent key who died only
>>>two years ago.
>>
>
>>He won't know
>
>
> If the SK ham's family hasn't bothered to claim that call sign within the
> two-year period, then it's there for the taking. If it's the call sign of a
> well-known ham in your local area, it would be simple courtesy to check with
> his club and/or family to make sure they have no plans to use it.
>
>
>>>3. Related to #2, is there a good way to find out about the previous
>>>owner, especially if he died several years ago? It seems respectful to
>>>at least get to know the fellow whose call you're inheriting.
>>
>>Once you get the new callsign -- check past Callbooks and ask a club near
>>where he lived. Asking relatives may get a little dicey.
>
>
> Asking relatives isn't the least bit dicey, and it would show proper respect
> for the deceased ham and his family to request their permission to use his
> call.
>
>
>>>4. Similarly to #3, it would seem like a nice idea to learn about the
>>>general status of the previous owner. If W2ZZ was the best-loved old
>>>fellow in all of 2-land, it doesn't seem like a great idea to go

>>>asking for his call. Thoughts?
>>
>
>>If you don't get it some one else will. Not to worry
>
>
> However, it would be better for you to show the simple courtesy of inquiring of
> his family first, especially if they have other hams in the family.
>
>
>>>5. Is getting a 1x2 call just begging for harassment? A large part of
>>>my interest in amateur radio is historical, so it seems like a natural
>>>move. Can folks comment, especially from a historical perspective, on
>>>the idea of getting a 1x2 or a 2x1 call, etc?
>>
>
>>Can't imagine someone harrassing you for a reassigned call. Ignore
>
>
> That much is true. However, your Extra-Lite status can be easily determined by
> a simple check of QRZ.com, so don't try to pass yourself off as anything other
> than the dumbed-down Extra Lite that you truly are. If you are more than, say,
> 15 years old, you've had plenty of time to become a licensed amateur and
> upgrade to Extra under the Pre-Restructuring rules, so you have no excuse for
> waiting until the code and theory testing requirements were dropped to their
> present inconsequential levels. You may think that it's "not your fault" that
> you are a dumbed-down Extra Lite, but it is simply a fact of your life now,
> brought upon you as a result of lazy, dumbed-down people who wanted amateur
> radio privileges without being required to make the effort to meet the
> licensing requirements under the more comprehensive standards in place prior to
> April 15, 2000.
>
>
>>While you are at it --- some suffixes are nice for CW -- others catchy on p
>>hone. N2NY for new York. K2L? your initails. Good luck on getting a call
>>with the suffix DX.
>
>
> The only problem with 1x2's is there will be much less to choose from as
> opposed to 2x1's or 2x2's. However, if I were a dumbed-down Extra Lite, I'd
> probably just stick with my present call in order not to look like I'm trying
> to pass myself off as something I'm not!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

2521. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 04:15:51 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030219231551.09946.00000016@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 61702

In article <2mN4a.53666$Rx3.2151954@news1.west.cox.net>, "Aspiring Elmer" <elmer@nowhere.com> writes:

>"Len Budney" <lbudney-google@nb.net> wrote in message
>news:417b917a.0302190636.e464c20@posting.google.com...
>> Hello,
>>
>> I'm not a ham, but my parents are: AB2OA and AB2OB. I'd like to get
>> the general opinion of the group about callsigns.
>>
>> Later this year I'll be getting my "nickle extra". Despite the lowly,
>> dumbed down status of the Extra ticket today, I'm thinking about
>> getting a 1x2 callsign. :-)
>
>Hey if you pass the current test for extra-- you are an extra period. Ignore
>any comments about extra lite, etc

Len:

You've just been given bad advice. You ARE a "dumbed down Extra Lite" and have achieved your privileges under a licensing regime which is significantly reduced, compared to the one experienced by Pre-Restructuring Extras who were tested under a much more challenging and comprehensive set of requirements. Moreover, you have not been required to learn one of Amateur Radio's most practical, effective, efficient, and universal communications modes at a useful proficiency level (Morse/CW). You ARE an Extra Lite, and always will be, and you have the whining and complaining of lots of your fellow Extra Lites to thank for your newfound insignificance.

>> But some questions come to mind:
>>
>> 1. Any opinions about region? It seems like cheating to get a W3 call
>> when I live in 2-land.

Yes, it is cheating. Get a call sign which properly reflects the Call Sign District in which you actually live.

>Lots of folks do this as they can't get the desired prefix or suffix in
>their area. So common as NOT TO WORRY

Yes, I'd worry about it if I were you! These idiots with the out-of-district Vanity Call signs demonstrate nothing more than selfish self-interest and have no concern for how they appear to fellow amateurs on-the-air. It is just plain frustrating for a ham like myself, trying to complete a basic Worked All States award, to work a W2 and find out that he, like virtually every other W2 he's worked, has a QTH of Florida, Texas, or California! You can go a long way to

reducing the personal impact of your dumbed-down Extra Lite status by at least choosing a proper call sign with the right District number.

>> 2. What about waiting times? The FCC enforces a two-year wait, but it
>> feels a little tacky to ask for the call of a silent key who died only
>> two years ago.

>He won't know

If the SK ham's family hasn't bothered to claim that call sign within the two-year period, then it's there for the taking. If it's the call sign of a well-known ham in your local area, it would be simple courtesy to check with his club and/or family to make sure they have no plans to use it.

>> 3. Related to #2, is there a good way to find out about the previous
>> owner, especially if he died several years ago? It seems respectful to
>> at least get to know the fellow whose call you're inheriting.
>Once you get the new callsign -- check past Callbooks and ask a club near
>where he lived. Asking relatives may get a little dicey.

Asking relatives isn't the least bit dicey, and it would show proper respect for the deceased ham and his family to request their permission to use his call.

>> 4. Similarly to #3, it would seem like a nice idea to learn about the
>> general status of the previous owner. If W2ZZ was the best-loved old
>> fellow in all of 2-land, it doesn't seem like a great idea to go
>> asking for his call. Thoughts?

>If you don't get it some one else will. Not to worry

However, it would be better for you to show the simple courtesy of inquiring of his family first, especially if they have other hams in the family.

>> 5. Is getting a 1x2 call just begging for harassment? A large part of
>> my interest in amateur radio is historical, so it seems like a natural
>> move. Can folks comment, especially from a historical perspective, on
>> the idea of getting a 1x2 or a 2x1 call, etc?

>Can't imagine someone harrassing you for a reassigned call. Ignore

That much is true. However, your Extra-Lite status can be easily determined by a simple check of QRZ.com, so don't try to pass yourself off as anything other than the dumbed-down Extra Lite that you truly are. If you are more than, say, 15 years old, you've had plenty of time to become a licensed amateur and upgrade to Extra under the Pre-Restructuring rules, so you have no excuse for waiting until the code and theory testing requirements were dropped to their present inconsequential levels. You may think that it's "not your fault" that you are a dumbed-down Extra Lite, but it is simply a fact of your life now, brought upon you as a result of lazy, dumbed-down people who wanted amateur radio privileges without being required to make the effort to meet the licensing requirements under the more comprehensive standards in place prior to April 15, 2000.

>While you are at it --- some suffixes are nice for CW -- others catchy on p
>hone. N2NY for new York. K2L? your initails. Good luck on getting a call
>with the suffix DX.

The only problem with 1x2's is there will be much less to choose from as opposed to 2x1's or 2x2's. However, if I were a dumbed-down Extra Lite, I'd probably just stick with my present call in order not to look like I'm trying to pass myself off as something I'm not!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2522. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 04:16:38 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hal1su7.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 61703

On 19 Feb 2003 19:09:10 -0800, Brian wrote:

>Phil, I thought I heard on WLW last week that there's some idea of a
>bill that, concerning the filling out of government forms, that only
>the individual signing the form, or an attorney, is allowed to fill
>them out. I wonder where that would put tax preparers and VEC's if
>the "bill" should pass.
>
>Have you heard any such noise?

Haven't heard. I'll check with a friend who is an EA.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2523. Re: Q: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 04:16:38 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hal23m8.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 61704

On Wed, 19 Feb 2003 22:18:38 -0500, Robert Casey wrote:

>> Yes, but don't let it get ya. As long as the call is not
>> obscene/profane/indecent, go for it.
>>
>
>Well, the FCC has issued suffixes like "Tango India Tango",
>"Kilo zero charlie kilo" (the zero looks like an "O"),
>"kilo lima one tango", and such. Though I doubt that
>they'll let you have x# fox-trot uniform kilo or charlie. :-)

If you approach those combos as obscene/profane/indecent, you
have bigger fixation problems than the choice of call sign.

The American fixation.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2524. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 05:00:10 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E54612B.331A2187@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61705

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <Nki4a.157130$be.141628@rwcrnsc53>, "Jackie"
> <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> writes:
>
> >"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20030217211127.03532.00000536@mb-cp.aol.com...
> >> In article <20030216173704.14527.00000384@mb-cc.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
> >(N2EY)
> >> writes:

>
> >While you might continue to insist that a REAL ham must worship at the altar
> >of CW so that others in the hobby might consider them worthy (which I still
> >don't get, since I've never heard anyone say such a thing on the air, but
> >ONLY off the air), the facts are out there if you bother to listen...
>
> I tried to point that out to the Merrie Morsemen in here,
> Jackie but all their master switches are in Off position.

I won't attempt to speak for others but I've certainly never made a
claim about "worshipping at the altar of CW" and I don't recall seeing
others write anything like that. It looks as if your "facts" are in
error.

> >Some ops may prefer one
> >mode, and some may work multiple modes.
>
> Ahem...there's only ONE acceptible mode to the Three
> Morseketeers in here, the one that shows Mastery of Radio.
> Can you guess what that mode might be? [the familiar
> acronym can also stand for "conventional wisdom." :-)]

You keep getting your "facts" tangled up, Leonard H. I've stated on
several occasions that I use CW about half the time. Steve made a
similar comment about his operation just recently. As we've seen over
just the past few weeks, you aren't a guy to let facts stand in the way
of a good rant.

> In this newsgroup it's a Very Different condition. The Three
> Morseketeers (and their aging bus driver buddy, Dartisgone)
> keep commanding "IT'S THE LAW!!!" as if they are authorized
> amateur kops. :-)

I can look out a window and see rain. When I tell you, "It's raining",
that is not a command, it is a statement based in fact. When I tell

you, "You must pass a 5 wpm morse test for HF amateur radio access", it
isn't a command. It is a statement based in fact.

> Remember the old mantra, "CW gets through when nothing else
> will?" :-) Dates from the 1930s and the official pages of QST.
> Morsemanship is EVERYTHING about the radio expert to them.

Now that's a statement NOT based in fact. You've made up your "facts".

>
> >I think that the key to the future of AR does not reside in any one mode,
> >but rather in the people who're attracted to it in the first place.
>
> The "attractiveness" has become less with age and the refusal
> of so many to adapt to change. Some of the BDOFs do a
> bad parody of the famous closing scene of the film "Sunset
> Boulevard" (Gloria Swanson announcing she is ready for her
> close-up).

Don't blame someone else that you allowed several decades of "interest"
in amateur radio to pass without acting on that "interest". Your
expectation that radio amateurs should change for you is significant.

> >With
> >some exceptions (and there are always exceptions), the type of people that
> >are attracted to this hobby are technically oriented and fascinated by
> >technical/scientific stuff that the general public finds mostly
> >undecipherable, and therefore many (if not most) of us who're initially
> >interested are plenty capable of keeping this hobby alive via the sheer
> >force of our curiosity and willingness to experiment.
>
> Ahem. One of the Three Morseketeers has already Given
> Orders (!) in here that interest-in-radio MUST be shown by
> a grant of an amateur radio license! No arguments allowed!

You aren't interested in becoming a ham, Len. Your interest is in
posting lengthy rants here.

> >If you've got an amateur radio license, use the privileges you have and have
> >maximum fun with them. Don't let the jackass know-it-alls tell you what is
> >fun.
>
> As you might have noticed, I do NOT let the jackass braying of
> the morseketeers "telling me what is fun!" :-) :-) :-)

No, you don't. You are too busy attempting to out-bray them and are far
too busy here to be involved in amateur radio.

> >I've got my HF privileges and rig set up now, but I
> >still can't wait to get a 6 meter SSB transceiver and try out the "Magic
> >Band" before the sunspots disappear. A new Tech licensee can do this from
> >the get-go, no code required.
>

> That's nice. :-) I have a little familiarity with VHF...and UHF...
> and the microwave region...and MF...and LF...and VLF.
>
> But, I MUST take a code test to "get on HF legally" (in the
> ham bands) because "It's the LAW!" Haw.

Laugh, Len. At this time, it is the only way into HF amateur radio.

> >Life's too short to not have as much fun as
> >you can in your hobbies of choice.

>
> One of the Three Morseketeers keeps insisting I must
> (no, MUST, all-caps imperative) take a morse test for an
> amateur radio license to properly show my "interest in
> radio!" That after a bit more than half a century of
> involvement professionally and militarily and avocationally
> as a technical hobbyist. :-)

All this time and you still misunderstand. You have to pass a morse test and one or more written exams in order to become a radio amateur with HF privileges. A half century of commercial or governmental electronics, or of plumbing or of baking bread don't count toward an amateur radio license. Until you pass an exam for an amateur radio license, you are simply a spectator.

Dave K8MN

2525. Re: New Field Day Entry Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 05:03:22 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E5461FC.9B8680E1@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61706

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E528806.166FE13D@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >> Please keep to the program.
> >
> >I've been with the program for nearly forty years. You're still making
> >up your mind.
>
> Which means you are past re-runs and past syndication?
>
> :-)

No, it means I'm in and you're still talking about "GETTING INTO amateur
radio".

Dave K8MN

2526. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 05:06:00 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E54629A.D484A704@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61707

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <c2356669.0302180920.6d0ef744@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> (N2EY) writes:
>
> >"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> >news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hah4ji9.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> >> On 17 Feb 2003 17:53:32 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:

> >Anybody can comment, propose rule changes, etc., not just hams.
> >However, it is a mystery why an individual who has never held an
> >amateur license and obviously has little interest in getting one is so
> >interested in changing the rules.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk, it's a mystery to me why someone who is an
> amateur will hide his profession. :-)
>
> Must be some schizoid fantasy thing going around... :-)

Your method of "civil debate" is well documented.

Dave K8MN

2527. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 05:07:09 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E5462DF.785B79D2@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61708

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20030216102315.03444.00000169@mb-mb.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Attilla
> the Ham) writes:
>
> > Never once did I take any "flak" over BEING a "Novice".
>
> That's because you've never been anything but a novice in
> human interrelations. :-)

I'd add a "smiley" too if I were you, Len. You're a real charmer.

Dave K8MN

2528. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 05:19:59 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E5465D0.DF4AA0B9@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61710

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E528D5D.1886246A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <3E5141FB.3E185308@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >> >>
> >> >> In article <v50k145bv3ppe1@corp.supernews.com>, "KB9TMP"
> ><kb9tmp@juno.com>
> >> >> writes:
> >> >>
> >> >> >"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
> >> >> >news:20030216185049.10587.00000315@mb-bk.aol.com...
> >> >> >> From: "KB9TMP"
> >> >
> >> >> >> I don't want to learn the code, okay?
> >> >> >
> >> >> >I didn't WANT to either but I did because that is the requirement!
> >> >>
> >> >> Following orders like a good little soldier? :-)
> >> >
> >> >Didn't you follow orders when you were a little soldier?
> >>
> >> Amateur radio is NOT a military unit or auxilliary.
> >
> >Good. I didn't write that it was. I asked if you followed orders when
> >you were a little soldier?
>
> I never answered you. You don't deserve an answer. :-)
>
> I was adult size in the US Army, not "little." :-)

Then why is someone who tackles learning the code and who passes the
morse exam a "good little soldier" to you?

> Prove I did NOT follow orders. Begin with NARA.

I don't care if you followed orders or not. I'm sure you followed
orders like a "good little soldier".

> >No one can obtain an HF access as a radio amateur without passing the
> >little five word per minute morse exam.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. I had HF access just three months ago from
> a moored 35-footer in a Ventura, CA, marina. Nice little
> SGC 2020 (made in the USA). No amateur radio license
> required. In fact, an amateur radio license would not be
> authorization at that particular frequency, even with alleged
> State Department control! :-)

Duh! We're aren't talking of a service other than amateur radio. You
may have found your niche, your HF outlet. Have a blast.

> >You've "argued". The current regs set a 5 wpm code test for HF access.
>
> Yes, yes, your extreme Robustness. No one is arguing
> breaking any law. The talk is about CHANGING THE LAW.

I didn't write anything about breaking any law so it is nice to see you
not arguing something no one wrote.

> Hello? Are you still doing a bad Otto Preminger imitation?

Hello? Are you still picking your nose?
>
> >No discussions have been stopped. I've not attempted to stop such
> >discussions, Foghorn.
>
> You couldn't, not even with a blaring foghorn. :-)

Ummmm, you ARE the blaring Foghorn.

> >It is certainly a subject. You told us you were going for it.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. Jimmie Miccolis said I "make frequent errors."

This wasn't an error. This was your cockiness writing checks that your
body couldn't cash.

> Don't you want to use that to damn me? :-)

We can just add it to the list.

> You PCTAs are an uncommunicative bunch who lack
> steerage way and a compass needle. :-)

Uncommunicative? You've been communicated to beat the band, Leonard.

> >That's right, Windy. The regulation sets the requirement. What is it
> >about that you don't understand?
>
> What is it about free speech and talking about changing laws
> that YOU don't understand, Herr Robust?

Not a single thing. You've had your say. My freedom of speech starts
when I call your ideas silly.

> You've either forgotten some US Constitution amendments or
> can't understand them. <shrug>

You seem to believe that freedom of speech extends only to yourself. If everyone would just agree with you, all would be peachy. You pretend to be all about "civil debate" in discussing an end to morse testing but you'd like us to forget that you want to see a minimum age for an amateur radio license. We're supposed to forget all your incivility. You reap what you sow.

Maybe you can be a part of the amateur radio "auxilliary".

Dave K8MN

2529. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 05:32:34 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E5468C3.4AE9D3D3@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61711

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <c2356669.0302180947.69df98fd@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> (N2EY) writes:
>
> >Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >news:<3E4E68EA.8FC821B7@earthlink.net>...
> >> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >> >
> >> > In article <3E4C5F89.6049AC04@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> > writes:

> > >But Len keeps quoting me as saying Amazon was/is "bankrupt". Just
> > >another of his untruths.
> >
> > My apologies, parson. I was equating mental and emotional
> > bankruptcy toward ARRL criticsm with financial bankruptcy
> > of a real business. :-)

No apologies despite the fact that you've stated yet another untruth any
number of times. You do that frequently.

> >> I've asked before but you didn't respond, what is "overly proud"?
> > >
> > >Any mention of any accomplishment by those who disagree with Len.
> >
> > When the parson receives a Nobel Prize, I will cheer him.
> > :-)

...but you didn't address the statement.

>
> >Because it removes a whole line of possible insults from Len's NG ammo
> >case.
>
> Translation: FEAR. :-)

No translation by you needed. Jim has observed the games you play over
employment/employers of anyone who disagrees with you. Why would he
subject himself to it?

> >> Why the silly names like "Reverend Jimmie"?
> > >
> > >Avoids addressing the actual issue. Also, an attempt to get me to
> > >reply in kind.

>
> Those who act like prissy pedantic parsons get what
> they deserve. :-)

And you, Foghorn Lenhorn, get what you deserve.

> >Because keeping the location undisclosed removes a whole line of
> >possible insults from Len's NG ammo case.
>
> Translation: Fear of the unknown. :-)

I'd guess that he has no desire to subject himself to your slurs and
falsehoods. Don't let that stop you though, Len. You've never let a
shortage of facts stop you from making up material about others.

> >Len wants to minimize the fact that I have electrical engineering
> >degrees from major universities (Penn and Drexel, right here in
> >Philly) and that I have designed and built much of my own ham
> >equipment in my 35 years as a ham. Nowhere have I claimed to have
> >designed and built all of it. That's just another of Len's misquotes.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk..."much" is the new morph of the original "all."
>
> Let's grab the chassis punches and design another one!
> :-)

You must never tire of being made to look like a fool, Len. You want
the Google archived posts on this one?

> >Direct insult in an attempt to get me to reply in kind.
>
> "Brain dead old fart" is a phrase used by Jim Kehler, KH2D
> (a definitive PCTA) over five years ago and still being used
> by him on his website. :-)

You're no Jim Kehler. Besides, you're the oldest guy here. If anyone
deserves the crown, it is you.

Dave K8MN

2530. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 05:53:32 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E546DAE.C21DE326@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61712

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E53A231.357CC0B8@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5121E0.42131FD4@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030216173704.14527.00000384@mb-cc.aol.com>...
> > > > >
> > > > > > --
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Think about how many stations you've heard on the air this weekend, all using
> > > > > > CW. Consider that there are lots more out there you can't hear due to
> > > > > > propagation, antenna limitations, etc. Also those you won't hear because
> > > > > > they're mostly in hunt'n'pounce mode rather than calling CQ.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Remember all those stations next time somebody says or writes that CW has no
> > > > > > relevance in ham radio today, or that nobody uses it anymore.
> > >
> > > > > Welp, if you say you can't hear a CW station, then you just shot down
> > > > > the Morse Myth that CW always gets through.
> > > > >
> > > > Those cans will work better if you plug them in.
> > > >
> > > Tell Jim. He's the one making the claims.
> > >
> > No, he did not jump to the conclusion you came to. Don't forget to turn
> > the equipment on, Brian. That'll help too.
>
> You conclude that "cans" are involved, yet none were mentioned. Now
> you think Jim's radio isn't turned on. Why do you do that? You must
> have needed the exercise.

I can see how you'd have trouble with a sentence containing ",Brian".

> > > > > As far as CW having no relevance, that's just not true. Lots of hams
> > > > > enjoy using it.
> > > > >
> > > > Please advise your friend Mr. Anderson.
> > > >
> > > Mr. Anderson, "cans" work better if you plug them in. Hearing the

> > > other station makes it much more fun and enjoyable.
> >
> > One simple request and you couldn't get it right.
>
> So now unplugged cans makes it more enjoyable? Dave, give him the
> message yourself.

I thought maybe you were up to the task. I was wrong.

> > > > > The ARGUMENT is that a CW EXAM is no longer relavant. Give CW the
> > > > > same exam that FM, SSB, RTTY, SSTV, FSTV, PACKET, PACTOR and PSK31
> > > > > have.
> > > > >
> > > > That's AN argument.
> > >
> > > Yes, Dave, that's what I said it was.
> >
> > No, you said it was "the" argument.
>
> It is around here.

We're not all at your house.

> > > Anything else you would like me to pass on to Len?
> >
> > No, you'd likely get it screwed up too.
>
> Just like you to jump to conclusions.

You mean like your thinking that I was addressing Jim in a statement
that ended ", Brian"?

Dave K8MN

2531. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 06:00:35 UTC
From: Jackie <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com>
Message-ID: <7a_4a.185305$be.172770@rwcrnsc53>
Source record: 61713

Self-appointed alpha RF technophile, master of the non-sequitur and abuser of innocent emoticons, Mr. "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message news:20030219180742.24452.00000015@mb-fw.aol.com...

> >Despite your ardent insistence to the contrary, Len, there is no "one" mode
> >of communication that epitomizes amateur radio. That's one of the things
> >that makes it interesting.
>
> Not in here... :-)

I actually listen to my radio to get an idea of what is interesting about AR. I don't use this NG as an example of what I was talking about because it is not AR, it's people talking about AR.

> Really? :-) "Weird noises?" Oh, my, you mean there are
> real "weird noises" out there? I haven't heard any "weird noises"
> for a long time since I can identify all of them as various modes
> carrying information.

I hope you didn't hurt your shoulder when you reached around to pat yourself on the back there, Len. I am sure these noises mean something to you, but being new to this myself, I am not currently aware of what information these noises carry. But I'm impressed that you are secure enough in your knowledge that you feel the need to point out a rather obvious fact without actually bothering to teach something at the same time. I would head down to my local community college to sign up for a course in Electronic Beep- and Boop-ology so that I could find out what all those weird noises are caused by, but it's really not that important to me right now. Kinda like not everyone who is interested in what causes migraines wants to become a neurologist.

> Ahem...there's only ONE acceptible mode to the Three
> Morseketeers in here

"Three Morseketeers"... clever. Is that original?

> I keep trying to point that out in here and the Three
> Morseketeers shout, holler, weep, and wave their sword
> hilts around when not waving their morsemanship plumes.

Do they really bother you that much, Len? If so, why? They cannot possibly interfere with your enjoyment of amateur radio, since you're not even licensed. Why do you let them bother you so? I thought you were superior to them by virtue of your being the self-appointed alpha RF technophile of the group, beyond and above anything the Morse users or other AR types could affront you with! Good lord, man, why don't you quit while you're ahead!

> Ah, yes, good old "international LAW." :-)

If you don't want to abide by the AR rules because you think they are foolish, that's your choice.

> Tsk, tsk, tsk.

Your tsk-tsking reminds me of my great aunt. She always did that clucking-hen thing whenever she disapproved of what people did. Sadly, my whole family hated her.

>What MIGHT be discussed in June in Geneva
> (WRC-03) is a total rewrite of all of S25, not just S25.5. Don't
> bank anything on that, it is a minor matter as far as ALL of
> this world's radio. Many, many, many items of non-amateur
> radio to take up by the administrations in summer Switzerland.

Fine, but I don't really care one way or the other what happens to the Morse test. Let it stay, let it go.

> What be this "vindication?"

Why, Len, you're being coy. It's so *cute* when you do that! Of course, the vindication I'm talking about is seeing come to pass that one issue that you so ardently try to advance in this very newsgroup. That thorn in your side. I won't bother to repeat it, for you've beaten it so far into the ground that it must be feeling hot by virtue of its being so close to the Earth's molten core by now.

>> In FCC 90-53 the FCC stated that
> it didn't consider a morse code test to be worthwhile for its
> task on determining any amateur applicant's qualifications for
> an amateur radio license. That was in 1990. 13 years ago.
> FCC said it again in NPRM 98-143. 5 years ago. The IARU
> took a position against the morse code test nearly 2 years ago.
> ARRL still hasn't made up its mind, won't take a stand either
> way (they say the speak for all US amateurs).

The ARRL does not nearly compromise all US amateurs, but they still have the loudest voice of any AR organization in the US. The content of the voices of its combined members is what is important.

> How soon is the "soon" you mention? :-)

Dunno. Who's waiting with baited breath for the outcome of the meetings in the Alps? Some prospective amateurs might be looking towards the outcome of this summer's convention and waiting for the Morse test to finally be pronounced DOA before they jump into the fray, but I'm more concerned about loss of frequency privileges to commercial interests myself.

> Remember the old mantra, "CW gets through when nothing else
> will?" :-) Dates from the 1930s and the official pages of QST.

I wasn't around in the 1930's. I was sixty years away from being born, in fact.

Seems like common sense to me that good radio operation and amateur practice comes with the attitude and skill of the operator, and not the modes in which they choose to work. I will maintain that it should not matter if you choose to work strictly CW or not, or whether you choose to use a mixed bag when communicating. Even Extra class ops can and do key out the f-word over and over again while jamming other people's conversations. Like that takes a lot of skill.

> >That certainly won't happen.

> Not a good statement. Nobody knows what will happen, despite
> what the Three Morseketeers "knowing what will happen."

Not a good statement? I said that outlawing CW won't happen. Who is going to outlaw the use of CW? Read what I wrote again.

> Is that like the Churchillian (?) statement "up with which I will
> not put?" :-)

I'm glad that at least your emoticons find your non-sequiturs amusing.

> The "attractiveness" has become less with age and the refusal
> of so many to adapt to change.

I was not around in 1930, Len, but I think there've been plenty of changes in amateur radio since then. You are perenially p.o.'d because they still make people take the Morse test to get a higher class license. Seems that this, and ONLY this issue is the one that keeps you away from the AR ranks. Otherwise, I could not imagine why you would spend so much time harping about the horrid CW on a newsgroup. If this ONE change were instituted in amateur radio, would you "all of a sudden" find it a useful and wonderful place to be? Gee, I'd hate to hinge all of my decisions to do or not do something on account of one particular point I didn't agree with.

Or maybe you really do get your jollies out of lording some imagined alpha-RF technophile status over us. I don't know.

> Some of the BDOFs do a
> bad parody of the famous closing scene of the film "Sunset
> Boulevard" (Gloria Swanson announcing she is ready for her
> close-up).

<whiplash segue>

... what??

> Ahem. One of the Three Morseketeers has already Given
> Orders (!) in here that interest-in-radio MUST be shown by
> a grant of an amateur radio license! No arguments allowed!

Well! In that case, I guess I'll send my license back to the FCC with the word "CANCEL" written over the face of it in LARGE BLACK LETTERS! As BLACK as those helicopters that are often found hovering over your abode, Len!!

> [must be some addictive property of cashew nuts...]

Here's a little-known fact! Did you know that cashew shells are poisonous?

(I can do whiplash conversational segues, too.)

> Like SSB? First "fruit" in wireline long-distance telephony? :-)

I think that Mr. Bell's invention beat it by at least four decades.

> Except for PSK31, innovated by G3PLX, a clever Brit who has
> not hesitated to innovate since the 1970s, all those "new digital
> modes" were born and borne in the commercial world of radio.
> Spread spectrum was given its impetus by the militaries.
>
> The inventiveness and innovations of Japanese electronics gave
> rise to the "state of the amateur art" in HF, VHF, and UHF ham
> equipment. That's shown by the history of hamvertising in the
> official periodicals of ARRL.
>
> A singular, elegant new innovation is the "Tayloe detector" by
> Dan Tayloe. Only a terribly small percentage of today's US
> radio amateurs would recognize it in its original form, a
> switched commutating filter using a low-On-resistance, low-
> noise CMOS IC. Dan Tayloe saw it where hardly anyone did
> and got a US patent on it as a mixer. Well-deserved patent
> grant but all the "ham experts" seem to recognize is that it
> makes a neat QRP rig. :-)

You are preaching to the choir, Len. While I will be the first to admit that I am not familiar with all of these innovations (yet), the above are perfect examples of the very innovations in AR I pointed out.

> Gosh! Really? How about the Corpse of Morseketeers who
> should "It's a SERVICE!" while waving their morsekets? :-)

Who cares?

> As you might have noticed, I do NOT let the jackass braying of
> the morseketeers "telling me what is fun!" :-) :-) :-)

From the frequency and ardency with which you do so, I am forced to conclude that "fun" for you must consist mostly of writing smug retorts and non-sequiturs to your perceived AR persecutors, followed by smiley emoticons ad nauseum.

> Oh, and I've had a commercial (first class, one test) license
> since 1956...47 years ago. That certificate sits in a safety
> deposit box since it isn't needed in retirement.

Oh! Damn! That hurt...

<Cue to slighty morose, violin-tinged music; Jackie slinks to her corner, wounded but only momentarily defeated>

<Cue dramatic, Oscar-worthy scream, "I AM NOT AN ANIMAL, I AM AN AMATEUR!">

Cripes, Len, get a grip. I'm not a professional radio engineer, nor do I aspire to be one. But that does not make me inferior to you. I don't care where or when you got your commercial license. I am just a little stumped as to why you feel above taking a simple test to receive an amateur license, despite the fact that everyone else, no matter how much they know, has to do the exact same thing.

Are you better than the rest of us, Len? Really, tell me what you think.

> One or the other of the Three Morseketeers keep reminding me that "it
isn't
> lawful for the amateur bands" over and over and over and over
> and over and over again. [gotta love it! :-)]

They really burn your butt, don't they.

> >As a human being that has reached adulthood, YOU get to decide what is
> >fun about your hobbies.
>
> I sort of came to that conclusion some time ago.... :-)

I still have a hard time seeing what's so "fun" about picking on people who have no sense of the future and whose attitudes run counter to yours. Cheap and easy targets, don't you think?

> That's nice. :-) I have a little familiarity with VHF...and UHF...
> and the microwave region...and MF...and LF...and VLF.

Since being on this newsgroup, I have a familiarity with BFM! *

> But, I MUST take a code test to "get on HF legally" (in the
> ham bands) because "It's the LAW!" Haw.

Haw! Sure you do! Just like I did. If it's important to you, you'll do it. Otherwise, you'll just sit in your pen and bray at the folks that're on the other side of the fence, where you wish you were. Oop! Damn, forgive me. In the world according to Len, WE are the ones who are inside the "pen", and Len exists OUTSIDE of it.

> Er, I don't think the Three Morseketeers and Dartisgone
> allow "fun" on a personal choice. All must do Their kind
> of "fun" or it is not "fun!" "It's a SERVICE!" "CW gets
> through when nothing else will!" Etc., etc., etc. :-)

They don't tell me what to do.

> One of the Three Morseketeers keeps insisting I must
> (no, MUST, all-caps imperative) take a morse test for an
> amateur radio license to properly show my "interest in
> radio!" That after a bit more than half a century of
> involvement professionally and militarily and avocationally
> as a technical hobbyist. :-)

That's just great, Len. Your half-century (no, HALF-CENTURY, all-caps imperative) experience in the technical aspects of RF technology are duly

noted. Now, I am very sure that you know a LOT more about radio than I do. I will not CLAIM to know more about radio than you do. However, this is a hobby/service (BOTH!) which has rules for obtaining a license. No one gets away with obtaining a license without abiding by the requirements for licensure and the rules; not even RF techs who know a LOT about radio, such as yourself. Brain surgeons, astronauts and other highly proficient technical types still have to abide by those rules. MENSA members would have to pass the same tests I did to get the privileges I have, Len. Now, I ask you, in all seriousness, what is it, BESIDES your smug refusal that you should be exempt from the rules that the rest of us must abide by, that keeps you out of amateur radio?

So far, all I can deduce from the substance of your postings is that you don't want to follow the rules to get an AR license, because you feel that the skills you amassed over many years should be enough to allow you to slide through to a hobby without doing what everyone else has to do to get into it. True?

Jackie

* you have to ask?

2532. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 06:11:10 UTC
From: Jackie <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com>
Message-ID: <2k_4a.185429$be.174499@rwcrnsc53>
Source record: 61714

> I wasn't around in the 1930's. I was sixty years

Hehe, make that "30". I wasn't born yesterday, you know.

Jackie

2533. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 07:10:35 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030220021035.29944.00000027@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 61716

In article <2k_4a.185429$be.174499@rwcrnsc53>, "Jackie"
<buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> writes:

>> I wasn't around in the 1930's. I was sixty years
>
>Hehe, make that "30". I wasn't born yesterday, you know.

Judy Holliday was...but that's for another newsgroup.

This one is all about TNSG, CAP, State Department,
Bill Clinton and his dresses, and whose shirts are
stuffed the most, whose ego balloons are inflated
largest and more. :-)

Oh, yeah, and what the others say often -

"It's the LAW!" Right. Laws in force now cannot ever
be changed, cannot be talked about (absolutely never
by those without official authorized licenses!). Yup.

:-)

2534. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 07:10:36 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030220021036.29944.00000028@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 61718

In article <3E54612B.331A2187@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <Nki4a.157130$be.141628@rwcrnsc53>, "Jackie"
>> <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> writes:
>>
>> >"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>> >news:20030217211127.03532.00000536@mb-cp.aol.com...
>> >> In article <20030216173704.14527.00000384@mb-cc.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>> >(N2EY)
>> >> writes:
>
>>
>> >While you might continue to insist that a REAL ham must worship at the
>altar
>> >of CW so that others in the hobby might consider them worthy (which I
>still
>> >don't get, since I've never heard anyone say such a thing on the air, but
>> >ONLY off the air), the facts are out there if you bother to listen...
>>
>> I tried to point that out to the Merrie Morsemen in here,
>> Jackie but all their master switches are in Off position.
>
>I won't attempt to speak for others but I've certainly never made a
>claim about "worshipping at the altar of CW" and I don't recall seeing
>others write anything like that. It looks as if your "facts" are in
>error.

Geez, will you Three Morseketeers make up your collective
mind? :-)

To the Morseketeers everything negative said about morse
code is an "error" while everything positive is "fact?" Of
course. It must be the New Math or something... :-)

>You keep getting your "facts" tangled up, Leonard H. I've stated on
>several occasions that I use CW about half the time. Steve made a
>similar comment about his operation just recently. As we've seen over
>just the past few weeks, you aren't a guy to let facts stand in the way
>of a good rant.

:-) Did you just raise the rant, lendlord? :-)

>I can look out a window and see rain.

Goodie, you have some eyesight. But, what if its just a
lawn sprinkler set on high? :-)

>When I tell you, "It's raining",
>that is not a command, it is a statement based in fact.

Of course. You will also say "the sky is blue, the grass is
green" and other colorful statements of fact while red in
the face. Go for it.

>When I tell
>you, "You must pass a 5 wpm morse test for HF amateur radio access", it
>isn't a command. It is a statement based in fact.

Ooooo! How about that?

Why MUST I pass a test at all? I was ON HF first a half
century ago...no "test" needed then...and I was perfectly
legal. [how about that?]

Now let's see what you can do with that thread opening... :-)

>Now that's a statement NOT based in fact. You've made up your "facts".

Ooooo. I'd call it satire or parody or just having fun unstuffing
some shirts, hearing ego balloons pop from a small needle.

>Don't blame someone else that you allowed several decades of "interest"
>in amateur radio to pass without acting on that "interest".

I have interest in my bank, too, but don't want to become a
banker. There, two facts, absolute truth. :-)

>Your
>expectation that radio amateurs should change for you is significant.

Would I expect the Three Morseketeers (and Dartisgone)
to "change?!?!?" Oh, my, no...not in a millennia....nobody
can tell them anything! :-)

>You aren't interested in becoming a ham, Len.

Ham is the butchered meat of swine. I don't want to be that.
:-)

I might, sometime, take an amateur radio test and change
from professional to amateur. Might be fun.

But, I've never been interested in jumping through hoops on
command of a bunch of control freaks who demand
dedication and committment to be shown to those freaks.

FCC writes radio regulations, not the ham control freaks.
I can argue federal regulations civilly, no problem. Problem
is all these stuffed shirts and ego balloons who think they
are such noble, splendid, role models who want to keep
things their way. <shrug>

>No, you don't. You are too busy attempting to out-bray them and are far
>too busy here to be involved in amateur radio.

Poor baby. Get both of your balloons popped?

>Laugh, Len. At this time, it is the only way into HF amateur radio.

Oooooo! "It's the LAW!" Ooooo!

>All this time and you still misunderstand. You have to pass a morse
>test and one or more written exams in order to become a radio amateur
>with HF privileges.

No kidding?

>A half century of commercial or governmental
>electronics, or of plumbing or of baking bread don't count toward an
>amateur radio license.

Oh? I'm just talking about regulations...and unstuffing some
shirts, popping balloons.

Did you know that amateur radio regulations can be CHANGED?

Really. "It's the LAW!" :-)

>Until you pass an exam for an amateur radio
>license, you are simply a spectator.

Okay. I'll look out the window for rain.

Nope. No rain. That's a fact!

<pop...pop...>

2535. Re: After S25.5 Goes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 07:10:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030220021037.29944.00000030@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 61715

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hakq1o2.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

> We WERE talking about CB installations. Time to change the
> between-the-ears filter?

Were "we?" CB? :-)

Isn't this an amateur radio newsgroup? :-)

2536. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 07:10:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030220021037.29944.00000029@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 61717

In article <f45722ac.0302191918.52d72040@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> > Anything else you would like me to pass on to Len?
>>
>> No, you'd likely get it screwed up too.
>
>Just like you to jump to conclusions.

Pssst...mention the cashews... :-)

2537. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 07:35:28 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030220023528.14846.00000448@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 61719

>Subject: Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran
>From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart)
>Date: 2/19/03 8:15 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <5f4fe4c2.0302191815.db4b44b@posting.google.com>

>Don't be so quick to dismiss the great significance of the Puerto
>Rican Novice... a true statistical aberration, if there ever was one.
>Indeed, if you peruse the FCC database, you will not find any other
>State/Psuedostate of the Union where Novices actually outnumber
>Generals(no others even come CLOSE)... In fact the Ns outnumber the Gs
>almost 2 to 1 in PR - whereas it is typically about a 1 to 5 ratio in
>other other place. Nowhere else is the Novice Class so important as
>"down there - thataway".

And I reiterate my point vis-a-vis school projects, etc.

By April 14, 2010 those licenses will go ker-plop. fall off the database,
most of which, I am willing to be, were never "consumated" by an on-the-air
contact...

Steve, K4YZ

2538. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 07:39:18 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030220023918.14846.00000449@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 61720

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/19/03 7:38 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030219203806.10560.00000016@mb-ma.aol.com>

>>And you have used "nocwtest", "lenof21", "averyfine", "averyfineman"
>>and "lenover21" to post to this newgroup over the past 5 years.
>
>You betcha, parson. Got more screen names you haven't seen!

Oh, I am sure we've seen them...Eh, MegHz?

Steve, K4YZ

2539. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 07:49:11 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030220024911.25398.00000248@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 61721

>Subject: Re: Callsign etiquette?
>From: "Bill, W7TI" jamspam@upyours.now
>Date: 2/19/03 2:41 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <Xns9327812F65D0Dpookster@216.168.3.50>

>I'm trying to think of a useful purpose that served.

Let's start with having a ballpark idea where the other station is without having to go to the trouble of waiting for him to tell the other guy (or you) where he is. Once upon a time, if I worked, let's say a SEVEN...I had a pretty good chance of knowing he WASN'T in California...Unless of course he was signing "/6" or said "portable Six".

>If ham call signs
>had been issued without regard to district from day one what would have
>been the harm?

See above. Although certainly not enacted for our benefit, it was a tool for enforcement. Now, it's completely useless.

>That's what's happening now, in effect, and ham radio
>goes on just fine it appears. Where am I wrong?

Yes...it goes on...but it would be a bit more orderly if it were left the way it was.

Steve. K4YZ

2540. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 07:53:12 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030220025312.25398.00000249@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 61722

>Subject: Re: Callsign etiquette?
>From: "Bill, W7TI" jamspam@upyours.now
>Date: 2/19/03 6:59 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <Xns9327ACCF9AB97pookster@216.168.3.50>

>> 2. Provide a easy means of locating the station for the FCC
>> monitoring that actually used to go on.
>
>More nonsense. The bad guys, whom the FCC is really interested in, will
>not give their correct call or portable designator anyway, and besides,
>if it's a *real* call, all the FCC has to do is look it up in their
>database.

You're assuming, Bill, that "the bad guy" is intentionally operating
contrary to rules and regs. "Good guys" make mistakes too and occassionally
need the gentle hand of compliance guidance too.

>And of course, the FCC eventually abandoned the strict
>district system anyway since it proved to have little or no value.

I think this was more due to economics than it was any other reason.

73

Steve, K4YZ

2541. Re: Q: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 07:54:49 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030220025449.25398.00000250@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 61723

>Subject: Re: Q: Callsign etiquette?
>From: "Bill, W7TI" jamspam@upyours.now
>Date: 2/19/03 2:35 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <Xns9327800F438B7pookster@216.168.3.50>

>I used to add the /6 for ragchewing but gave it up as rather pointless
>since the FCC no longer requires it. I just say W7TI located in Southern
>California, and let 'em figure it out.

OK...I give up...what's the difference?

73

Steve, K4YZ

2542. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 07:59:27 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030220025927.25398.00000251@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 61724

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/19/03 5:07 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030219180751.24452.00000024@mb-fw.aol.com>

>You can't make any point so you use profanity and epithets

Oh. You mean you don't like being called a name?

You mean like "Reverend Callsign Jimmie"..???

Or "The Pendantic Parson"...???

Or "Atilla the Ham"...???

Or "Jacbooted Thug"...???

etc, etc etc...

Like those, Your Selfrighteousness???

Ya PUTZ ! ! !

2543. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 08:04:13 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030220030413.25398.00000252@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 61725

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/19/03 5:07 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030219180757.24452.00000032@mb-fw.aol.com>

>The phrase "state of the art" applies to nearly all crafts, technical
> fields, medical practice, etc., etc. It is common American
> English, widely used. You have absolutely no authority to
> redefine phrases to fit your disordered little picture of anything.

Hey Dr. Self Righteous...

When you get off this rant, the phrase "state-of-the-art" was not at the
center of the exchange.

Ya Putz.

2544. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 08:09:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030220030900.25398.00000253@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 61726

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/19/03 5:07 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030219180754.24452.00000027@mb-fw.aol.com>

>General Radiotelephone...was a First Class Radiotelephone,
> first obtained in 1956

The one you let "expire"...???

And what can you do with it RIGHT NOW, other than be compensated for your time, that I can't do with my Amateur Extra?

Would you like to know what I CAN do with my Amateur Extra that you CAN'T do with your GROL under ANY circumstances...?!?!

How's that Part 15 project coming along?

And still making "use" of 11 meters?

Steve, K4YZ

2545. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 08:12:45 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030220031245.25398.00000254@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 61727

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/19/03 5:07 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030219180755.24452.00000029@mb-fw.aol.com>

>> Is it your assertion that no one can learn more than one thing or be
>>proficient at more than one skill? or perhaps you mean no one BUT
>you...?!?!
>
> Absolutely NOTHING of radio technical knowledge is imparted
> by manual morse code training, sending, or receiving. NOTHING
> but morsemanship.

Do I need to spell the questions a bit slower, Lennie, so you can read
them correctly?

I did not ask if any "radio technical knowledge" was gained, but if Vippy
thought that it was not possible to learn more than one thing at a time.

Your silly responses didn't answer them, that's for sure.

Steve

2546. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 08:16:11 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030220031611.25398.00000255@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 61728

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/19/03 5:07 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030219180755.24452.00000028@mb-fw.aol.com>

>> I live in a world where I am proud to be serving in some capacity. My
>>"service" has, on more than one occassion, meant that someone went home
>alive
>>that might not have otherwise had that option had I and other like-minded
>>volunteers not been there.
>
> Oh, my, those high-sounding words and then he comes in
> here and throws it all away!!!

Oh?...All of those people died when I posted in here?

I doubt it.

>Yes to people that only want their picture taken in uniform,
> like the ones never smiling and showing teeth

Like the one's you were showing in the nose of the A-26?

>> You're a putz.
>
> Not at all. You might try not using Jewish-ethnic pejoratives.
> I know it will be a new experience for you, but try it anyway.

Why? You ARE a putz. No other "pejorative" fits.

Steve

2547. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 08:25:36 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030220032536.25398.00000256@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 61729

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/19/03 5:07 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030219180751.24452.00000023@mb-fw.aol.com>

>> No...They discuss military matters using CURRENT US Army manuals...The
>same
>>one's that pertain to the active Army, the Reserves AND the National Guard.
>
> Not current.

Oh? You've BEEN to Tennessee, stopped by the armory and checked the
shelves yourself?

And you didn't even stop in for coffee...What a putz.

>You are one sick person. Get help.

I am sure you'd like to think so, Lennie, but I suggest you look at how
many folks are making that same suggestion to you.

>> And I have "damned" only ONE veteran. That would be you. I still call
>>you a liar and a coward. That's MY right under the Freedom of Speech"

I reiterate the above.

>> I have not damned the Army, Lennie, and you are again tasked to provide
>>the quote wherein you say I did.

And again...still don't see where you provided the requested quote.

>> I DARE you to quote ONE sentence where I said ONE disrespectful thing
>>about those Men, Lennie. I am only sorry that a disgusting coward like you
>>can hide behind "Freedom of Speech" when you invoke their memory for your
>own
>>gain.

Still not taking the dare, Lennie?

Probably because you are still a liar and a coward.

>>I am not the one dishonoring those men, LennieH. You are. Every time
>>you recount their deaths so that you can hide behind them.

Still the truth. No changes there.

You woke up as a putz. Spent the day as a putz. And you'll go to bed as
a putz.

Must be a putz.

Steve, K4YZ

2548. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 08:42:16 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030220034216.25398.00000257@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 61730

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/19/03 5:07 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030219180753.24452.00000025@mb-fw.aol.com>

>Presidential Unit Citations and other honors have no specified
> "period."

ERROR WILL ROBINSON! ERROR!

When initially issued, the award will specify a period of time overwhich
the award was earned, or for what specific event the was issued.

>Once awarded they stay with the unit.

WITH the UNIT...The ONLY time the PERSON can "keep" the award as part of
his/her heraldry is when that person was a member of a unit that was awarded
the ribbon WHEN it was earned.

Now...Lennie...cough up the dates of those awards.

>> I read fine, Lennie. As for the adjective, I have asked you three
>>different ways to tell us from what day to what day the PUC's to which you
>>lay claim were awarded.
>
> Irrelevant for any amateur radio policy newsgroup.

So are your re-tellings of the ballad of the Fighting 71st, except, of
course, when it's biting you on the butt.

>A Presidential Unit Citation is not some "soldier of the month"
> thing. It is an honor bestowed on ALL members of the unit
> receiving the award.

IF they were a member of the unit during the period of time it was earned.

> False. The entire Battalion received both Presidential Unit
> Citations. We wore that proudly.

W-h-a-t w-e-r-e t-h-e a-w-a-r-d p-e-r-i-o-d-s...?!?!?!

>This is an amateur radio newsgroup...(SNIP)

Then what are YOU doing here? You are not an Amateur Radio operator.

>not a playground for
> deranged individuals with distinctive unit insignia.

You are the one ranting on about unit awards taht you won't specifiy the earned dates for, Lennie.

>For better mental health, contact your local psychiatrist and
> get treatment.

I might suggest the same for you, Lennie, in as much as you've demonstrated your penchant for pathological lying, profanity in a public forum, and obsessive-compulsive behaviour in a forum for persons for whom you have expressed great hatred and disgust for.

Just my observations.

Steve

2549. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 08:49:49 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030220034949.25398.00000258@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 61731

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/19/03 5:07 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030219180758.24452.00000033@mb-fw.aol.com>

>Then stop trying to start a verbal battle over Army unit honors.

Ahhhhhhh...but Lennie...That was YOUR doings...

>Then stop all the jabbering about Army unit honors, Civil Air
> Patrol, Maxwell AFB, and all things NOT amateur radio.

Then can I assume that we will NEVER hear about SINCGARS, The 71st Signal
Buttallion, or be spammed by your CV EVER AGAIN...?!?!

>You are not a moderator of this newsgroup, have no authority
> to moderate it, cannot change it despite all the hundreds of
> epithets you have posted here.

And despite YOUR attempts to BE the moderator, Lennie, the NG goes where
it will WITHOUT your permission or approval.

>You are not a moderator of this newsgroup, have no authority
> to moderate it, cannot change it despite all the hundreds of
> epithets you have posted here.

And despite YOUR attempts to BE the moderator, Lennie, the NG goes where
it will WITHOUT your permission or approval.

Sorry you don't like it. You're free to leave.

Steve, K4YZ

2550. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 08:56:29 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BA7A026C.F725%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 61732

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> (snip) The root cause is almost always clueless
> newbie syndrome.
>
> Another example of what Bill (and I) are concerned
> about is basic misunderstanding of certain aspects
> of the rules. (snip)

Lets get to the chase. I just don't understand the present intolerance of "newbies" and their mistakes - intolerance to the point of some even publicly advocating a fundamental change in the license structure to deal with it. Every single ham since the very beginning of ham radio has made mistakes and didn't fully understand everything. And, for most of the last century (75+ years), experienced ham operators understood and tolerated this. I've seen nothing to even suggest this "problem" is any more common today, yet the tolerance and understanding of it is almost nonexistent with some of today's more experienced hams. As I see it, the real problem isn't with the "newbies" and their mistakes - it's with the intolerance and lack of understanding of it. Perhaps you, or Bill, can explain why I shouldn't see it that way.

> The concern for all this stems from the fact that
> violations of the type described above are much
> more common today than technical violations.

Mistakes and misunderstandings have ALWAYS been much more common than technical violations. Which have you made more of - mistakes or technical violations? What about you, Bill? Where, then, is the argument in this to support a change in the license structure?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2551. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 09:14:43 UTC
From: Alphonse <QRZ@Anon.com>
Message-ID: <b326a6frt0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 61733

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030220034949.25398.00000258@mb-cb.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >Date: 2/19/03 5:07 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20030219180758.24452.00000033@mb-fw.aol.com>
>
> >Then stop trying to start a verbal battle over Army unit honors.
>
> Ahhhhhhh...but Lennie...That was YOUR doings...
>
> >Then stop all the jabbering about Army unit honors, Civil Air
> > Patrol, Maxwell AFB, and all things NOT amateur radio.
>
> Then can I assume that we will NEVER hear about SINCGARS, The 71st
Signal
> Buttallion, or be spammed by your CV EVER AGAIN...?!?!
>
> >You are not a moderator of this newsgroup, have no authority
> > to moderate it, cannot change it despite all the hundreds of
> > epithets you have posted here.
>
> And despite YOUR attempts to BE the moderator, Lennie, the NG goes
where
> it will WITHOUT your permission or approval.
>
> >You are not a moderator of this newsgroup, have no authority
> > to moderate it, cannot change it despite all the hundreds of
> > epithets you have posted here.
>
> And despite YOUR attempts to BE the moderator, Lennie, the NG goes
where
> it will WITHOUT your permission or approval.
>
> Sorry you don't like it. You're free to leave.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Gee, Stevie.
How many more comments do you have in store?
Give it a break, willya?

2552. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 11:14:31 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030220061431.23241.00000013@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 61735

In article <F172B951A6E11322.4406F5C67FB9AB85.E9F7BB3E1CCFCDC8@lp.airnews.net>,
"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>> For example, when the license term was doubled from 5 years to 10 years in
>> 1984, one of the main benefits to the FCC was an admin work savings
>> estimated
>> at 1000 person-hours/year. Yes, that's maybe one person's job for six
>> months,
>> but it was worth it to FCC to make the change.
>>
>> Under the old system, a new ham who went from no license to Extra could
>> "cost"
>> FCC as many as 5 interactions (new license, upgrade to Tech Plus, upgrade
>> to
>> General, upgrade to Advanced, upgrade to Extra) even if no tests were
>> failed
>> and no CSCEs issued. Under the current system, the total is reduced to 3
>> interactions (new license, upgrade to General, upgrade to Extra).
>> Multiply
>> that by the number of new hams and upgrades and the saving is
>> considerable.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>Yessiree...and in today's world of budget cut-budget cut-budget cut, it's
>got to be at least an attractive thought in the minds of Congress and maybe
>even the FCC.

FCC's been chronically underfunded for decades, and that's not gonna change
much. The best hope of more money for FCC, I think, would be for things that
would help 'homeland security' (like more monitoring and enforcement). Fancy
license structures just don't cut it in that environment.

>I know if I was the head of the organization and I was told
>to look for deep cuts, I'd be considering what could be done in the world of
>radio services.
>
Been that way a long time. Oddly enough, the situation may be changing on other
fronts, though.

A few years back, FCC "deregulated" the radio broadcast services, removing many
regulations so that "free market" forces would prevail, improving quality and
diversity through competition, yada yada yada. One of the biggest changes was
that companies were no longer limited as to how many radio stations they could
own, in total or in one market. End result was many sales and reformatting, and

a general homogenization of broadcast radio. Less quality, less diversity and less competition, not more. Now the chairman of the FCC, Michael Powell, may be rethinking the whole idea.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2553. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 11:14:32 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030220061432.23241.00000014@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 61734

In article <b30o6l$1fo$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:

>Since you are interested in the history and traditions of Amateur Radio
>please accept these opinions from me.
>
>A W/K one by 2 or one by 3 at one time were considered 'prefered calls'.
>This all went out the door when the fcc got lazy and went to a whole bunch
>of new callsign blocks and refused to break into the new program and
>re-issue ANYTHING.

I recall that happening in the late 1960s or early 1970s. FCC blamed their 1964-vintage computer system, which they said made it difficult to reassign calls. The non-reassignment rule was in effect in 1979 when I moved from NY to PA. One of the big reasons I kept my call was that if I'd given it up the FCC would not have reassigned it to anyone, meaning there'd be one less Extra with a 1x2 call. To me that was a bigger issue than being a 2 in 3-land.

In fact, for quite a while the FCC would not issue ANY 1x2 calls at all, even though some 1x2s beginning with N had never been issued.
>
>That being said....from that point on (late 70s or so) a bunch of strange
>callsigns came about. Still having trouble with some of them...hi.

Yeah, me too. 2x2 and 2x1 calls seemed "lopsided" or "front heavy" at first.

But it's been over a quarter century now. Not going back. If all of the present day callsigns which don't conform to the old system were dumped, a lot of hams would lose their short calls and have to take on 2x3s. I would not want to go back to my old call!

73 de Jim, N2EY

2554. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 11:14:33 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030220061433.23241.00000015@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 61736

In article <Xns9327ACCF9AB97pookster@216.168.3.50>, "Bill, W7TI"
<jamspam@upyours.now> writes:

>"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in
>news:b317cpekh1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net:
>
>> The purpose of the districting of ham radio calls were two fold.
>>
>> 1. Allow the issue of many more calls with the same suffix. I.E.
>> W1AW, W2AW...etc.
>
>Nonsense. W1AW, W2AW, etc. could have all been in the same town if
>there were no districts.

Agreed.
>
>> 2. Provide a easy means of locating the station for the FCC
>> monitoring that actually used to go on.
>
>More nonsense.

No, not really.

>The bad guys, whom the FCC is really interested in, will
>not give their correct call or portable designator anyway, and besides,
>if it's a *real* call, all the FCC has to do is look it up in their
>database. If you're an FCC monitor and you hear W4NTI breaking a
>rule, do you *know* he's in the 4th call district? Of course not. And
>would it matter if you did? You just mail the pink slip to his address,
>don't you?
>
It must be remembered that the call sign district system goes back to the very
early days of amateur radio, before databases or even the FCC itself. Indeed,
it started with the 1912 rules that required licensing of all transmitting
stations.
>>
>> By REQUIRING hams to sign PORTABLE (district) made it much easier to
>> tell where the station was. Making it a lot easier for contest
>> operators and general ops by knowing which way to point the
>> beam...etc.

Also gave a good indication of propagation. Back when a 1000 mile contact was a
major accomplishment, this was an important feature.
>
>A good point for contesting, but I assure you the districting system was
>not created for the benefit of contesters. I'm still wondering why it

>was created at all. I suspect the original plan was to administer each
>district separately, but that either never happened or was abandoned
>early on.

Not really. For quite a few years ham callsigns were issued by the district,
not a central office. Radio licensing was going on for over 20 years before the
centralized FCC was even created.

btw, before WW2 there were only 9 districts (no 0 calls back then) and some
states were in two districts. After WW2, the current system was put in place.

>And of course, the FCC eventually abandoned the strict
>district system anyway since it proved to have little or no value.
>
The strict adherence of callsign-numeral-matches-geography was only abandoned
in the 1970s, and it was done at the request of hams.

The main reason for abandoning it was to avoid having to change callsigns when
moving from district to district. FCC and its predecessors used to try to
assign corresponding or similar calls when a ham moved, but as the number of
hams grew and the mobility of the US population increased, doing so became
unworkable. It was also an additional drain on FCC administrative resources.

I remember when you could reliably tell propagation by the calls that were
being heard. A small but significant advantage in the SS and other contests. I
notice that some stations make it really easy in SS by gettijg vanity calls
matching their section (guess where N2NNY is?)

So what it comes down to is the question of which is the lesser of two evils:
having callsigns that don't match the geographical location of a station, or
having to change callsigns every time a ham moved between districts?
Particularly if the new district has few or no similar callsigns available.

73 de Jim, N2EY (since 1977)

2555. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 12:45:26 UTC
From: Jackie <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com>
Message-ID: <G545a.187100$HN5.815085@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 61737

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030220021035.29944.00000027@mb-fi.aol.com...

> "It's the LAW!" Right. Laws in force now cannot ever
> be changed, cannot be talked about (absolutely never
> by those without official authorized licenses!). Yup.

Who sez?

J.

2556. Re: Q: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 12:52:51 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302200452.327a4357@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61738

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030220025449.25398.00000250@mb-cb.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Q: Callsign etiquette?
> >From: "Bill, W7TI" jamspam@upyours.now
> >Date: 2/19/03 2:35 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <Xns9327800F438B7pookster@216.168.3.50>
>
> >I used to add the /6 for ragchewing but gave it up as rather pointless
> >since the FCC no longer requires it. I just say W7TI located in Southern
> >California, and let 'em figure it out.
>
> OK...I give up...what's the difference?
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

One is more specific than the other.

2557. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 12:55:56 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302200455.6870531d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61739

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hal1su7.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> On 19 Feb 2003 19:09:10 -0800, Brian wrote:
>
> >Phil, I thought I heard on WLW last week that there's some idea of a
> >bill that, concerning the filling out of government forms, that only
> >the individual signing the form, or an attorney, is allowed to fill
> >them out. I wonder where that would put tax preparers and VEC's if
> >the "bill" should pass.
> >
> >Have you heard any such noise?
>
> Haven't heard. I'll check with a friend who is an EA.
>
> ---
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

Phil, check with someone who's a W or a K. The EA's probably wouldn't
know anything about it. ;))

2558. Re: New Field Day Entry Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 12:57:06 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302200457.cfd33c6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61740

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E5461FC.9B8680E1@earthlink.net>...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > In article <3E528806.166FE13D@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > writes:
> >
> > >> Please keep to the program.
> > >
> > >I've been with the program for nearly forty years. You're still making
> > >up your mind.
> >
> > Which means you are past re-runs and past syndication?
> >
> > :-)
>
> No, it means I'm in and you're still talking about "GETTING INTO amateur
> radio".
>
> Dave K8MN

I haven't heard him talking about that. Could you be more specific?

2559. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 13:02:18 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <EF02DE40C81EDD65.8FD122C04D2252CE.89DDC25D232BA098@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 61742

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030219231551.09946.00000016@mb-md.aol.com...
> In article <2mN4a.53666$Rx3.2151954@news1.west.cox.net>, "Aspiring Elmer"
> <elmer@nowhere.com> writes:
>
> >"Len Budney" <lbudney-google@nb.net> wrote in message
> >news:417b917a.0302190636.e464c20@posting.google.com...
> >> Hello,
> >>
> >> I'm not a ham, but my parents are: AB2OA and AB2OB. I'd like to get
> >> the general opinion of the group about callsigns.
> >>
> >> Later this year I'll be getting my "nickle extra". Despite the lowly,
> >> dumbed down status of the Extra ticket today, I'm thinking about
> >> getting a 1x2 callsign. :-)
> >>
> >Hey if you pass the current test for extra-- you are an extra period.
Ignore
> >any comments about extra lite, etc
>
> Len:
>
> You've just been given bad advice. You ARE a "dumbed down Extra Lite"

Sure--in *Larry's* eyes; and we all know with what clarity Larry sees.

Kim W5TIT

2560. Re: Q: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 13:04:45 UTC
From: Bob H <BH@comcaastorg.net>
Message-ID: <b32jpi$326$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 61741

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hal23m8.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Wed, 19 Feb 2003 22:18:38 -0500, Robert Casey wrote:
>
> >> Yes, but don't let it get ya. As long as the call is not
> >> obscene/profane/indecent, go for it.
> >>
> > >
> > >Well, the FCC has issued suffixes like "Tango India Tango",
> > >"Kilo zero charlie kilo" (the zero looks like an "O"),
> > >"kilo lima one tango", and such. Though I doubt that
> > >they'll let you have x# fox-trot uniform kilo or charlie. :-)
> >
> > If you approach those combos as obscene/profane/indecent, you
> > have bigger fixation problems than the choice of call sign.
> >
> > The American fixation.
> >
> > ---
> > 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
> >

Yes, and it has been my experience that the type of mentality
which seeks out to have this type of call sign assigned to them is
almost always of the "CB mentality." Meaning, mentally, they
have never left 11 meters and bring all their CB habits and thinking
right along with them when they enter "Super CB" (ham radio).

Bob H
Norfolk, VA

2561. Re: Q: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 15:11:18 UTC
From: lbudney-google@nb.net
Message-ID: <417b917a.0302200711.26b43a3c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61743

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote:
> On Wed, 19 Feb 2003 22:18:38 -0500, Robert Casey wrote:
>>
>> Well, the FCC has issued suffixes like "Tango India Tango",
>> "Kilo zero charlie kilo"...
>
> If you approach those combos as obscene/profane/indecent, you
> have bigger fixation problems than the choice of call sign.
> The American fixation.

Ah--if only we'd loosen up, and adopt the cosmopolitan immorality of the Euros!

Thanks for making me feel good about my homeland, Phil.

--Len.

2562. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 15:28:12 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3E54F40C.5090903@psu.edu>
Source record: 61744

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> In article <2mN4a.53666$Rx3.2151954@news1.west.cox.net>, "Aspiring Elmer"
> <elmer@nowhere.com> writes:

> Len:
>
> You've just been given bad advice. You ARE a "dumbed down Extra Lite" and
> have achieved your privileges under a licensing regime which is significantly
> reduced, compared to the one experienced by Pre-Restructuring Extras who were
> tested under a much more challenging and comprehensive set of requirements.
> Moreover, you have not been required to learn one of Amateur Radio's most
> practical, effective, efficient, and universal communications modes at a useful
> proficiency level (Morse/CW). You ARE an Extra Lite, and always will be, and
> you have the whining and complaining of lots of your fellow Extra Lites to
> thank for your newfound insignificance.

<A whole bunch of other stuff snipped>

heh heh, Larry, you're bad! Good post.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2563. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 15:35:35 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3E54F5C7.7060602@psu.edu>
Source record: 61745

W5TIT wrote:
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20030219231551.09946.00000016@mb-md.aol.com...
>
>>In article <2mN4a.53666$Rx3.2151954@news1.west.cox.net>, "Aspiring Elmer"
>><elmer@nowhere.com> writes:
>>
>>
>>>"Len Budney" <lbudney-google@nb.net> wrote in message
>>>news:417b917a.0302190636.e464c20@posting.google.com...
>>>
>>>>Hello,
>>>>
>>>>I'm not a ham, but my parents are: AB2OA and AB2OB. I'd like to get
>>>>the general opinion of the group about callsigns.
>>>>
>>>>Later this year I'll be getting my "nickle extra". Despite the lowly,
>>>>dumbed down status of the Extra ticket today, I'm thinking about
>>>>getting a 1x2 callsign. :-)
>>>
>>>Hey if you pass the current test for extra-- you are an extra period.
>>
> Ignore
>
>>>any comments about extra lite, etc
>>
>>Len:
>>
>>You've just been given bad advice. You ARE a "dumbed down Extra Lite"
>
>
> Sure--in *Larry's* eyes; and we all know with what clarity Larry sees.

Come on Kim! Larry's post was a masterpiece of leg pulling. (his
leanings are in that direction, admittedly) But it was one of the
funniest posts here in a long time.

Aside from the thread subject, I hope you're feeling better.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2564. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 15:52:39 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3E54F9C7.7020807@psu.edu>
Source record: 61746

Robert Casey wrote:
> N2EY wrote:
>
>
>>Given factors 1 and 2, and possibly 3, it's more likely that the last
>>Novice license will be gone from the database before the last
>>Advanced.
>
>
> If a novice bothers to renew, he is just as likely to go to the trouble
> (not a lot of trouble, though) to upgrade to tech with code or to
> general. Novices can't do much on the air, and any interested in
> staying hams will likely upgrade.
>
> Advanced's are less likely to upgrade, as they only lack a few hundred
> KHz of sub bands to play in.
>

And I know of a few who don't upgrade because they want people to know
that they passed the "tougher" test. Go figure.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2565. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 16:37:36 UTC
From: "Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now>
Message-ID: <Xns932857C177206pookster@216.168.3.50>
Source record: 61747

Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net> wrote in news:BA7A026C.F725%
stewart@say.net:

> What about you, Bill? Where, then, is the argument in this to
> support a change in the license structure?
>

My recommendation for a change in the license structure to only two classes was primarily to mitigate the incentive licensing issue. I believe having multiple classes above the beginner's class is non productive. You may disagree, but that's how I see it.

My comments about the new "learner's" class foucsing more on operating skill and less on the esoteric things was to hopefully reduce some of the dreadful stuff heard on the air these days.

--
Bill, W7TI

2566. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 16:42:06 UTC
From: "Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now>
Message-ID: <Xns93285884856CFpookster@216.168.3.50>
Source record: 61748

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
news:20030220061431.23241.00000013@mb-da.aol.com:

> One of the biggest changes was
> that companies were no longer limited as to how many radio stations
> they could own, in total or in one market. End result was many sales
> and reformatting, and a general homogenization of broadcast radio.
> Less quality, less diversity and less competition, not more. Now the
> chairman of the FCC, Michael Powell, may be rethinking the whole idea.
>

I hope he is. This problem exists all throughout American society, not
just in broadcasting. Mergers and acquisitions are almost invariably
detrimental to customers. Unfortunately, customers have little voice in
such decisions whereas businesses generally get what they want.

Are we off topic or what?

--
Bill, W7TI

2567. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 17:09:17 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0302200909.6c766e08@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61749

Followup to earlier message:

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message news:<20030220061431.23241.00000013@mb-da.aol.com>...

(Kim wrote:)

> >Yessiree...and in today's world of budget cut-budget cut-budget cut, it's
> >got to be at least an attractive thought in the minds of Congress and maybe
> >even the FCC.
>
> FCC's been chronically underfunded for decades, and that's not gonna change
> much. The best hope of more money for FCC, I think, would be for things that
> would help 'homeland security' (like more monitoring and enforcement). Fancy
> license structures just don't cut it in that environment.
>
> >I know if I was the head of the organization and I was told
> >to look for deep cuts, I'd be considering what could be done in the world of
> >radio services.
> >
> Been that way a long time. Oddly enough, the situation may be changing on
> other fronts, though.
>
> A few years back, FCC "deregulated" the radio broadcast services, removing
> many
> regulations so that "free market" forces would prevail, improving quality and
> diversity through competition, yada yada yada. One of the biggest changes was
> that companies were no longer limited as to how many radio stations they could
> own, in total or in one market. End result was many sales and reformatting, and
> a general homogenization of broadcast radio. Less quality, less diversity and
> less competition, not more. Now the chairman of the FCC, Michael Powell, may > be
> rethinking the whole idea.

Take a look at:
http://www.salon.com/tech/feature/2003/02/19/clear_channel_deregulation/index.html?x

Seems like the reality of broadcast radio deregulation doesn't match
the expectations.

Back in the '60s and '70s, FCC was micro-regulating the ARS. The trend
has been towards less and less regulation ever since. Yes, inadequate
budget is a big factor in that trend, but it's not the only factor.

Maybe in another 20 years...

73 de Jim, N2EY

2568. N8WWM BUSTED SAYS RAIN REPORT

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 17:20:30 UTC
From: deckthehall@webtv.com
Message-ID: <dc1baa4a.0302200920.2171992a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61750
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

N8WWM guilty of FCC violations. According to the FCC, N8WWM, Dog Adair committed several violations over the air at the expense of the Toledo Amateur Radio Club by utilizing their repeater to break the law. The amateur club received a warning letter from the FCC concerning Adair's violations and were told to take steps to make certain the violations by Adair will not be repeated. Adair not only hurt the entire image of amateur radio with his inexcusable behavior, but damaged the reputation of yet another entity trying to further the good of amateur radio. It's a shame when bad apples like these make it so clubs can't even trust their own users to abide by the rules they were sworn to uphold. Adair is also an infamous presence on the internet. A google search of "N8WWM" reveals a peek into the world of the individual identified as Adair. In addition to FCC violations, Adair has, in the past, been accused of being a prolific spammer, breaking several internet laws and violating several terms of service agreements with internet providers.

2569. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 17:56:41 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0302200956.d3cdafa@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61601

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:<Mms4a.23493$Yv2.14310@nwrddc02.gnilink.net>...

> > >Oops, that was supposed to read "Imagine that...a young person actually
> > >having <fun with> Morse code!"
> > >
> > Not hard to imagine at all. Seen it in reality many times. Also
> experienced it
> > myself.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Me too, Jim:
>
> My very first experience with 2-way radio was a "CB" walkie-talkie that my
> best bud and I used to communicate accross the vast expanse that was the
> vacant lot between our houses. I put CB in quotation marks because although
> they were advertised as CB h/t's and operated on CB frequencies, they wer
> Part 15 devices @ 100mW rather than Part 95 @ 4W.

I remember other kids having those things, but I never had them
myself.
>
> They were awfully fun though and had the 'International Morse Code'
> placarded on the front of the rig with a bright orange button labeled 'Morse
> Code Key.' After sending some very slow code back and forth for awhile, we
> wanted a little more range. (Here is where I admit my very first violation
> of a FCC rule.) So I read up a little on outdoor antennas and decided that a
> dipole would be best on a 13-yr. old's lawn-cutting/snow-shoveling earnings.
> Dad provided supervised access to his soldering iron and the h/t's
> telescoping whip was replaced by RG-58 coax feeding a half-wave dipole. My
> friend's whip was replaced by a commercial quarter-wave ground plane. Ah,
> those were the days!

HAW! Of course the range may not have been that much better because of
the mismatch.
>
> I'd be remiss if I didn't mention the trip to the local CB/ham shop to buy
> the necessary materials. When the owner asked me about my planned
> "installation" and how much I had to spend, Mike (WB2 something or other)
> cheerfully supplied me with a Budwig-style center insulator, two dogbone end
> insulators, the required 14-gauge stranded copper antenna wire, 18 ft. of
> RG-58 coax, and a set of crystals for ch. 20, the local rag-chew freq. "Yep,
> fourteen bucks'll just about cover that." The ch. 20 crystals were $8.99
> alone. That was my first exposure to the amicable spirit of radio. :-D

Great story! Here's some of mine (you started this, Bert!).....

First experience with homebrew radio was building a "foxhole" set from instructions found in a thrift-store book, "All About Radio and Television". I was maybe 10 years old at the time. Had a six-foot scrap of multiconductor telephone-type cable, which was taken apart, ends stripped, and square-knotted together to get a 70 foot length that would stretch from the bedroom window to the crab apple tree in the back yard. Insulators? What insulators? The detector in the "foxhole" set was a single-edged razor blade and a piece of pencil lead (actually graphite), held in place by thumb tacks and a safety pin.

When I was about 12, my family went to an auction for some forgotten reason or other. I don't know what else was bought, but I went home with a J-37 key and what turned out to be the projects from an old NRI (remember them?) home-study course. Total cost: Less than a dollar. The projects were mostly built on nice aluminum chassis of various sizes, and there were a good assortment of tubes and parts in them. Over the next few months they were disassembled, and with a few small purchases at the local RESCO store, I had a 2 tube regenerative receiver for listening to the lower part of the HF spectrum. Also had parts from an old TV found on the trash, and the guidance of an old ARRL Handbook. Much redesign was needed to build the rx with the parts at hand, though. Coils wound on old pill bottles, tube sockets and bases for power connectors, etc.

Learning the code with that crude 2 tube regen was an experience in itself, because you needed one hand to keep the station tuned in while writing the code down with the other. Helped me learn to build better receivers, though!

Passed the Novice test in the early summer of 1967 at the ripe old age of 13 and built a 10 watt transmitter from other NRI parts. The old TV set provided the power supply. Only part I had to buy for the transmitter was the xtal. Tuned it up with a dial lamp in the antenna lead as RF indicator, plus the plate milliameter. Not a rock crusher but had a lot of fun. By that time the antenna had been upgraded to use "real antenna wire", those same glass insulators and went from the attic window to much higher up in the crab apple tree.

Total cost - maybe $14 for everything...You wanna talk about doing radio on a shoestring budget, you came to the right place!

Now here's the part that relates to the subject line:

All through this time, I was working with high voltages and dangerous tools like soldering irons and razor blades. (Still have some of the scars...;-))

Also climbing trees to put up antennas and such. Parental supervision? Bah!
The Feds saw fit to grant me the license and I didn't electrocute anyone nor burn the house down. Nor did my 10 watter bother any other

radio services. I knew and worked other hams who were younger than me, too.

But some folks would have denied us our licenses based on age alone. Odd, really odd.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2570. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 18:41:36 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3E552160.3000403@psu.edu>
Source record: 61602

Bill, W7TI wrote:
> Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net> wrote in news:BA7A026C.F725%
> stewart@say.net:
>
>
>>What about you, Bill? Where, then, is the argument in this to
>>support a change in the license structure?
>>
>
>
> ----------
>
> My recommendation for a change in the license structure to only two
> classes was primarily to mitigate the incentive licensing issue. I
> believe having multiple classes above the beginner's class is non
> productive. You may disagree, but that's how I see it.

I dunno that classes are such a bad thing. works for the mil!

> My comments about the new "learner's" class foucsing more on operating
> skill and less on the esoteric things was to hopefully reduce some of the
> dreadful stuff heard on the air these days.

Good point there. I would have really liked that. I had no instruction on the "how to" portion of Ham radio in the study/testing process. I learned everthing after I already had a license. Working in some ettiquite and proper QSO form would be a godsend.

Learning by listening on the air doesn't work very well with the aforementioned bad habits some hams have. I ended up listening to the more experienced hams at a QSO party for my initial experience. And we all know how good a technique is used for contesting!

2571. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 18:54:51 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.ham51qa.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 61603

On 20 Feb 2003 04:55:56 -0800, Brian wrote:

>> Haven't heard. I'll check with a friend who is an EA.

>Phil, check with someone who's a W or a K. The EA's probably wouldn't
>know anything about it. ;))

Are you trying to appear stupid or is that your default setting?

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2572. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 18:54:52 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.ham5dxb.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 61604

On 20 Feb 2003 07:53:12 GMT, Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:

>>And of course, the FCC eventually abandoned the strict
>>district system anyway since it proved to have little or no value.
>
> I think this was more due to economics than it was any other reason.
>
The key reason was to make it possible to retain one's call sign
upon a relocation.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2573. Re: Q: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 18:54:52 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.ham5s3c.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 61605

On 20 Feb 2003 07:11:18 -0800, Len Budney wrote:

>Ah--if only we'd loosen up, and adopt the cosmopolitan immorality of
>the Euros!

Considering that as "immorality" is proof of what I posted.

How many Europeans do you know? Most of those whom I know have
a healthy sense of what is moral and immoral. Perhaps you are
referring to what you see of "Euros" on TV and in the movies.
Do US "daytime soaps" reflect the moral and social attitudes of
this country's society properly?

Ask any therapist dealing in sexual disorders what a healthy
attitude toward the human body and its functions, including
sex, consists of.

>Thanks for making me feel good about my homeland, Phil.

It's my homeland too, Len.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2574. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 18:57:44 UTC
From: "Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now>
Message-ID: <Xns93286F83DDC14pookster@216.168.3.50>
Source record: 61606

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in news:3E552160.3000403@psu.edu:

> I dunno that classes are such a bad thing. works for the mil!
>
>

The "mil" needs a multi-level command structure.

Ours is a lot simpler. The FCC talks, we listen. :-)

--
Bill, W7TI

2575. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 19:36:55 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3E552E57.9010207@psu.edu>
Source record: 61609

N2EY wrote:
> Followup to earlier message:
>
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030220061431.23241.00000013@mb-da.aol.com>...
>
> (Kim wrote:)
>
>
>>>Yessiree...and in today's world of budget cut-budget cut-budget cut, it's
>>>got to be at least an attractive thought in the minds of Congress and maybe
>>>even the FCC.
>>
>>FCC's been chronically underfunded for decades, and that's not gonna change
>>much. The best hope of more money for FCC, I think, would be for things that
>>would help 'homeland security' (like more monitoring and enforcement). Fancy
>>license structures just don't cut it in that environment.
>>
>>
>>>I know if I was the head of the organization and I was told
>>>to look for deep cuts, I'd be considering what could be done in the world of
>>>radio services.
>>>
>>
>>Been that way a long time. Oddly enough, the situation may be changing on
>>other fronts, though.
>>
>>A few years back, FCC "deregulated" the radio broadcast services, removing
>>many
>>regulations so that "free market" forces would prevail, improving quality and
>>diversity through competition, yada yada yada. One of the biggest changes was
>>that companies were no longer limited as to how many radio stations they could
>>own, in total or in one market. End result was many sales and reformatting, and
>>a general homogenization of broadcast radio. Less quality, less diversity and
>>less competition, not more. Now the chairman of the FCC, Michael Powell, may > be
>>rethinking the whole idea.
>
>
> Take a look at:
> http://www.salon.com/tech/feature/2003/02/19/clear_channel_deregulation/index.html?x
>
> Seems like the reality of broadcast radio deregulation doesn't match
> the expectations.
>

> Back in the '60s and '70s, FCC was micro-regulating the ARS. The trend
> has been towards less and less regulation ever since. Yes, inadequate
> budget is a big factor in that trend, but it's not the only factor.

In our area we have two AM stations broadcasting the exact same thing 24/7. This from stations about 8 miles apart as the crow flies. The third AM station mirrors the other two about 30 percent of the time. We have three AM's in our area, so if we listen to local AM, we have three to tune to, and almost zero choice.

Homogenization heck, we've got radio clones!

- Mike KB3EIA -

2576. Re: Q: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 19:39:19 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030220143919.22429.00000003@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 61608

>Subject: Re: Q: Callsign etiquette?
>From: lbudney-google@nb.net (Len Budney)
>Date: 2/20/03 9:11 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <417b917a.0302200711.26b43a3c@posting.google.com>

>Ah--if only we'd loosen up, and adopt the cosmopolitan immorality of the
>Euros!

And invite open warfare on our continent more often than anywhere else in
the world...?!?!

No thanks.

Rumor has it that Proctor-Gamble wants to hire Frenchmen to do thier next
deodorant commercials...In as much as having thier hands in the air is an old
habit......

Steve, K4YZ

2577. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 19:40:38 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030220144038.22429.00000004@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 61610

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: "Alphonse" QRZ@Anon.com
>Date: 2/20/03 3:14 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <b326a6frt0@pita.alt.net>

>Gee, Stevie.
>How many more comments do you have in store?
>Give it a break, willya

Another sperm-swallowing anonymous critic.

Steve

2578. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 19:58:01 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E553338.C2DE600C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61611

N2EY wrote:

> Great story! Here's some of mine (you started this, Bert!).....
>
> First experience with homebrew radio was building a "foxhole" set from
> instructions found in a thrift-store book, "All About Radio and
> Television".

Still have the book? I made one from the very same book and later modified it with a store-bought diode. Until our local station went on the air, all I heard was WOWO in Fort Wayne, a pretty good haul from southern West Virginia.

There was a kid in our town who had a shortwave receiver and a pair of Part 15 walkie-talkies. By the time I met him, I was studying to become a ham. Talking to a kid a couple of blocks away on a walkie-talkie didn't hold much fascination. Maybe that's why I don't spend much time on two meter repeaters to this day.

> Passed the Novice test in the early summer of 1967 at the ripe old age
> of 13 and built a 10 watt transmitter from other NRI parts. The old TV
> set provided the power supply. Only part I had to buy for the
> transmitter was the xtal. Tuned it up with a dial lamp in the antenna
> lead as RF indicator, plus the plate milliameter. Not a rock crusher
> but had a lot of fun. By that time the antenna had been upgraded to
> use "real antenna wire", those same glass insulators and went from the
> attic window to much higher up in the crab apple tree.
>
> Total cost - maybe $14 for everything...You wanna talk about doing
> radio on a shoestring budget, you came to the right place!

My gear was store bought and used. Both the receiver and transmitter came from Allied's used equipment list. My deal with my dad was that I'd save the money for the receiver from my paper route and he and Mom would get me that transmitter for Christmas. I bought a Knight R-100 general coverage receiver and Pop ordered me a Knight T-60 transmitter a couple of weeks later. Oddly enough, when the new UPS delivery service driver brought the parcel from Allied, there was a Heath DX-40 inside. A note explained that they'd sold the T-60 and hoped that the DX-40 would be a suitable substitute.

Every tube in the DX-40 was broken in shipping but a trip to K8CFT's TV service shop yielded replacements (at no charge). A few days after I'd begun using the DX-40, another parcel from Allied arrived at our door. Inside was a Knight T-60. Allied had fouled up. My dad suggested that I try the T-60 and decide which one I wanted to keep. The DX-40 won,

hands down.

We didn't own an extension ladder and the old apple tree in the yard was only twenty or so feet high so my first antenna was quite low running from the tree to the house. K8CFT came to my rescue again. He stopped by the house with his service truck and a 40 foot extension ladder. We had a line of tall fir trees around the perimeter of the yard. Buzz installed an 80m dipole at what seemed to me to be extreme altitude.

> Now here's the part that relates to the subject line:
>
> All through this time, I was working with high voltages and dangerous
> tools like soldering irons and razor blades. (Still have some of the
> scars...;-))

There's nothing like having molten solder drip on your leg while you're wearing a pair of shorts! My scar is from an Exacto knife to the right thumb. A drunken doctor, on call at the local hospital, broke a needle off in the thumb before managing a few stitches.

> Also climbing trees to put up antennas and such. Parental supervision?
> Bah!

Trees are made to be climbed.

> The Feds saw fit to grant me the license and I didn't electrocute
> anyone nor burn the house down. Nor did my 10 watter bother any other
> radio services. I knew and worked other hams who were younger than me,
> too.

My mother was sure that I was GOING to burn the house down. Her opinion was reinforced the day we went to church and I left the DX-40 on standby. The entire house was filled with the melted tar smell of the potted power transformer when we returned (again K8CFT to the rescue with an old TV power transformer).

> But some folks would have denied us our licenses based on age alone.
> Odd, really odd.

It makes perfect sense if you're a fellow with half a century of PROFESSIONAL experience and you're embarrassed to be shown up by a bunch of telegraph key wielding CHILDREN!

Dave K8MN

2579. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 20:01:21 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E553401.874AE9F6@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61612

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <2k_4a.185429$be.174499@rwcrnsc53>, "Jackie"
> <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> writes:
>
> >> I wasn't around in the 1930's. I was sixty years
> > >
> > >Hehe, make that "30". I wasn't born yesterday, you know.
> >
> > Judy Holliday was...but that's for another newsgroup.
> >
> > This one is all about TNSG, CAP, State Department,
> > Bill Clinton and his dresses, and whose shirts are
> > stuffed the most, whose ego balloons are inflated
> > largest and more. :-)

I'll cast my vote for you on the balloons and shirts, Leonid.

> Oh, yeah, and what the others say often -
>
> "It's the LAW!" Right. Laws in force now cannot ever
> be changed, cannot be talked about (absolutely never
> by those without official authorized licenses!). Yup.
>
> :-)

You've talked. You continue to talk...er...write. What you've never managed to do is round up much support for your views. It likely has something to do with your presentation, Lynnard.

Dave K8MN

2580. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 20:20:47 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0302201220.1d230af5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61613

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3E54F9C7.7020807@psu.edu>...
> Robert Casey wrote:
> > N2EY wrote:
> >
> >>Given factors 1 and 2, and possibly 3, it's more likely that the last
> >>Novice license will be gone from the database before the last
> >>Advanced.
> >
> >
> > If a novice bothers to renew, he is just as likely to go to the trouble
> > (not a lot of trouble, though) to upgrade to tech with code or to
> > general. Novices can't do much on the air, and any interested in
> > staying hams will likely upgrade.
> >
> > Advanced's are less likely to upgrade, as they only lack a few hundred
> > KHz of sub bands to play in.
> >
>
> And I know of a few who don't upgrade because they want people to know
> that they passed the "tougher" test.

Tougher test? "Lite" license? Big deal. Kinda like saying "I paid $500
for this VCR 20 years ago, so it's gotta be 'better' than the one you
just got for $100".

The important thing is what the licensee does after the license is
earned.

The funniest part is that the mere possession of an Advanced simply
proves the holder passed 5 wpm and the old writtens.

There may also be some sour grapes because the restructuring doesn't
give Advanceds any more credit towards Extra than a General.

Plus the leg-pulling factor.

>Go figure.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2581. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 20:26:09 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E553A2E.859D91C9@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61614

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E54612B.331A2187@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <Nki4a.157130$be.141628@rwcrnsc53>, "Jackie"
> >> <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> writes:
> >>
> >> >"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> >> >news:20030217211127.03532.00000536@mb-cp.aol.com...
> >> >> In article <20030216173704.14527.00000384@mb-cc.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
> >> >(N2EY)
> >> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >>While you might continue to insist that a REAL ham must worship at the
> >altar
> >> >of CW so that others in the hobby might consider them worthy (which I
> >still
> >> >don't get, since I've never heard anyone say such a thing on the air, but
> >> >ONLY off the air), the facts are out there if you bother to listen...
> >>
> >> I tried to point that out to the Merrie Morsemen in here,
> >> Jackie but all their master switches are in Off position.
> >
> >I won't attempt to speak for others but I've certainly never made a
> >claim about "worshipping at the altar of CW" and I don't recall seeing
> >others write anything like that. It looks as if your "facts" are in
> >error.
>
> Geez, will you Three Morseketeers make up your collective
> mind? :-)

We don't have a collective mind. You must have skipped the part where I
wrote that I wouldn't attempt to speak for others.

> To the Morseketeers everything negative said about morse
> code is an "error" while everything positive is "fact?" Of
> course. It must be the New Math or something... :-)

That's one of your "way out there" statements. I note that you've
previously talked about the removal of morse testing. Now you're
writing of morse code itself. In fact, your recent rants include a line

about HF amateur radio being all about working DX on CW. Do you now
have a problem with use of the mode? With working DX?

> >You keep getting your "facts" tangled up, Leonard H. I've stated on
> >several occasions that I use CW about half the time. Steve made a
> >similar comment about his operation just recently. As we've seen over
> >just the past few weeks, you aren't a guy to let facts stand in the way
> >of a good rant.
>
> :-) Did you just raise the rant, lendlord? :-)

No, I simply called attention to your playing fast and loose with the
truth.

> >I can look out a window and see rain.
>
> Goodie, you have some eyesight. But, what if its just a
> lawn sprinkler set on high? :-)
>
> >When I tell you, "It's raining",
> >that is not a command, it is a statement based in fact.
>
> Of course. You will also say "the sky is blue, the grass is
> green" and other colorful statements of fact while red in
> the face. Go for it.

Those aren't commands either.

> >When I tell
> >you, "You must pass a 5 wpm morse test for HF amateur radio access", it
> >isn't a command. It is a statement based in fact.
>
> Ooooo! How about that?

How about it? Like I said, it is a statement of fact.

> Why MUST I pass a test at all? I was ON HF first a half
> century ago...no "test" needed then...and I was perfectly
> legal. [how about that?]

The answer is simple: You don't have to pass a test if you don't want
an HF amateur license. That you were on HF fifty years back in the
military doesn't mean diddly toward obtaining an amateur radio license.

> Now let's see what you can do with that thread opening... :-)
>
> >Now that's a statement NOT based in fact. You've made up your "facts".
>
> Ooooo. I'd call it satire or parody or just having fun unstuffing
> some shirts, hearing ego balloons pop from a small needle.

If you're proud of your handiwork, why'd you snip it?

> >Don't blame someone else that you allowed several decades of "interest"
> >in amateur radio to pass without acting on that "interest".
>
> I have interest in my bank, too, but don't want to become a
> banker. There, two facts, absolute truth. :-)

Only dodges from you, Leonard?

> >Your
> >expectation that radio amateurs should change for you is significant.
>
> Would I expect the Three Morseketeers (and Dartisgone)
> to "change?!?!?" Oh, my, no...not in a millennia....nobody
> can tell them anything! :-)

Somebody can. You can't. I have no obligation to accept your input on amateur radio matters. As far as I'm concerned, you aren't anything to amateur radio.

> >You aren't interested in becoming a ham, Len.
>
> Ham is the butchered meat of swine. I don't want to be that.
> :-)

Ham: An amateur radio operator.

You don't want to be that either.

> I might, sometime, take an amateur radio test and change
> from professional to amateur.

I'll wait in eager anticipation. How long do you think people live on average?

> Might be fun.

A couple of weeks ago you told us that it IS fun--as if you knew. That's funny coming from a non-participant and it is likely a puzzling statement to anyone reading your regular rants here. You don't write your stuff as if you believed that anything about amateur radio is "fun".

> But, I've never been interested in jumping through hoops on
> command of a bunch of control freaks who demand
> dedication and committment to be shown to those freaks.

Yeah, those damned control freaks at the FCC. They'll only have you in amateur radio on their terms unless you can convince them that the regs should be changed for your personal benefit.

> FCC writes radio regulations, not the ham control freaks.
> I can argue federal regulations civilly, no problem. Problem
> is all these stuffed shirts and ego balloons who think they
> are such noble, splendid, role models who want to keep
> things their way. <shrug>

Oh, I see. We should all be reasonable and do it your way, huh? Would it wound you if I point out that you haven't been observed to argue ANYTHING civilly?

> >No, you don't. You are too busy attempting to out-bray them and are far
> >too busy here to be involved in amateur radio.
>
> Poor baby. Get both of your balloons popped?

No, but I have a birthday at the end of the month. Maybe I get a chance then.
Keep up the braying.

> >Laugh, Len. At this time, it is the only way into HF amateur radio.
>
> Oooooo! "It's the LAW!" Ooooo!

That shouldn't surprise you. You're subject to the law in every other aspect of your life. You have only two small obstacles to overcome in your quest for an amateur radio license which permits HF access: 1) the law and 2) intertia.

> >All this time and you still misunderstand. You have to pass a morse
> >test and one or more written exams in order to become a radio amateur
> >with HF privileges.
>
> No kidding?

Absolutely. There are no exceptions for those who want the law changed or for those with fifty years of military or commercial experience.

> >A half century of commercial or governmental
> >electronics, or of plumbing or of baking bread don't count toward an
> >amateur radio license.
>
> Oh? I'm just talking about regulations...and unstuffing some
> shirts, popping balloons.

Then you just aren't doing a very good job of it.

> Did you know that amateur radio regulations can be CHANGED?
>
> Really. "It's the LAW!" :-)

A guy like yourself who has nothing but time on his hands--you can try to out wait the morse requirement. You'll still have to pass an exam. Inertia, kindly old fellow. Inertia.

> >Until you pass an exam for an amateur radio
> >license, you are simply a spectator.
>
> Okay. I'll look out the window for rain.

It makes about as much sense as anything else you've done toward obtaining a license.

> Nope. No rain. That's a fact!
>
> <pop...pop...>

With the sound effects you've provided, perhaps it's hail. It surely isn't pouring down amateur radio licenses.

Dave K8MN

2582. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 21:14:44 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3E554544.78559BF9@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 61615

N2EY wrote:

>
>
> The funniest part is that the mere possession of an Advanced simply
> proves the holder passed 5 wpm and the old writtens.

Thought it was 13 wpm.

>
>
> There may also be some sour grapes because the restructuring doesn't
> give Advanceds any more credit towards Extra than a General.

Well, they could have taken the old extra test up to a year before April
15, 2000 and cashed the CSCE in on April 15, 2000 and have an extra.
I did something similar: Had the old style tech (general written and 5wpm).
Took the advanced and the extra writtens in Jan 2000. Got the CSCEs
and cashed them in on April 15, 2000 at a special VE event set up for
this purpose. And got the extra ticket a week later in the mail (The VEs
were quick to submit the paperwork, obviously).

Well, the above advanceds missed the boat.

2583. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 21:22:03 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302201322.62f63781@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61616

"Aspiring Elmer" <elmer@nowhere.com> wrote in message
news:<2mN4a.53666$Rx3.2151954@news1.west.cox.net>...
> "Len Budney" <lbudney-google@nb.net> wrote in message
> news:417b917a.0302190636.e464c20@posting.google.com...
> > Hello,
> >
> > I'm not a ham, but my parents are: AB2OA and AB2OB. I'd like to get
> > the general opinion of the group about callsigns.
> >
> > Later this year I'll be getting my "nickle extra". Despite the lowly,
> > dumbed down status of the Extra ticket today, I'm thinking about
> > getting a 1x2 callsign. :-)

Len, get in line. I'm waiting for W0EX.

Brian

2584. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 21:25:10 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302201325.58e7134b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61617

"Alphonse" <QRZ@Anon.com> wrote in message news:<b326a6frt0@pita.alt.net>...
> "Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030220034949.25398.00000258@mb-cb.aol.com...

> > And despite YOUR attempts to BE the moderator, Lennie, the NG goes
> where
> > it will WITHOUT your permission or approval.
> >
> > Sorry you don't like it. You're free to leave.
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
>
> Gee, Stevie.
> How many more comments do you have in store?
> Give it a break, willya?

Obsessive/compulsive, as in an illness.

2585. Re: eBay removes legal 10m ham gear but allows illegal CB equipment

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 21:26:38 UTC
From: WW <Go@wwgothereallday.com>
Message-ID: <b33h59$jr5$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 61618
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"TooManyRadios" <toomanyradios@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030220130606.05751.00000017@mb-ba.aol.com...
> I've noticed something interesting on eBay lately: selective enforcement
and
> removal of legitimate gear.
>
> Several 10-meter radios have been removed from the site, prior to the
close of
> the auction. HR2600s, HR2510s, RCIs, etc. I'm talking about radios which
are
> advertised as NON-MODIFIED, for amateur use only, and are being sold in
the
> "Ham Radio: Transceivers" category. As such, there is nothing illegal
about
> these radios.
>
> On the other hand, I have witnessed several radios which were advertised
as
> being modified, listed in the CB section, reference to "upper and lower
> channels", "can be used with kickers", etc. These radios clearly ARE
illegal,
> as is their intended use on the CB band. Yet, these auctions are allowed
to
> proceed. Here are a few current examples:
>
>
http://cgi.ebay.com/ws/eBayISAPI.dll?ViewItem&item=3008370255&category=1501
>
>
http://cgi.ebay.com/ws/eBayISAPI.dll?ViewItem&item=3008183762&category=1501
>
>
> Seems to me that eBay is opening themselves up for legal action here.
Allowing
> illegal CB equipment while not allowing similar, legal amateur radio
> transceivers.
>
> Your thoughts?

From what I hear, the CBs are fighting back. They are sick and
tired of whiney geek hams complaining about CB radios on ebay,
now the CBs have turned the tables, doing like hams do, they are
complaining about ham radios on ebay. Childish hams who appoint

themselves as ebay policemen brought this on themselves. I think
its funny as hell. Law suits? Nope! You better go read ebay
rules. They reserve sole right to pull ads, anytime, for no reason.
Now, your assignment is to educate ebay personnel how to tell
what a CB radio is and what a ham radio is. Good Luck!
HA HA HA

WW

2586. Re: eBay removes legal 10m ham gear but allows illegal CB equipment

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 21:30:02 UTC
From: Belcher from 75 Meters <fartinechobox3@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3e5548e3@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 61619
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

Legal action? Come down from out
of your gum ball tree and catnip!

75% of the time that e-Bay has pulled Ham/CB/Radio auctions
it is for numerous complaints against the
Sellers for not shipping earlier auction
products won, non-payment of fees or fraud.

E-bay does not think ham radio
as some type of a special group worthy of
merited special attention - apart from the fact that
ham and CB related equipment sales usually are
in the top-5 categories for complaints of
Seller fraud filed to e-Bay from buyers.

Bottom line: When you bid on anything on E-Bay
be DAMM SURE your Seller is on the level and
IS NOT one of these (former) "traveling hamfest bum gypsies"
we used to see set up in the flea market at all the hamfests
trying to pass off the same overpriced non-working junk
to suckers or newbies. Many of em have abandoned the
"Hamfest Flea Market Circuit" and now sell exclusively on e-Bay

"TooManyRadios" <toomanyradios@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030220130606.05751.00000017@mb-ba.aol.com...
> I've noticed something interesting on eBay lately: selective enforcement
and
> removal of legitimate gear.
>
> Several 10-meter radios have been removed from the site, prior to the
close of
> the auction. HR2600s, HR2510s, RCIs, etc. I'm talking about radios which
are
> advertised as NON-MODIFIED, for amateur use only, and are being sold in
the
> "Ham Radio: Transceivers" category. As such, there is nothing illegal
about
> these radios.
>
> On the other hand, I have witnessed several radios which were advertised
as
> being modified, listed in the CB section, reference to "upper and lower
> channels", "can be used with kickers", etc. These radios clearly ARE
illegal,

> as is their intended use on the CB band. Yet, these auctions are allowed
to
> proceed. Here are a few current examples:
>
>
http://cgi.ebay.com/ws/eBayISAPI.dll?ViewItem&item=3008370255&category=1501
>
>
http://cgi.ebay.com/ws/eBayISAPI.dll?ViewItem&item=3008183762&category=1501
>
>
> Seems to me that eBay is opening themselves up for legal action here.
Allowing
> illegal CB equipment while not allowing similar, legal amateur radio
> transceivers.
>
> Your thoughts?

The above 2 auctions contain item types that I have seen for
sale at **NUMEROUS hamfests** in the past - and that
INCLUDED the DAYTON HAMVENTION. What's the difference
selling this stuff at Dayton....or on e-Bay ??

(none if you ask me - but I sure will not be the first one to place my bid
on saidsame items - JUST IGNORE THEM AND THEIR SALE
SIMPLE EH ? How difficult is that to do..???)

2587. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 22:23:32 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0302201423.3400b616@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61620

vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030217201610.04532.00000254@mb-fx.aol.com>...
> From N2EY:

Get your attributions right, Vipul. You wrote the following, not me:

> >>Learning the code is a waste of time.
> >>
> >I have BSEEand MSEE and I say it's not a waste of time at all.
>
> It is a waste of time for those that have a degree or are just interested in
> the technical aspect.

I have two degrees in electrical engineering and I say it's not a
waste of time.

You were the one who started waving degrees around.

And I'm interested in the technical aspect.

> The exception is if you TRULY enjoy it.

I didn't enjoy it until I learned it.

>In that case, it
> is not a waste of time. You may truly enjoy it,so it is not a waste of time for
> you. I do not truly enjoy Morse code.

Then why not simply say it's not fun FOR YOU?
>
> >How you spend your time is up to you, but the way you write says that
> >learning
> >code is a waste of time for everyone, not just for you.
>
> It should not be tied to the higher licence class.

How would YOU structure the licenses, Vipul, given the following
facts:

1) Currently, all amateur privileges above 30 MHz are granted with a
Tech license that has no code test.

2) FCC says that the treaty requires a code test for any amatuer
license with HF/MF privileges.

Would you have the code test tied to the entry level license class? Or
would you limit VHF-UHF privileges?

Tell us how YOU would solve the problem and not violate the
constraints.
>
> >>This takes away from other (legitimate) skills.
> >
> >Is Morse code not a "legitimate" skill for a ham to have?
>
> Its legitamate for a Ham.

Whether the TEST is a necessary requirement is a different thing.

> Not for one who wants to increase technical skills
> and does not enjoy Morse code.

So how should the license structure be set up?
>
> >Did you get to pick and choose the courses you wanted for the BSEE, and
> >reject
> >any that didn't interest you? Or did you have to learn some stuff that was of
> >no interest but was required for the degree?
>
> There were many course I didn't like.

Such as?

> Many even were irrelevant.

Such as?

> To satisfy
> some rationalization, or to act as filler courses to get the required amount of
> credits, or for a variety of reasons, they were tied to the degree. That does
> not make it right.

Give us some examples of courses that were irrelevant.

I still remember every course I took and every teacher in EE school.
Some of the things I learned there I did not fully appreciate until
years later.

> There is not need to do the same thing to amateur radio.

I'm beginning to understand why you dislike the code so much.
>
> >(I'm NOT saying a ham license is an academic certificate, just that one
> >doesn;t
> >get to pick and choose.)
>
> One has the ability to use common sense and not tie the code to the technical
> license class.

How? Solve the problem I posted above.
> ---
> ---------------------
> ---

> --
> Morse code, dissected:
>
> It is possible that in the early stages of learning an "audio-motory" skill
> such as Morse code , a quasi-phonological approach to temporal processing is
> used, which prioritizes sequence over temporal precision, and that what marks
> the acquisition of a motor skill is the changeover to from sequence-priority
> processing to time-priority processing.

Really? Define "sequence priority" and "time priority" for us.

Much more simply: Learning to receive Morse code consists of learning
to associate certain sound or light patterns with the letters of the
alphabet, numerals and punctuation marks.
>
> It is this state of "time-priority" processing, when one can say they "learned"
> the code. This state is not achieved at 5wpm.

How do you know?

>(It is still a waste of time,
> however).

How do you know?

Koch and others showed that for most people the optimal way to learn
to receive Morse code is by hearing the characters at speeds in excess
of about 15 wpm, with exaggerated spaces between characters. The
characters are thus heard as "units of sound" rather than separate
sound. Similar to the way a child learning to understand speech does
not process a word like "cat" as "kuh.....ahhhh....tuh" but rather as
a single unit of sound.

>I have successfully learned another real-time encoding/decoding
> symbol set scheme, with Kinaesthetic processing (because I enjoy it).

In other words, you learned to talk and understand human speech.

> Once one
> reaches the state of time-priority processing, one cannot unlearn the code.

How do you know? Can you guarantee that nobody who has learned it has
ever forgotten it?
>
> After the changeover to time-priority processing, one may lose the ability of
> sequence priority processing. This is called "motor-memory".

Is that a bad thing?
>
> The end result is communication over a medium, which despite hypothetical
> scenarios, can be achieved by voice.

Not always.

Under some conditions, Morse will be usable for radio communications
when analog voice modes (AM, FM, SSB) using equivalent equipment
simply won't work.

> If you don't enjoy it, or find it
> relevant, don't learn it.

> Don't be pressured into it, just to satisfy some
> "requirement".

I think that's bad advice if someone wants to have an HF/MF amateur
license. Of course after WRC 2003 it may not be an issue anymore.

--

You say you're interested in "the technical aspect" and "homebrewing",
but I don't see you describing what it is you want to build.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2588. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 22:31:21 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.52.0302202216410.137@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 61621

On Thu, 20 Feb 2003, Mike Coslo wrote:
> And I know of a few who don't upgrade because they want people to know
>that they passed the "tougher" test. Go figure.

All I can say is that they are idiots - because we will still know that from the "prior license class" data field. For the first 3.5 months of 2000, upgrading from advanced to extra has a relatively simple test (element 4B, as compared to the immediately prior test they had passed - element 4A), but after April 14, 2000, they would have to retake the hardest examination. Why more of them didn't upgrade then is a mystery, except for those who were completely inactive (yes, some of them exist).

There is a similar situation with the novice class, being that their written element credit (old element 2) was effectively cancelled: Take element 3A before, or retake the new element 2; either way become a Technician (w/HF), but doing it before would have the advantage of the license database actually showing the privilege.

I'm surprised that more people in these license classes didn't actually [try to] upgrade during the 3.5 month window in 2000.

Similarly, for those who have the "paper-only" upgrade to General because they were pre-March-1987 Technicians, why more of them DON'T at least ATTEMPT element 4 seems strange. As long as one has to pay the test/processing fee, one may as well TRY once. Believe it or not, the VE testing team I work with still sees an occasional paper upgrade even today (well, as of our January 2003 session) and we're only able to "twist the arm" of the candidate into trying element 4 about 20% of the time (and sometimes, they even pass too).

2589. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 22:32:22 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0302201432.3a32d44b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61622

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E54629A.D484A704@earthlink.net>...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > In article <c2356669.0302180920.6d0ef744@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> > (N2EY) writes:
> >
> > >"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> > >news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hah4ji9.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> > >> On 17 Feb 2003 17:53:32 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> > >Anybody can comment, propose rule changes, etc., not just hams.
> > >However, it is a mystery why an individual who has never held an
> > >amateur license and obviously has little interest in getting one is so
> > >interested in changing the rules.
> >
> > Tsk, tsk, tsk, it's a mystery to me why someone who is an
> > amateur will hide his profession. :-)

Who does that? Can't be me. My profession has been reported here
several times. Here it is again:

I'm an electrical engineer. I've been employed full time in design
(and a few other EE-related activities) since graduation from college.

> > Must be some schizoid fantasy thing going around... :-)

lessee...who needs multiple screen names?
>
> Your method of "civil debate" is well documented.

Len is very civil - until somebody disagrees with him.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2590. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 22:34:42 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.52.0302202232310.137@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 61623

On Thu, 20 Feb 2003, N2EY wrote:
>... The funniest part is that the mere possession of an Advanced simply
>proves the holder passed 5 wpm and the old writtens.

Except for the medical certificate (which actually shows up as a field entry in the FCC database) cheats, don't you really mean 13 wpm?

>There may also be some sour grapes because the restructuring doesn't
>give Advanceds any more credit towards Extra than a General.

But they DID have an advantage during the 3.5 month window in 2000 since element 4B was a much easier test. If they didn't take advantage of that, that's their own damn fault.

2591. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 22:45:05 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0302201445.1b11025c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61624

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E5468C3.4AE9D3D3@earthlink.net>...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > In article <c2356669.0302180947.69df98fd@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> > (N2EY) writes:
> >
> > >Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > >news:<3E4E68EA.8FC821B7@earthlink.net>...
> > >> Len Over 21 wrote:
> > >> >
> > >> > In article <3E4C5F89.6049AC04@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > >> > writes:
>
> >
> > >Because it removes a whole line of possible insults from Len's NG ammo
> > >case.
> >
> > Translation: FEAR. :-)

No, just common sense.
>
> No translation by you needed. Jim has observed the games you play over
> employment/employers of anyone who disagrees with you. Why would he
> subject himself to it?

I was born at night, but not last night.
>
> > >> Why the silly names like "Reverend Jimmie"?
> > >
> > >Avoids addressing the actual issue. Also, an attempt to get me to
> > >reply in kind.
> >
> > Those who act like prissy pedantic parsons get what
> > they deserve. :-)
>
> And you, Foghorn Lenhorn, get what you deserve.

Not really ;-)

Len has recently dropped to the level of racial epithets as well,
repeatedly calling me "boy".

> > >Len wants to minimize the fact that I have electrical engineering
> > >degrees from major universities (Penn and Drexel, right here in
> > >Philly) and that I have designed and built much of my own ham

> > >equipment in my 35 years as a ham. Nowhere have I claimed to have
> > >designed and built all of it. That's just another of Len's misquotes.
> >
> > Tsk, tsk, tsk..."much" is the new morph of the original "all."

Note that he does not provide any evidence, just repeats the same
false claim.

> You must never tire of being made to look like a fool, Len. You want
> the Google archived posts on this one?
>
> > >Direct insult in an attempt to get me to reply in kind.
> >
> > "Brain dead old fart" is a phrase used by Jim Kehler, KH2D
> > (a definitive PCTA) over five years ago and still being used
> > by him on his website. :-)
>
> You're no Jim Kehler.

Neither am I.

Len demonstrates his logical processes by the above example. Some ham
named Jim with a 2-land call used a pejorative phrase 5 years ago, so
he thinks he's justified in tossing it at me. Four-year-olds see the
logical faults in that. ;-)

> Besides, you're the oldest guy here. If anyone
> deserves the crown, it is you.

Pretty "immagure" behavior, really.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2592. Re: Q: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-20 23:22:19 UTC
From: lbudney-google@nb.net
Message-ID: <417b917a.0302201522.53d49621@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61625

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote:
> On 20 Feb 2003 07:11:18 -0800, Len Budney wrote:
>>
>> Ah--if only we'd loosen up, and adopt the cosmopolitan
>> immorality of the Euros!
>
> Considering that as "immorality" is proof of what I posted.

Agreed: that you fail to recognize it as immoral indicates that your moral compass is mis-calibrated.

> How many Europeans do you know?

Quite a number.

> Most of those whom I know have a healthy sense of what
> is moral and immoral.

They're reasonably polite, and don't kill people. Otherwise, they're no better than any other humans, which is to say they're a very mixed bag. European culture takes a libertine attitude to sex, and folks who espouse it are espousing immorality.

--Len.

2593. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-21 01:12:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030220201223.14527.00000481@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 61626

In article <7a_4a.185305$be.172770@rwcrnsc53>, "Jackie"
<buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> writes:

>Subject: Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)
>From: "Jackie" <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com>
>Date: Thu, 20 Feb 2003 06:00:35 GMT
>
>Self-appointed alpha RF technophile, master of the non-sequitur and abuser
>of innocent emoticons, Mr. "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in
>message news:20030219180742.24452.00000015@mb-fw.aol.com...

I sense strong opposition....

>>> In FCC 90-53 the FCC stated that
>> it didn't consider a morse code test to be worthwhile for its
>> task on determining any amateur applicant's qualifications for
>> an amateur radio license. That was in 1990. 13 years ago.

Ancient history. Note, however, that FCC continued to require the 13 and 20 wpm
code tests until 2000.

Note also that despite the fact that FCC dropped all code test requirements for
the Technician license in February of 1991 (12 years ago), Len hasn't bothered
to get one. That tells you something about his interest in radio.

>> FCC said it again in NPRM 98-143. 5 years ago.

No, they didn't. They asked for input on the issue - no code test speeds were
proposed in the NPRM. In the R&O, which came out 3 years ago, FCC said that
code tests served "no regulatory purpose" other than meeting the requirements
of the treaty, and dropped all code testing except 5 wpm.

>> The IARU
>> took a position against the morse code test nearly 2 years ago.
>> ARRL still hasn't made up its mind, won't take a stand either
>> way (they say the speak for all US amateurs).

The actual ARRL BoD position is to neither oppose nor support removal of the
treaty changes.
>
>The ARRL does not nearly compromise all US amateurs, but they still have the
>loudest voice of any AR organization in the US. The content of the voices of
>its combined members is what is important.

And ARRL does not claim to speak for "all" US radio amateurs.

>> How soon is the "soon" you mention? :-)
>

>Dunno. Who's waiting with baited breath for the outcome of the meetings in
>the Alps? Some prospective amateurs might be looking towards the outcome of
>this summer's convention and waiting for the Morse test to finally be
>pronounced DOA before they jump into the fray, but I'm more concerned about
>loss of frequency privileges to commercial interests myself.

Very valid concerns.
>
>> Remember the old mantra, "CW gets through when nothing else
>> will?" :-) Dates from the 1930s and the official pages of QST.

I have every issue of QST from mid 1927 to this year, as well as many earlier issues. I cannot recall that particular quoted sentence ever appearing in QST. Perhaps Len can supply us with some issue and page numbers where that phrase supposedly occurs?

It is a fact, however, that under some conditions CW will get through when analog voice modes (AM, FM, SSB) simply won't.

>Seems like common sense to me that good radio operation and amateur practice
>comes with the attitude and skill of the operator, and not the modes in
>which they choose to work. I will maintain that it should not matter if you
>choose to work strictly CW or not, or whether you choose to use a mixed bag
>when communicating.

Agreed!

> Even Extra class ops can and do key out the f-word over
>and over again while jamming other people's conversations.

I've never heard that around here, from any class of license.

>Like that takes a lot of skill.

'zactly

>> The "attractiveness" has become less with age and the refusal
>> of so many to adapt to change.
>
>I was not around in 1930, Len, but I think there've been plenty of changes
>in amateur radio since then. You are perenially p.o.'d because they still
>make people take the Morse test to get a higher class license. Seems that
>this, and ONLY this issue is the one that keeps you away from the AR ranks.
>Otherwise, I could not imagine why you would spend so much time harping
>about the horrid CW on a newsgroup.

His hobby is wasting time. Your time.

> If this ONE change were instituted in
>amateur radio, would you "all of a sudden" find it a useful and wonderful
>place to be?

Judging by Len's posts here over the past several years, I don't think so.

>Gee, I'd hate to hinge all of my decisions to do or not do
>something on account of one particular point I didn't agree with.
>
>Or maybe you really do get your jollies out of lording some imagined
>alpha-RF technophile status over us. I don't know.

>> A singular, elegant new innovation is the "Tayloe detector" by
>> Dan Tayloe.

N7VE - one of those 20 wpm Extra class hams with a 1x2 call that Len loves to bash so much.

In another post, Len describes him:

"There's an intermittent discussion going on in rec.radio.amateur.homebrew under the subject thread of "Barnstorming Ideas for a 40 Meter Rig." Several good things have been raised there and also slightly interrupted by Dan Tayloe plumping for his NorCal 30, featuring the Tayloe Mixer."

>> Only a terribly small percentage of today's US
>> radio amateurs would recognize it in its original form, a
>> switched commutating filter using a low-On-resistance, low-
>> noise CMOS IC.

Len has interviewed lots of hams and knows what they would and would not recognize, you see.

>> Dan Tayloe

N7VE

>> saw it where hardly anyone did
>> and got a US patent on it as a mixer. Well-deserved patent
>> grant but all the "ham experts" seem to recognize is that it
>> makes a neat QRP rig. :-)

Actually, it's a CW transceiver. According to his own account, N7VE was trying out ideas for a different kind of product detector, and the idea occurred to him. He developed it into a complete receiver, then into a CW transceiver of amazing simplicity, low cost, low current drain and high performance. Only a monoband design at this point, but the principles have all been demonstrated and a kit is available.

The amateur radio QRP folks use mostly CW, btw. They also do a lot of homebrewing and kitbuilding, often designing and building rigs from scratch in a short time just to try out an idea, circuit or component. The good performance of CW with low power and simple equipment makes it a natural combination.

Just think - a ham developed a new, patented, high performance mixer design while developing a QRP CW transceiver. Len doesn't want you to know this ;-)

Does all that mean a code test MUST stay? Of course not.
>

>From the frequency and ardency with which you do so, I am forced to conclude
>that "fun" for you must consist mostly of writing smug retorts and
>non-sequiturs to your perceived AR persecutors, followed by smiley emoticons
>ad nauseum.

His hobby is...

>Cripes, Len, get a grip. I'm not a professional radio engineer, nor do I
>aspire to be one. But that does not make me inferior to you. I don't care
>where or when you got your commercial license. I am just a little stumped as
>to why you feel above taking a simple test to receive an amateur license,
>despite the fact that everyone else, no matter how much they know, has to do
>the exact same thing.
>
>Are you better than the rest of us, Len? Really, tell me what you think.

He's been telling the rest of us for years now....;-)

73 de Jim, N2EY

2594. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-21 01:28:05 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b33vfbpfu1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 61627

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hakgbh1.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Tue, 18 Feb 2003 23:13:23 -0500, Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> >My hard copy arrived today. I mailed the ARRL renewal formback
> >to ARRL about 2/5/03. Not bad, total elapsed time from my
> >mailing to hardcopy was only 13 days.
>
> Could you have renewed on line instead?

I believe I could have, but all I needed to do was sign/date the ARRL
pre-populated form and mail it back in the pre-addressed envelope.
That took less time than finding the FCC URL, typing in whatever
data I needed, etc.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2595. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-21 01:51:40 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E558636.5060809@adelphia.net>
Source record: 61628

N2EY wrote:

> Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3E54F9C7.7020807@psu.edu>...
>
>>Robert Casey wrote:
>>
>>>N2EY wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>Given factors 1 and 2, and possibly 3, it's more likely that the last
>>>>Novice license will be gone from the database before the last
>>>>Advanced.
>>>>
>>>
>>>If a novice bothers to renew, he is just as likely to go to the trouble
>>>(not a lot of trouble, though) to upgrade to tech with code or to
>>>general. Novices can't do much on the air, and any interested in
>>>staying hams will likely upgrade.
>>>
>>>Advanced's are less likely to upgrade, as they only lack a few hundred
>>>KHz of sub bands to play in.
>>>
>>>
>> And I know of a few who don't upgrade because they want people to know
>>that they passed the "tougher" test.
>>
>
> Tougher test? "Lite" license? Big deal. Kinda like saying "I paid $500
> for this VCR 20 years ago, so it's gotta be 'better' than the one you
> just got for $100".

Oh, for sure. (whispering) I really think its cuz their just getting
cranky! (back to normal) Nice guys all, but they have this thing yaknow?

> The important thing is what the licensee does after the license is
> earned.

Absolutely. I'm having a ball learning more stuff.

> The funniest part is that the mere possession of an Advanced simply
> proves the holder passed 5 wpm and the old writtens.

Heh, not to hear them talk!

> There may also be some sour grapes because the restructuring doesn't
> give Advanceds any more credit towards Extra than a General.

Bingo! As we can see here in the group, there are still hams who are p****d off about that.

> Plus the leg-pulling factor.

Well, they seemed pretty serious, and the joke is on them in hte end.

>>Go figure.

Yeah.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2596. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-21 02:01:20 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E55887A.8040709@adelphia.net>
Source record: 61629

Robert Casey wrote:

> N2EY wrote:
>
>
>>
>>The funniest part is that the mere possession of an Advanced simply
>>proves the holder passed 5 wpm and the old writtens.
>>
>
> Thought it was 13 wpm.

Now that you mention it, I think you are right.

>>
>>There may also be some sour grapes because the restructuring doesn't
>>give Advanceds any more credit towards Extra than a General.
>>
>
> Well, they could have taken the old extra test up to a year before April
> 15, 2000 and cashed the CSCE in on April 15, 2000 and have an extra.
> I did something similar: Had the old style tech (general written and 5wpm).
> Took the advanced and the extra writtens in Jan 2000. Got the CSCEs
> and cashed them in on April 15, 2000 at a special VE event set up for
> this purpose. And got the extra ticket a week later in the mail (The VEs
> were quick to submit the paperwork, obviously).

Good move, Robert. Why anyone wouldn't take advantage of the new setup......

> Well, the above advanceds missed the boat.

But they still have their pride. I guess. 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

2597. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-21 02:08:13 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E558A17.8070001@adelphia.net>
Source record: 61630

D. Stussy wrote:

> On Thu, 20 Feb 2003, Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>> And I know of a few who don't upgrade because they want people to know
>>that they passed the "tougher" test. Go figure.
>>
>
> All I can say is that they are idiots - because we will still know that from the
> "prior license class" data field. For the first 3.5 months of 2000, upgrading
> from advanced to extra has a relatively simple test (element 4B, as compared to
> the immediately prior test they had passed - element 4A), but after April 14,
> 2000, they would have to retake the hardest examination. Why more of them
> didn't upgrade then is a mystery, except for those who were completely inactive
> (yes, some of them exist).

True, although I suspect that as a group, the Advanced were relatively
active compared to say novices.

> There is a similar situation with the novice class, being that their written
> element credit (old element 2) was effectively cancelled: Take element 3A
> before, or retake the new element 2; either way become a Technician (w/HF), but
> doing it before would have the advantage of the license database actually
> showing the privilege.
>
> I'm surprised that more people in these license classes didn't actually [try to]
> upgrade during the 3.5 month window in 2000.
>
> Similarly, for those who have the "paper-only" upgrade to General because they
> were pre-March-1987 Technicians, why more of them DON'T at least ATTEMPT element
> 4 seems strange. As long as one has to pay the test/processing fee, one may as
> well TRY once. Believe it or not, the VE testing team I work with still sees an
> occasional paper upgrade even today (well, as of our January 2003 session) and
> we're only able to "twist the arm" of the candidate into trying element 4 about
> 20% of the time (and sometimes, they even pass too).

I agree it's weird. It's weird that they wouldn't try even if they had to
study some.

- mike KB3EIA -

2598. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-21 02:24:17 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <l5g5a.1374$hj.1136114@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 61631

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030219231551.09946.00000016@mb-md.aol.com...
> Len:
>
> You've just been given bad advice. You ARE a "dumbed down Extra Lite"
and
> have achieved your privileges under a licensing regime which is
significantly
> reduced, compared to the one experienced by Pre-Restructuring Extras who
were
> tested under a much more challenging and comprehensive set of
requirements.
> Moreover, you have not been required to learn one of Amateur Radio's most
> practical, effective, efficient, and universal communications modes at a
useful
> proficiency level (Morse/CW). You ARE an Extra Lite, and always will be,
and
> you have the whining and complaining of lots of your fellow Extra Lites
to
> thank for your newfound insignificance.

Len ... welcome to ham radio from "Larry the (bigoted) Lecturer" ...
ham radio's "ambassador of goodwill and the true ham spirit" (NOT!)

Seriously ... don't let his "dumbed down Extra Lite" crap get to you.
I'm an RF engineer w/over 32 years experience and have been a
ham for over 25 years and Larry insults me, too ...

As my friend from the UK would say, "Tell him to piss off."

And, despite jerks like Larry, welcome to ham radio.

73,
--
Carl R. Stevenson - wk3c (ex - wa6vse)
Grid Square FN20fm
<mailto:wk3c@wk3c.com> (general personal e-mail and NCI e-mail)
<mailto:wk3cqth@wk3c.com> (QSO, QSL, skeds, only, please)

NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, QCWA (31424)
Member, ARRL
Member, TAPR

Member, The SETI League

Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

[remainder of Larry the (bigoted) Lecturers AH comments deleted]

2599. Re: N8WWM BUSTED SAYS RAIN REPORT

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-21 02:59:28 UTC
From: "... ... _..."
Message-ID: <sqOcnefZkMSNC8ijXTWc3A@comcast.com>
Source record: 61632
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

wow pretty neat trick Twistedhed
Watch out doug doesn't sue you for libel.

"deck-the-hall" <deckthehall@webtv.com> wrote in message
news:dc1baa4a.0302200920.2171992a@posting.google.com...
> N8WWM guilty of FCC violations. According to the FCC, N8WWM, Dog Adair
> committed several violations over the air at the expense of the Toledo
> Amateur Radio Club by utilizing their repeater to break the law. The
> amateur club received a warning letter from the FCC concerning Adair's
> violations and were told to take steps to make certain the violations
> by Adair will not be repeated. Adair not only hurt the entire image of
> amateur radio with his inexcusable behavior, but damaged the
> reputation of yet another entity trying to further the good of amateur
> radio. It's a shame when bad apples like these make it so clubs can't
> even trust their own users to abide by the rules they were sworn to
> uphold. Adair is also an infamous presence on the internet. A google
> search of "N8WWM" reveals a peek into the world of the individual
> identified as Adair. In addition to FCC violations, Adair has, in the
> past, been accused of being a prolific spammer, breaking several
> internet laws and violating several terms of service agreements with
> internet providers.

2600. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-21 04:02:22 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302202002.6a15e16b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61633

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.ham51qa.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> On 20 Feb 2003 04:55:56 -0800, Brian wrote:
>
> >> Haven't heard. I'll check with a friend who is an EA.
>
> >Phil, check with someone who's a W or a K. The EA's probably wouldn't
> >know anything about it. ;))
>
> Are you trying to appear stupid or is that your default setting?
>
> ---
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

Phil, I just didn't want you running off to Spain for something that's
a domestic matter. ;))

Anyway, what did you find out?

2601. Re: N8WWM BUSTED SAYS RAIN REPORT

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-21 05:51:37 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <e4fb5vco5s3iu0cuu339or349lun6hb6o5@4ax.com>
Source record: 61634
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Thu, 20 Feb 2003 21:59:28 -0500, "... ... _..." <.@... .com> wrote:

>wow pretty neat trick Twistedhed
>Watch out doug doesn't sue you for libel.

This is highly unlikely on Usenet. The burden of proof rests with the person being libeled. Anyone can sign any name in a Usenet posting. Even if you prove that a post came from a certain computer via an IP address, you still have to prove that *that* *person* made the posting. The only way of defending would be to build a case against the poster if libelous postings continue. IOW, N8WWN should be patient and give the poster enough rope to hang themselves with

2602. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-21 06:44:01 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030221014401.25546.00000881@mb-me.aol.com>
Source record: 61639

In article <20030220061433.23241.00000015@mb-da.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>Also gave a good indication of propagation. Back when a 1000 mile contact was
>a major accomplishment, this was an important feature.

Maybe you could help out K3LT complete his WAS? He seems
to have difficulty getting out...

Let's all encourge him to be a WAS-been.

<signature here>

2603. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-21 06:44:01 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030221014401.25546.00000882@mb-me.aol.com>
Source record: 61640

In article <20030220025312.25398.00000249@mb-cb.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Attilla the Ham) writes:

>>And of course, the FCC eventually abandoned the strict
>>district system anyway since it proved to have little or no value.
>
> I think this was more due to economics than it was any other reason.

Ah! Attilla is now the Alan Greenspan wannabe! Another who "knows" what the FCC thinks!

2604. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-21 06:44:02 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030221014402.25546.00000883@mb-me.aol.com>
Source record: 61636

In article <20030220024911.25398.00000248@mb-cb.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

> Yes...it goes on...but it would be a bit more orderly if it were left
>the way it was.

Order in the ranks! Keep that formation! Hold those muskets proudly! Hup-too-tree-foah! :-)

2605. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-21 06:44:03 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030221014403.25546.00000884@mb-me.aol.com>
Source record: 61651

In article <20030219231551.09946.00000016@mb-md.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam
(Dartisgone) writes the following without
the aid of the Three Morseketeers:

>In article <2mN4a.53666$Rx3.2151954@news1.west.cox.net>, "Aspiring Elmer"
><elmer@nowhere.com> writes:
>
>>"Len Budney" <lbudney-google@nb.net> wrote in message
>>news:417b917a.0302190636.e464c20@posting.google.com...
>>> Hello,
>>>
>>> I'm not a ham, but my parents are: AB2OA and AB2OB. I'd like to get
>>> the general opinion of the group about callsigns.
>>>
>>> Later this year I'll be getting my "nickle extra". Despite the lowly,
>>> dumbed down status of the Extra ticket today, I'm thinking about
>>> getting a 1x2 callsign. :-)
>>
>>Hey if you pass the current test for extra-- you are an extra period. Ignore
>>any comments about extra lite, etc
>
>Len:
>
>You've just been given bad advice. You ARE a "dumbed down Extra Lite" and
>have achieved your privileges under a licensing regime which is significantly
>reduced, compared to the one experienced by Pre-Restructuring Extras who were
>tested under a much more challenging and comprehensive set of requirements.

Yes, get to the back of the soma cum loud's paratransit vehicle!
:-)

>Moreover, you have not been required to learn one of Amateur Radio's most
>practical, effective, efficient, and universal communications modes at a
>useful proficiency level (Morse/CW).

:-) The mobile morseman of the Amateur Radiotelegraph Service
speaks again!

>You ARE an Extra Lite, and always will be, and
>you have the whining and complaining of lots of your fellow Extra Lites to
>thank for your newfound insignificance.

...must have gotten a reject letter from ARRL Public Relations
department after seeking that job there. Dartisgone has the
Human Resources qualifications. :-)

>Yes, it is cheating. Get a call sign which properly reflects the Call Sign
>District in which you actually live.

By all means Follow Regulations as They Have Always Been
Done, never ever to be changed, modified, altered in any way?
:-)

>Yes, I'd worry about it if I were you! These idiots with the out-of-district
>Vanity Call signs demonstrate nothing more than selfish self-interest and have
>no concern for how they appear to fellow amateurs on-the-air. It is just
plain
>frustrating for a ham like myself, trying to complete a basic Worked All
States
>award, to work a W2 and find out that he, like virtually every other W2 he's
>worked, has a QTH of Florida, Texas, or California!

Oooo...worry, worry, worry about pleasing an extra who hasn't
gotten a WAS yet! :-)

[where was this jeremiad during the RI ham's KH6 days in here?]

>You can go a long way to
>reducing the personal impact of your dumbed-down Extra Lite status by at
>least choosing a proper call sign with the right District number.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. That would be "cheating" according to the desk
driving ace of the USAF. See above quotes.

>That much is true. However, your Extra-Lite status can be easily determined
by
>a simple check of QRZ.com, so don't try to pass yourself off as anything other
>than the dumbed-down Extra Lite that you truly are. If you are more than,
say,
>15 years old, you've had plenty of time to become a licensed amateur and
>upgrade to Extra under the Pre-Restructuring rules, so you have no excuse for
>waiting until the code and theory testing requirements were dropped to their
>present inconsequential levels. You may think that it's "not your fault" that
>you are a dumbed-down Extra Lite, but it is simply a fact of your life now,
>brought upon you as a result of lazy, dumbed-down people who wanted amateur
>radio privileges without being required to make the effort to meet the
>licensing requirements under the more comprehensive standards in place prior
>to April 15, 2000.

Oooo! Larrie should really investigate a comfortable seat cushion
for his paratransit vehicle. He's obviously had a bad day at the
orifice.

>The only problem with 1x2's is there will be much less to choose from as
>opposed to 2x1's or 2x2's. However, if I were a dumbed-down Extra Lite, I'd
>probably just stick with my present call in order not to look like I'm trying
>to pass myself off as something I'm not!

Larrie boy, you just concentrate on getting that WAS, okay?
Then you can have another lovely certificate to show how much

better you are than those good-for-nothing dumbed-down back-
of-the-bus extra lites.

2606. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-21 06:44:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030221014404.25546.00000885@mb-me.aol.com>
Source record: 61638

In article <Xns9327812F65D0Dpookster@216.168.3.50>, "Bill, W7TI"
<jamspam@upyours.now> writes:

>You used the word "insanity" so I'm expecting a pretty convincing reply.
>Something more than "I don't like it".

You are too optimistic, Bill. :-)

2607. Re: Q: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-21 06:44:05 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030221014405.25546.00000886@mb-me.aol.com>
Source record: 61642

In article <b32jpi$326$0@pita.alt.net>, "Bob H" <BH@comcaastorg.net> writes:

> Yes, and it has been my experience that the type of mentality
>which seeks out to have this type of call sign assigned to them is
>almost always of the "CB mentality." Meaning, mentally, they
>have never left 11 meters and bring all their CB habits and thinking
>right along with them when they enter "Super CB" (ham radio).

Filthy evil Citizen Banders? :-)

2608. Re: Q: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-21 06:44:05 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030221014405.25546.00000887@mb-me.aol.com>
Source record: 61643

In article <20030220025449.25398.00000250@mb-cb.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Q: Callsign etiquette?
>>From: "Bill, W7TI" jamspam@upyours.now
>>Date: 2/19/03 2:35 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <Xns9327800F438B7pookster@216.168.3.50>
>
>>I used to add the /6 for ragchewing but gave it up as rather pointless
>>since the FCC no longer requires it. I just say W7TI located in Southern
>>California, and let 'em figure it out.
>
> OK...I give up...what's the difference?

Lost without the "consummation" ritual? :-)

2609. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-21 06:44:06 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030221014406.25546.00000888@mb-me.aol.com>
Source record: 61637

In article <20030220023528.14846.00000448@mb-cc.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Attilla the Ham) writes:

> By April 14, 2010 those licenses will go ker-plop. fall off the database,
>most of which, I am willing to be, were never "consumated" by an on-the-air
>contact...

Ooooo. Sex on the radio! :-)

2610. Re: New Field Day Entry Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-21 06:44:07 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030221014407.25546.00000890@mb-me.aol.com>
Source record: 61641

In article <f45722ac.0302200457.cfd33c6@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> No, it means I'm in and you're still talking about "GETTING INTO amateur
>> radio".
>>
>> Dave K8MN
>
>I haven't heard him talking about that. Could you be more specific?

He's "in" amateur radio. Like "turf," man...don' boddah da Hood
bout whut dey gots as 'hood rights! Dey RULEZ! :-)

2611. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-21 06:44:07 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030221014407.25546.00000889@mb-me.aol.com>
Source record: 61649

In article <G545a.187100$HN5.815085@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net>, "Jackie"
<buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030220021035.29944.00000027@mb-fi.aol.com...
>
>> "It's the LAW!" Right. Laws in force now cannot ever
>> be changed, cannot be talked about (absolutely never
>> by those without official authorized licenses!). Yup.
>
>Who sez?

Heh...that phrase "It's the LAW!" turns up from time to
time in here, written by several. It's the "turf" mentality
of the old-timers.

You, specifically, haven't written that, but others have. I'd
mention DejaNews but that is "defunct." :-) Google
bought out DejaNews. Google has most of the past
messages in newsgroups. Some of the regulars in here
virtually live there, virtual ego bruisings very painful,
demanding some sort of retribution or at least a chance
at more virtual combat. :-)

All laws are made by humans. Humans can also unmake
laws in a democratic-principle republic. The fact that a law
exists does not mean it is inviolate, never to be removed.
Those who feel comfortable and secure under a specific set
of laws dislike the thought of anyone changing that set so
they invoke the "It's the LAW!" hue and cry, hoping to
suppress dissenters (to their pet set of laws).

Some even go so far as to virtually claim ownership of an
activity, including the alleged authority to rule on who is
allowed to express opinions. They have no authority but
demand obeyance or they will meet the dissenters after
school is over and beat them up. :-)

All that about a hobby. :-)

2612. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-21 06:44:08 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030221014408.25546.00000891@mb-me.aol.com>
Source record: 61635

In article <b326a6frt0@pita.alt.net>, "Alphonse" <QRZ@Anon.com> writes:

>Gee, Stevie.
>How many more comments do you have in store?
>Give it a break, willya?

Shhhh...don't disturb Attilla the Ham...he is very busy with
his ethnic cleansing. :-)

2613. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-21 06:44:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030221014410.25546.00000892@mb-me.aol.com>
Source record: 61652

In article <20030220034949.25398.00000258@mb-cb.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Then stop trying to start a verbal battle over Army unit honors.
>
> Ahhhhhhh...but Lennie...That was YOUR doings...

Those two Presidential Unit Citations were the doing of then-President Dwight D. Eisenhower. :-)

>>Then stop all the jabbering about Army unit honors, Civil Air
>> Patrol, Maxwell AFB, and all things NOT amateur radio.
>
> Then can I assume that we will NEVER hear about SINCGARS, The 71st
>Signal Buttallion, or be spammed by your CV EVER AGAIN...?!?!

SINgle Channel Ground Air Radio System is the standard US military small-unit RADIO; standard and operational for 14 years now. US Army Signal units are engaged in RADIO communications.

The former "commissioned officer" and "communications officer" of the Tennessee State Guard wasn't familiar with standard, operational radios of the US military or the USA National Guard units. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

>>You are not a moderator of this newsgroup, have no authority
>> to moderate it, cannot change it despite all the hundreds of
>> epithets you have posted here.
>
> And despite YOUR attempts to BE the moderator, Lennie, the NG goes where
>it will WITHOUT your permission or approval.

Goes where? To the dumpster? Dumpsters seem to be the in thing in here lately... :-)

You are not a moderator of this newsgroup, have no authority to moderate it, cannot change it despite all the hundreds of epithets you have posted here.

>>You are not a moderator of this newsgroup, have no authority
>> to moderate it, cannot change it despite all the hundreds of
>> epithets you have posted here.
>
> And despite YOUR attempts to BE the moderator, Lennie, the NG goes where
>it will WITHOUT your permission or approval.

You are not a moderator of this newsgroup, have no authority to moderate it, cannot change it despite all the hundreds of epithets you have posted here.

> Sorry you don't like it. You're free to leave.

Most anyone is "free to leave." The sole exemption is one poor puppy who seems to be looking for a substitute for his failed, defunct USMC career...one where he can indulge in pushing others around. :-)

2614. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-21 06:44:14 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030221014414.25546.00000893@mb-me.aol.com>
Source record: 61653

In article <20030220034216.25398.00000257@mb-cb.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Presidential Unit Citations and other honors have no specified
>> "period."
>
> ERROR WILL ROBINSON! ERROR!
>
> When initially issued, the award will specify a period of time overwhich
>the award was earned, or for what specific event the was issued.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, this is an amateur radio newsgroup, not some battleground over military honors. There are separate news-groups for those subjects.

A Presidential Unit Citation is not a medal or ribbon. It is awarded to a unit, stays with that unit as long as it is organized. For disputes over a Unit Citation, take arguments to the US Army Historical Center or the Adjutant General, United States Army.

>>Once awarded they stay with the unit.
>
> WITH the UNIT...The ONLY time the PERSON can "keep" the award as part of
>his/her heraldry is when that person was a member of a unit that was awarded
>the ribbon WHEN it was earned.

A Presidential Unit Citation is not a ribbon. Unit Citations are a part of the uniform of all unit members, the same as all identifying insignia of that unit.

> Now...Lennie...cough up the dates of those awards.

1954 and 1955. That was written before. Do you need Remedial English Comprehension classes? Contact your local school district's night-time extension class program.

>>> I read fine, Lennie. As for the adjective, I have asked you three
>>>different ways to tell us from what day to what day the PUC's to which you
>>>lay claim were awarded.

Repeat: This is an amateur radio newsgroup, not a military affairs administrative discussion venue. If you have a dispute with unit awards and citations of the US Army of the 1950s, contact the US Army Historical Center or the Adjutant General of the United States Army.

> So are your re-tellings of the ballad of the Fighting 71st, except, of
>course, when it's biting you on the butt.

The 71st Signal Service Battalion, 8235th Army Unit, Central
Command (Japan) was operationally attached to Far East
Command Headquarters, United States Army, beginning in
1946. In late1953 it was renamed Far East Command Signal
Service Battalion but retained the 8235th Army Unit designation.
The 8235th AU provided the entire signal communications for
the Far East Command Headquarters from the central Honshu
area of Japan. This continued until 1963 when all of the long-
distance HF communications facilities, including torn-tape
TTY relay and microwave inter-facility radio relay was
transferred to USAF control as part of downscaling US Army
forces in central Honshu. The USAF facilities were eliminated
in central Honshu in 1978 with land and buildings returned to
the Japanese government.

>>A Presidential Unit Citation is not some "soldier of the month"
>> thing. It is an honor bestowed on ALL members of the unit
>> receiving the award.
>
> IF they were a member of the unit during the period of time it was
>earned.

I was assigned to the 8235th AU from February 1953 to January
1956. The Presidential Unit Citations (two) were awarded to the
Battalion in 1954 and 1955.

Clearly there is some grasp of simple arithmetic situations which
seems common to PCTAs in here.

>> False. The entire Battalion received both Presidential Unit
>> Citations. We wore that proudly.
>
> W-h-a-t w-e-r-e t-h-e a-w-a-r-d p-e-r-i-o-d-s...?!?!?!

Those Unit Citations were awarded in 1954 and 1955. They
remained with the Battalion including the US Army Japan
forces reorganization which merged the 8235th AU and the
US Army Forces Far East Signal Battalion (old designation
72nd Signal Service Bn) with headquarters at Camp Zama,
near Yokohama. That merger was complete in 1957 with
the combined battalions renamed Japan Signal Service
Battalion. All previous battalion honors and awards were
carried into the new organization now of half-brigade size.

There were two more reorganizations of Signal Units in
Central Honshu after the movement of Far East Command
Headquarters to Fort Shafter, Hawaii. As stated, central
Honshu Army HF radio facilities were transferred to USAF
in 1963. The existing 78th Signal Service Battalion at Camp
Zama is the result of downsizing all central Honshu Army

Signal units and it is under the 516th Signal Brigade, US Army Pacific, Fort Shafter, Hawaii. The 78th at Zama has an HF radio division but that is one function, not a full division. HF radio serves the US Army as an auxilliary, back-up communications function while the primary is the DSN with fiber-optic cable and satellite microwave relay. The callsign of the old 71st was ADA and that is retained under an Army Regulation of 1995 for Headquarters, USARPAC. The left shoulder patch of the 78th Sig Svc Bn and other central Honshu US Army units is the stylized image of Mt. Fuji, the same as worn by US Army units in central Honshu since 1947.

There is no "cessation of awards" or "periods" for unit citations in the US Army. If a unit is disbanded, its citations remain kept in the US Army History Center along with a unit's full history. If a unit is disbanded, it will not have any members. If a unit is reactivated, honors and citations apply to the reactivated unit and its members. For complete details, administrative and otherwise, contact the US Army Historical Center. For disputes on awards, contact the Adjutant General, United States Army.

>>This is an amateur radio newsgroup...(SNIP)
>
> Then what are YOU doing here?

1. Trying to argue the subject of the elimination of the morse code test for an amateur radio license.

2. Trying to straighten out the disordered mentalities of BDOFs who want to talk about military matters and seven hostile action stories having no distinctive unit insignias.

>>For better mental health, contact your local psychiatrist and
>> get treatment.
>
> I might suggest the same for you, Lennie, in as much as you've
>demonstrated your penchant for pathological lying, profanity in a public
>forum, and obsessive-compulsive behaviour in a forum for persons for
>whom you have expressed great hatred and disgust for.
>
> Just my observations.

Heh heh heh...the delayed mirror syndrome. :-)

"Pathological lying?" No. I know considerable about RADIO and certainly that of my military service, that including the history before, during, and afterwards of service in my particular signal battalion. All of what I've explained may be verified from offcial sources. I do not state generalities such

as participation in "seven hostile actions" which are not explained in any detail, including dates and locations.

"Profanity in a public forum?" Hardly. Anyone can recall (without going to Google) who uses "putz" and "creep" and sexual references. That is little Stevie Robeson, aka Attilla the Ham...one who regularly, routinely insults all those who disagree with him and says he owes no one any apology for such actions.

"Obsessive-compulsive behavior?" Even without a U in 'behavior,' it is clear that the obsessive-compulsive action is on the part of Attilla the Ham, the defunct ex-NCO of the USMC.

"...against persons whom you've expressed great hatred and disgust for?" Hardly that. Someone posts, I reply. Others reply to that, I return reply. Still others post to the original. Sometimes a flame war erupts, sometimes not. Some are outraged to the point of desiring physical confrontation but most simply take it and move on. What is notable about the "delayed-mirror syndrome" exhibited by Attilla is that he has, publicly stated hatred and disgust for myself without apology in a most sociopathic demonstration (it is "justified" to his perverted standards) of ill will. Clearly Attilla demonstrates undesireable qualities and an almost absolute inability to get along with opposite opinions. The "pathology" of that may be observed in at least four years of his messages archived in Google. Anyone may go there and look for themselves...and find nearly ALL messages from ALL newsgroup message participants.

Amateur radio is just a hobby, an avocation involving radio for non-pecuniary reasons, supposedly a recreation. To some it becomes transcendant, almost metaphysical, into realms of myth, lore, and distinctive unit insignia on uniforms. A cult behavior far from the majority view of the hobby. :-)

2615. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-21 06:44:16 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030221014416.25546.00000894@mb-me.aol.com>
Source record: 61650

In article <20030220032536.25398.00000256@mb-cb.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>> No...They discuss military matters using CURRENT US Army manuals...The
>>same
>>>one's that pertain to the active Army, the Reserves AND the National Guard.
>>
>> Not current.
>
> Oh? You've BEEN to Tennessee, stopped by the armory and checked the
>shelves yourself?
>
> And you didn't even stop in for coffee...What a putz.
>
>>You are one sick person. Get help.
>
> I am sure you'd like to think so, Lennie, but I suggest you look at how
>many folks are making that same suggestion to you.

Only one, a compulsive-obsessive wannabe ethnic cleanser
who is too far into the suds to make sense of anything but
military matters, uniforms, and distinctive unit insignia. :-)

>>> And I have "damned" only ONE veteran. That would be you. I still call
>>>you a liar and a coward. That's MY right under the Freedom of Speech"

...but not against civil law on libel and slander. :-)

That's the major reason AOL removed Attilla's libelous little
hate piece of a home page that lasted only two days before
being taken down by AOL, which also stripped you of that
particular screen name. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

> I reiterate the above.

Iteration after iteration will not make your lies truth.

> Still not taking the dare, Lennie?
>
> Probably because you are still a liar and a coward.

No. The "liar and coward" charge is an imaginary construct
of a sociopathic individual whose only aim in life is to fight
anyone not agreeing with him. They redefine justification into
impossible things attempting to rationalize their actions.

> You woke up as a putz. Spent the day as a putz. And you'll go to bed
>as a putz.
>
> Must be a putz.

One more demonstration of a sick individual. Get help.

2616. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-21 06:44:17 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030221014417.25546.00000895@mb-me.aol.com>
Source record: 61646

In article <20030220031611.25398.00000255@mb-cb.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>> I live in a world where I am proud to be serving in some capacity. My
>>>"service" has, on more than one occassion, meant that someone went home
>>alive
>>>that might not have otherwise had that option had I and other like-minded
>>>volunteers not been there.
>>
>> Oh, my, those high-sounding words and then he comes in
>> here and throws it all away!!!
>
> Oh?...All of those people died when I posted in here?
>
> I doubt it.

Ah...the "ER" thing again. Sad to say, not everyone survives being through any emergency room...except on television.

This isn't a newsgroup for medicine, doctors (you are not one), nurses, or heroic action figures claiming "seven hostile actions." That doesn't seem to stop the outpouring of virtual shouting, exhortations, commands against those not in agreement with you. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

>>Yes to people that only want their picture taken in uniform,
>> like the ones never smiling and showing teeth
>
> Like the one's you were showing in the nose of the A-26?

"A-26?" Tsk, tsk, tsk, that designation disappeared before Attilla was first issued.

But, this isn't a newsgroup about aviation or CAP or Maxwell AFB or hang-gliding or flight-suit wearing (with distinctive unit insignia).

>>> You're a putz.
>>
>> Not at all. You might try not using Jewish-ethnic pejoratives.
>> I know it will be a new experience for you, but try it anyway.
>
> Why? You ARE a putz. No other "pejorative" fits.

Poor baby. Get help, Steamy.

2617. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-21 06:44:17 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030221014417.25546.00000896@mb-me.aol.com>
Source record: 61647

In article <20030220031245.25398.00000254@mb-cb.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Attilla the Ham) writes:

>>> Is it your assertion that no one can learn more than one thing or be
>>>proficient at more than one skill? or perhaps you mean no one BUT
>>you...?!?!
>>
>> Absolutely NOTHING of radio technical knowledge is imparted
>> by manual morse code training, sending, or receiving. NOTHING
>> but morsemanship.
>
> Do I need to spell the questions a bit slower, Lennie, so you can read
>them correctly?

Tsk, tsk, tsk, Attilla, the blood in your eye makes it very
difficult to see your own mistakes in here... :-)

Try an eyewash. Murine is a good brand...

> I did not ask if any "radio technical knowledge" was gained, but if Vippy
>thought that it was not possible to learn more than one thing at a time.

Who is this "Vippy," Attilla?

Do you know radio technical things when you see them? Did
being a morseman open up new knowledge vistas beyond
arrythmic monotonic sound patterns?

> Your silly responses didn't answer them, that's for sure.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, and epithets and Jewish-ethnic swearwords
are not "silly responses?" Silly boy...get help.

2618. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-21 06:44:18 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030221014418.25546.00000897@mb-me.aol.com>
Source record: 61644

In article <20030220030900.25398.00000253@mb-cb.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>General Radiotelephone...was a First Class Radiotelephone,
>> first obtained in 1956
>
> The one you let "expire"...???
>
> And what can you do with it RIGHT NOW, other than be compensated for
>your time, that I can't do with my Amateur Extra?

Be a professional...be a human being...? :-)

> Would you like to know what I CAN do with my Amateur Extra that you
>CAN'T do with your GROL under ANY circumstances...?!?!

I have some suggestions on what you can do with yours...:-)

2619. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-21 06:44:18 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030221014418.25546.00000898@mb-me.aol.com>
Source record: 61648

In article <20030220030413.25398.00000252@mb-cb.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Attilla the Ham) writes:

>>The phrase "state of the art" applies to nearly all crafts, technical
>> fields, medical practice, etc., etc. It is common American
>> English, widely used. You have absolutely no authority to
>> redefine phrases to fit your disordered little picture of anything.
>
> Hey Dr. Self Righteous...
>
> When you get off this rant, the phrase "state-of-the-art" was not at the
>center of the exchange.
>
> Ya Putz.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Attilla you made a point about SOTA. [it's all in Google, ask the parson for help navigating there...]

2620. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-21 06:44:19 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030221014419.25546.00000899@mb-me.aol.com>
Source record: 61645

In article <20030220025927.25398.00000251@mb-cb.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Attilla the Ham) writes:

>>You can't make any point so you use profanity and epithets
>
> Oh. You mean you don't like being called a name?
>
> You mean like "Reverend Callsign Jimmie"..???

The author of the Sermon on the Antenna Mount?
Amen, brother... :-)

> Or "The Pendantic Parson"...???

Pedantry is not a noble characteristic? :-)

> Or "Atilla the Ham"...???

That's two "T" in Attilla. Barbarians practicing ethnic cleansing with an extra super special callsign ought to learn to spell.

> Or "Jacbooted Thug"...???

It's okay to wear the twin lightning bolts on your high collar Attilla. It goes with the boots you got from Jac.

> etc, etc etc...
>
> Like those, Your Selfrighteousness???
>
> Ya PUTZ ! ! !

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Take a trank, medicine man. :-)

2621. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-21 06:44:19 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030221014419.25546.00000900@mb-me.aol.com>
Source record: 61654

In article <Xns93285884856CFpookster@216.168.3.50>, "Bill, W7TI"
<jamspam@upyours.now> writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
>news:20030220061431.23241.00000013@mb-da.aol.com:
>
>> One of the biggest changes was
>> that companies were no longer limited as to how many radio stations
>> they could own, in total or in one market. End result was many sales
>> and reformatting, and a general homogenization of broadcast radio.
>> Less quality, less diversity and less competition, not more. Now the
>> chairman of the FCC, Michael Powell, may be rethinking the whole idea.
>____
>
>I hope he is. This problem exists all throughout American society, not
>just in broadcasting. Mergers and acquisitions are almost invariably
>detrimental to customers. Unfortunately, customers have little voice in
>such decisions whereas businesses generally get what they want.
>
>Are we off topic or what?

Well, there are several newsgroups concerned with broadcasting
per se. :-)

According to this week's national newspaper headlines, the focus
of the FCC is on telephony and those service providers. Of course
business is all about pecuniary interests...such as ARRL product
reseller company profits... :-)

2622. Re: arrl article on echolink - impress a non ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-21 06:50:20 UTC
From: Ross Archer <archer@topnow.com>
Message-ID: <3E55CC2C.F054A65@topnow.com>
Source record: 61655
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

perry chamberlain wrote:
[snip]
> Everyone has someone in their family who is crazy,
> if you don't know who it is, its you!
Uh oh. :)

2623. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-21 07:06:43 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E55D000.1107CA1@att.net>
Source record: 61656

Brian wrote:

> "Aspiring Elmer" <elmer@nowhere.com> wrote in message
news:<2mN4a.53666$Rx3.2151954@news1.west.cox.net>...
> > "Len Budney" <lbudney-google@nb.net> wrote in message
> > news:417b917a.0302190636.e464c20@posting.google.com...
> > > Hello,
> > >
> > > I'm not a ham, but my parents are: AB2OA and AB2OB. I'd like to get
> > > the general opinion of the group about callsigns.
> > >
> > > Later this year I'll be getting my "nickle extra". Despite the lowly,
> > > dumbed down status of the Extra ticket today, I'm thinking about
> > > getting a 1x2 callsign. :-)
>
> Len, get in line. I'm waiting for W0EX.
>
> Brian

Ah, poor Somolia Slim. Been waiting for something or the other in the way of ham radio for most of his adult
life, simply because he didn't have what it took to do otherwise.. Dunno what he waited on as a kid. Probably
adulthood, which seems to escaped him
Some of us just did it. Oh BTW, what makes you think anyone cares what you're waiting for? A dude who can't
understand "permission" wouldn't be likely to know how to go about properly applying. Then there's always the
matter of being first in line. And your own personal task of outfoxing the actuarial tables yourself.....

Seems Phil was right about your default mode. Should you ever want to rent a clue for a moment or two yer
buddy Putz will be eager to fix you up with a special deal. You'll have to call him on the landline, tho, he
doesn't have a ham radio license. Come to think of it, you still don't have much of one either. You sure do
generate a lot of QRN though.

2624. Re: eBay removes legal 10m ham gear but allows illegal CB equipment

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-21 09:21:52 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BA7B59E0.F981%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 61657
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"WW" wrote:

> From what I hear, the CBs are fighting back.

Actually, no. According to what I heard (from an eBay employee), eBay was given a list of which radios were "easily modified to operate on frequencies outside the CB band" and are therefore questionable (read eBay's rules on electronic devices). This list included Uniden and Ranger radios like the ones mentioned ("HR2600s, HR2510s, RCIs"), resulting in these radio auctions being routinely removed when discovered.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

2625. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-21 12:53:35 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302210453.586bcfc4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61658

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E55D000.1107CA1@att.net>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > "Aspiring Elmer" <elmer@nowhere.com> wrote in message
news:<2mN4a.53666$Rx3.2151954@news1.west.cox.net>...
> > > "Len Budney" <lbudney-google@nb.net> wrote in message
> > > news:417b917a.0302190636.e464c20@posting.google.com...
> > > > Hello,
> > > >
> > > > I'm not a ham, but my parents are: AB2OA and AB2OB. I'd like to get
> > > > the general opinion of the group about callsigns.
> > > >
> > > > Later this year I'll be getting my "nickle extra". Despite the lowly,
> > > > dumbed down status of the Extra ticket today, I'm thinking about
> > > > getting a 1x2 callsign. :-)
> > >
> > Len, get in line. I'm waiting for W0EX.
> >
> > Brian
>
> Ah, poor Somolia Slim. Been waiting for something or the other in the way of ham radio
for most of his adult
> life, simply because he didn't have what it took to do otherwise.. Dunno what he waited
on as a kid. Probably
> adulthood, which seems to escaped him
> Some of us just did it. Oh BTW, what makes you think anyone cares what you're waiting
for?

You care. You're still reading even if you're not replying all the
time.

A dude who can't
> understand "permission" wouldn't be likely to know how to go about properly applying.
Then there's always the
> matter of being first in line. And your own personal task of outfoxing the actuarial
tables yourself.....

I've got permission, and I've got the time to wait.

> Seems Phil was right about your default mode. Should you ever want to rent a clue for a
moment or two yer
> buddy Putz will be eager to fix you up with a special deal. You'll have to call him on
the landline, tho, he
> doesn't have a ham radio license. Come to think of it, you still don't have much of one
either. You sure do

> generate a lot of QRN though.

Welp, if I were invited to use my favorite mode... and didn't. If I kept tooting my horn about emergency comms... and couldn't oerate a radio away from the electric company. If... If... If.

73, Brian

2626. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-21 13:02:08 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302210502.5b0f4e3c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61659

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E546DAE.C21DE326@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E53A231.357CC0B8@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5121E0.42131FD4@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030216173704.14527.00000384@mb-cc.aol.com>...
> > > > > >
> > > > > > --
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Think about how many stations you've heard on the air this weekend, all using
> > > > > > CW. Consider that there are lots more out there you can't hear due to
> > > > > > propagation, antenna limitations, etc. Also those you won't hear because
> > > > > > they're mostly in hunt'n'pounce mode rather than calling CQ.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Remember all those stations next time somebody says or writes that CW has no
> > > > > > relevance in ham radio today, or that nobody uses it anymore.
>
> > > > > Welp, if you say you can't hear a CW station, then you just shot down
> > > > > the Morse Myth that CW always gets through.
> > > > >
> > > > Those cans will work better if you plug them in.
> > > >
> > > Tell Jim. He's the one making the claims.
> > >
> > No, he did not jump to the conclusion you came to. Don't forget to turn
> > the equipment on, Brian. That'll help too.
> >
> You conclude that "cans" are involved, yet none were mentioned. Now
> you think Jim's radio isn't turned on. Why do you do that? You must
> have needed the exercise.
>
> I can see how you'd have trouble with a sentence containing ",Brian".

Yet its Jim's radio. You're the one who cannot keep things straight.
Don't sit up all night tuning the 160M band endlessly trying to snag a
new one, then try to be coherent in replies. Doesn't work.

> > > > > > As far as CW having no relevance, that's just not true. Lots of hams
> > > > > > enjoy using it.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Please advise your friend Mr. Anderson.
> > > > >
> > > > > Mr. Anderson, "cans" work better if you plug them in. Hearing the
> > > > > other station makes it much more fun and enjoyable.
> > > >
> > > > One simple request and you couldn't get it right.
> > >
> > So now unplugged cans makes it more enjoyable? Dave, give him the
> > message yourself.
>
> I thought maybe you were up to the task. I was wrong.

Dave was wrong. Probably first time ever. Welp, at least we have it
in writing.

> > > > > > The ARGUMENT is that a CW EXAM is no longer relavant. Give CW the
> > > > > > same exam that FM, SSB, RTTY, SSTV, FSTV, PACKET, PACTOR and PSK31
> > > > > > have.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > That's AN argument.
> > > > >
> > > > > Yes, Dave, that's what I said it was.
> > > >
> > > > No, you said it was "the" argument.
> > >
> > It is around here.
>
> We're not all at your house.

I was not home when replying. Jump, jump, jump.

> > > > Anything else you would like me to pass on to Len?
> > > >
> > > > No, you'd likely get it screwed up too.
> > >
> > Just like you to jump to conclusions.
>
> You mean like your thinking that I was addressing Jim in a statement
> that ended ", Brian"?

Why would I turn on Jim's radio? You're still confused, aren't you?

Go get some sleep.

2627. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-21 13:03:25 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302210503.716575a8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61660

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030220021037.29944.00000029@mb-fi.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0302191918.52d72040@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >> > Anything else you would like me to pass on to Len?
> >>
> >> No, you'd likely get it screwed up too.
> >
> >Just like you to jump to conclusions.
>
> Pssst...mention the cashews... :-)

Dave, I've got a message for you from Len: "Cashews."

73, Brian

2628. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-21 13:06:24 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302210506.4e6c9ef0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61661

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0302202002.6a15e16b@posting.google.com>...
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.ham51qa.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> > On 20 Feb 2003 04:55:56 -0800, Brian wrote:
> >
> > >> Haven't heard. I'll check with a friend who is an EA.
>
> > >Phil, check with someone who's a W or a K. The EA's probably wouldn't
> > >know anything about it. ;))
> >
> > Are you trying to appear stupid or is that your default setting?
> >
> > ---
> > 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
> Phil, I just didn't want you running off to Spain for something that's
> a domestic matter. ;))
>
> Anyway, what did you find out?

Oh, well. Never mind. I guess Phil can't take a smiley.

2629. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-21 14:43:08 UTC
From: lbudney-google@nb.net
Message-ID: <417b917a.0302210643.46385e8e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61662

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:
>
> Come on Kim! Larry's post was a masterpiece of leg pulling. (his
> leanings are in that direction, admittedly) But it was one of the
> funniest posts here in a long time.

Definitely! I couldn't stop reading...even read through it twice. It
didn't sound like Larry, yet it sounded so sincere...

--Len.

2630. Re: New Field Day Entry Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-21 15:49:31 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030221104931.16405.00000042@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 61663

>Subject: Re: New Field Day Entry Class
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/21/03 12:44 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030221014407.25546.00000890@mb-me.aol.com>

>He's "in" amateur radio. Like "turf," man...don' boddah da Hood
> bout whut dey gots as 'hood rights! Dey RULEZ!

Well, so far this week you've "dissed" veterans, nurses, bus drivers,
CBer's, Amateurs, volunteers, doctors and NOW you're "going ethnic".

Is there any possible indignity that you WON'T submit anyone to just
because it fits YOUR needs at the moment?

Hmmmmmmmm...? ? ? ?

2631. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-21 15:56:31 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030221105631.16405.00000043@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 61664

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/21/03 12:44 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030221014418.25546.00000897@mb-me.aol.com>

>> And what can you do with it RIGHT NOW, other than be compensated for
>>your time, that I can't do with my Amateur Extra?
>
> Be a professional...be a human being...?

I'd need to get a sample of your blood to test the "human" part. If you
told me the sky was blue and the grass was green, I'd have to look and be sure.

>> Would you like to know what I CAN do with my Amateur Extra that you
>>CAN'T do with your GROL under ANY circumstances...?!?!
>
> I have some suggestions on what you can do with yours

I am sure you would, but I'd STILL be able to get on the band of my
choice, in the mode of my choice, when I want.

Oh yes...And with my OWN 1 x 2 callsign.

Steve, K4YZ

2632. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-21 15:59:46 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030221105946.16405.00000044@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 61665

>Subject: Re: Callsign etiquette?
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/21/03 12:44 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030221014401.25546.00000882@mb-me.aol.com>

>Another who "knows" what the FCC thinks!

I think I made it clear it was an opinion...not a fact.

Something I know you have a problem discerning the difference between....

2633. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-21 16:01:18 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030221110118.16405.00000045@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 61666

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/21/03 12:44 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030221014417.25546.00000896@mb-me.aol.com>

>Who is this "Vippy," Attilla?

Who's "Atilla", Your Scuminess?

2634. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-21 16:05:50 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030221110550.16405.00000046@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 61667

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/21/03 12:44 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030221014417.25546.00000895@mb-me.aol.com>

> This isn't a newsgroup for medicine, doctors (you are not one)...(SNIP)

Ahhhh, yes. Yet another item on the "Waiting for Lennie to Show Proof"
pile.

You keep making this insinuation that I said I was a doctor, Lennie, yet
have never provided a cite of a post wherein I said I was.

More lying. The days are getting longer again, and so is the list of
things you have yet again manufactured for your own satisfaction.

Shame, shame, shame......

Steve

2635. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-21 16:07:00 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E564F03.72EB24C0@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61669

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20030220061433.23241.00000015@mb-da.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:
>
> >Also gave a good indication of propagation. Back when a 1000 mile contact was
> >a major accomplishment, this was an important feature.
>
> Maybe you could help out K3LT complete his WAS? He seems
> to have difficulty getting out...

Oh, I think it is all relative, Leonard. Compared, for example, to your
progress on WAS, his performance is stellar.

> Let's all encourge him to be a WAS-been.

I'd think that much better than being a never-WAS.

Dave K8MN

> <signature here>

2636. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-21 16:07:38 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030221110738.16405.00000048@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 61668

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/21/03 12:44 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030221014416.25546.00000894@mb-me.aol.com>

>That's the major reason AOL removed Attilla's libelous little
> hate piece of a home page that lasted only two days before
> being taken down by AOL, which also stripped you of that
> particular screen name.

They took the post down, Lennie, but I still have the screen name if I
want it.

Where'd you get THAT at?

Steve

2637. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-21 16:11:55 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E565020.20165F6B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61670

Len Over 21 wrote:

> Yes, get to the back of the soma cum loud's paratransit vehicle!
> :-)

> :-) The mobile morseman of the Amateur Radiotelegraph Service
> speaks again!

> ...must have gotten a reject letter from ARRL Public Relations
> department after seeking that job there. Dartisgone has the
> Human Resources qualifications. :-)

> By all means Follow Regulations as They Have Always Been
> Done, never ever to be changed, modified, altered in any way?
> :-)

> Oooo...worry, worry, worry about pleasing an extra who hasn't
> gotten a WAS yet! :-)
>

> Tsk, tsk, tsk. That would be "cheating" according to the desk
> driving ace of the USAF. See above quotes.

> Oooo! Larrie should really investigate a comfortable seat cushion
> for his paratransit vehicle. He's obviously had a bad day at the
> orifice.

> Larrie boy, you just concentrate on getting that WAS, okay?
> Then you can have another lovely certificate to show how much
> better you are than those good-for-nothing dumbed-down back-
> of-the-bus extra lites.

The above is yet another example of Len's self declared mission of only discussing removal of morse testing in civil debate.

Where's that doggone N2EY quote, profiling your likely behavior when I need it?

Dave K8MN

2638. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-21 16:24:16 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E5652A1.65D2C4DB@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61671

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <G545a.187100$HN5.815085@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net>, "Jackie"
> <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> writes:
>
> >"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20030220021035.29944.00000027@mb-fi.aol.com...
> >
> >> "It's the LAW!" Right. Laws in force now cannot ever
> >> be changed, cannot be talked about (absolutely never
> >> by those without official authorized licenses!). Yup.
> >
> >Who sez?
>
> Heh...that phrase "It's the LAW!" turns up from time to
> time in here, written by several. It's the "turf" mentality
> of the old-timers.

The turf in question is amateur radio, in which we are participants and
in which you are not a participant.

> You, specifically, haven't written that, but others have. I'd
> mention DejaNews but that is "defunct." :-) Google
> bought out DejaNews. Google has most of the past
> messages in newsgroups. Some of the regulars in here
> virtually live there, virtual ego bruisings very painful,
> demanding some sort of retribution or at least a chance
> at more virtual combat. :-)

Recent quotes posted here from the Google site reveal the ego which has
been bruised to be yours.

> Some even go so far as to virtually claim ownership of an
> activity, including the alleged authority to rule on who is
> allowed to express opinions. They have no authority but
> demand obeyance or they will meet the dissenters after
> school is over and beat them up. :-)

To state that I am a participant in amateur radio while you are not is
just the iteration of a fact and has not been construed by any others as
a statement of ownership of amateur radio. I don't demand anything of
you. You've been free to post your rants for quite a number of years.
I've been laughing at them for years.

> All that about a hobby. :-)

(...in which you have no stake.)

Dave K8MN

2639. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-21 16:27:44 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E56536D.1DE84A8D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61672

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <b326a6frt0@pita.alt.net>, "Alphonse" <QRZ@Anon.com> writes:
>
> >Gee, Stevie.
> >How many more comments do you have in store?
> >Give it a break, willya?
>
> Shhhh...don't disturb Attilla the Ham...he is very busy with
> his ethnic cleansing. :-)

You never did tell us, Len. To which ethnic minority do you belong?
Have old people suddenly become an ethnic minority? How about non-radio
amateurs? Californians with peculiar socio-political ideas?

Dave K8MN

2640. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-21 16:33:45 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030221113345.16405.00000049@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 61673

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/21/03 12:44 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030221014414.25546.00000893@mb-me.aol.com>

>A Presidential Unit Citation is not a medal or ribbon.

ERROR WILL ROBINSON! ERROR!

There is a ribbon for the PUC.

>A Presidential Unit Citation is not a ribbon. Unit Citations are a
> part of the uniform of all unit members, the same as all identifying
> insignia of that unit

Not at least since the 1970's, Lennie. The PUC is a ribbon.

>1954 and 1955. That was written before. Do you need
> Remedial English Comprehension classes? Contact your
> local school district's night-time extension class program.

I guess we'll nevr get throguh to your "superior intellect", Lennie.
Never mind.

> Repeat: This is an amateur radio newsgroup, not a military
> affairs administrative discussion venue. If you have a dispute
> with unit awards and citations of the US Army of the 1950s,
> contact the US Army Historical Center or the Adjutant
> General of the United States Army.

OK, Lennie...expect the worst next time you deviate even the slightest
from an Amateur Radio topic.

>> So are your re-tellings of the ballad of the Fighting 71st, except, of
>>course, when it's biting you on the butt.
>
> The 71st Signal Service Battalion, 8235th Army Unit...(SNIP)

BUT LOOKIE HERE! ! ! Lennie didn't go ONE paragraph befoe he let into yet
another "Back in the Fighting 71st" rants!

Sheeeeesh, Your Putziness! SO PREDICTABLE!

Chastise ME for discussing "military matters" in an Amateur Radio
newsgroup, then roll right into the exact same BS that you've already put over
a half million bytes of bandwidth in the trash can with.

PLEASE tell us what relevence thier transfer to the Air Force or thier
return to Japanese control had to do with Amateur Radio? What was so important

about that useless trivia to violate your OWN "rules" about newsgroup content
after having just chastised ME about teh same thing...???

>I was assigned to the 8235th AU...(SNIP)

Yes, yes yes, Lennie...We know.

Other than just a blanket "1954" and "1955" "date", you have not told me
the effective dates of the awards. For wht period of time were the awards
issued? For what specific achievement or event were they issued?

>> W-h-a-t w-e-r-e t-h-e a-w-a-r-d p-e-r-i-o-d-s...?!?!?!
>
> Those Unit Citations were awarded in 1954 and 1955.

You're oviously not getting the message. Never mind, Lennie.

>They
> remained with the Battalion including the US Army Japan
> forces reorganization which merged the 8235th AU and the...(SNIP)

More irrelevent "military matters" in an Amateur Radio newsgroup from the
NG moderator who chastises others for doing it...even in the same post!

>There were two more reorganizations of Signal Units in
> Central Honshu...(SNIP)

And even MORE of the same.

>There is no "cessation of awards" or "periods" for unit
> citations in the US Army.

Who said there was? And why are you discussing "military matters" in an
Amateur Radio newsgroup ig they are not germane, Lennie?

It's OK for YOU to chastise others, but also OK for you to ramble on for
hours on the units you used to belong to, locations, status, etc..?!?!

Or just more of the same two-faced, lying scum we've become accustomed to?

>1. Trying to argue the subject of the elimination of the morse
> code test for an amateur radio license.

No you're not. You're spamming the NG with "Why I Hate Amateur Radio"
rhetoric.

>2. Trying to straighten out the disordered mentalities of
> BDOFs who want to talk about military matters and
> seven hostile action stories having no distinctive unit
> insignias.

Oh? And WHAT "qualifies" your for this? Sleeping with some dubiously
qualified pseudo-shrink? Your three years of active Army service in the mid
FIFTIES?

Neither will get you that cup of overpriced coffee at Starbuck, Your Putziness.

>Amateur radio is just a hobby...(SNIP)

In YOUR opinion, Lennie. No such assertion exists in FCC regulations.

2641. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-21 16:40:27 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E56566B.8DCCFB5B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61674

Len Over 21 wrote:

> No. The "liar and coward" charge is an imaginary construct
> of a sociopathic individual whose only aim in life is to fight
> anyone not agreeing with him. They redefine justification into
> impossible things attempting to rationalize their actions.

That you have lied a number of times has been demonstrated through a number of Google reposts and through offering the offering of urls and quotes from web pages which all disprove various claims made on a repeated basis by you. I would not be inclined to accept as truth, the statements of someone who has repeatedly told lies in the past.

When you've been nailed on some of your statements, you've gone to the beating-up-little-old-men defense on a couple of occasions. A little old piranha is still a piranha.

Sentences two and three of your statement above could easily apply to you.

Dave K8MN

2642. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-21 16:45:58 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E5657B7.CA553FE5@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61675

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20030220025927.25398.00000251@mb-cb.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Attilla
> the Ham) writes:

> > Or "Atilla the Ham"...???
>
> That's two "T" in Attilla. Barbarians practicing ethnic cleansing
> with an extra super special callsign ought to learn to spell.

I had to wait for my laughter to subside before I could even comment on
this one. Nice that you gave Steve a spelling lesson. Has it dawned on
you that, while the word does have two "T"s, it only has one "L"?
Attila, Foghorn.

Dave K8MN

2643. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-21 16:55:29 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E565A51.B1C29552@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61676

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E546DAE.C21DE326@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E53A231.357CC0B8@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5121E0.42131FD4@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030216173704.14527.00000384@mb-cc.aol.com>...

> > >
> > > > > > > > Welp, if you say you can't hear a CW station, then you just shot down
> > > > > > > > the Morse Myth that CW always gets through.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Those cans will work better if you plug them in.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Tell Jim. He's the one making the claims.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > No, he did not jump to the conclusion you came to. Don't forget to turn
> > > > > > the equipment on, Brian. That'll help too.
> > > >
> > > > You conclude that "cans" are involved, yet none were mentioned. Now
> > > > you think Jim's radio isn't turned on. Why do you do that? You must
> > > > have needed the exercise.
> > >
> > I can see how you'd have trouble with a sentence containing ",Brian".
>
> Yet its Jim's radio. You're the one who cannot keep things straight.
> Don't sit up all night tuning the 160M band endlessly trying to snag a
> new one, then try to be coherent in replies. Doesn't work.

I understand that ",Brian" gave you a problem.

> > > So now unplugged cans makes it more enjoyable? Dave, give him the
> > > message yourself.
> > >
> > I thought maybe you were up to the task. I was wrong.
>

> Dave was wrong. Probably first time ever. Welp, at least we have it
> in writing.

I've been wrong about your ability to comprehend before.

> > > > > > > The ARGUMENT is that a CW EXAM is no longer relavant. Give CW the
> > > > > > > same exam that FM, SSB, RTTY, SSTV, FSTV, PACKET, PACTOR and PSK31
> > > > > > > have.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > That's AN argument.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Yes, Dave, that's what I said it was.
> > > > >
> > > > > No, you said it was "the" argument.
> > > >
> > > It is around here.
> > >
> > We're not all at your house.
>
> I was not home when replying. Jump, jump, jump.

Oh. Correct my statement to read: "We're not all gathered whereever it
is that you are". You can explain your second sentence, the incomplete
one, later if you have any interest in anyone being able to understand
it.

> > > > > Anything else you would like me to pass on to Len?
> > > > >
> > > > > No, you'd likely get it screwed up too.
> > > >
> > > Just like you to jump to conclusions.
> > >
> > You mean like your thinking that I was addressing Jim in a statement
> > that ended ", Brian"?
>
> Why would I turn on Jim's radio? You're still confused, aren't you?

Phil may be on to something. Stupid seems to be your default mode. Ed
Hare lost interest in the group when you ran extended versions of your
nonsense replies.

Dave K8MN

2644. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-21 16:56:33 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E565A9F.1804896A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61677

Brian wrote:
>
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030220021037.29944.00000029@mb-fi.aol.com>...
> > In article <f45722ac.0302191918.52d72040@posting.google.com>,
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> >
> > >> > Anything else you would like me to pass on to Len?
> > >>
> > >> No, you'd likely get it screwed up too.
> > >
> > >Just like you to jump to conclusions.
> >
> > Pssst...mention the cashews... :-)
>
> Dave, I've got a message for you from Len: "Cashews."

Here's a Brianesque reply: "Gesundheit!"

Dave K8MN

2645. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-21 17:15:10 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030221121510.19463.00000032@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 61678

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/21/03 12:44 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030221014410.25546.00000892@mb-me.aol.com>

>> And despite YOUR attempts to BE the moderator, Lennie, the NG goes
>where
>>it will WITHOUT your permission or approval.
>
> Goes where? To the dumpster? Dumpsters seem to be the
> in thing in here lately.

I see. So it's your suggestion that the NG is "in the dumprster" without
YOU...?!?!

>You are not a moderator of this newsgroup, have no authority
> to moderate it, cannot change it despite all the hundreds of
> epithets you have posted here

Pot/Kettle/Black

2646. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-21 17:25:37 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030221122537.19498.00000034@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 61679

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 2/21/03 10:40 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3E56566B.8DCCFB5B@earthlink.net>

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>> No. The "liar and coward" charge is an imaginary construct
>> of a sociopathic individual whose only aim in life is to fight
>> anyone not agreeing with him. They redefine justification into
>> impossible things attempting to rationalize their actions.
>
>That you have lied a number of times has been demonstrated through a
>number of Google reposts and through offering the offering of urls and
>quotes from web pages which all disprove various claims made on a
>repeated basis by you. I would not be inclined to accept as truth, the
>statements of someone who has repeatedly told lies in the past.
>
>When you've been nailed on some of your statements, you've gone to the
>beating-up-little-old-men defense on a couple of occasions. A little
>old piranha is still a piranha.

I was wondering what that loud "BANG" sound was, but I see it was just the
hammer hitting the mail squarely on the head.

>Sentences two and three of your statement above could easily apply to
>you.

"DO" apply, Dave!

Maybe we need to get Mrs. Lennie out of her self-induced coma and have her
instruct The Putzy One on the meanings of "pathological liar" and
"Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder".

Not that is would help, but at least we could say we tried.....

73

Steve, K4YZ

2647. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-21 17:29:50 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030221122950.19463.00000033@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 61680

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
>Date: 2/21/03 11:25 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030221122537.19498.00000034@mb-mj.aol.com>

> hitting the mail...(SNIP)

oooops...Better correct my typo before the Putzy One tells me about it!

2648. Re: N8WWM BUSTED SAYS RAIN REPORT

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-21 19:00:19 UTC
From: Dave Hall <nojunk_n3cvj@worldlynx.net>
Message-ID: <3E567743.10F0@worldlynx.net>
Source record: 61681
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Lloyd wrote:
>
> On Fri, 21 Feb 2003 00:51:37 -0500, Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote:
> > On Thu, 20 Feb 2003 21:59:28 -0500, "... ... _..." <.@... .com> wrote:
> >
> > >wow pretty neat trick Twistedhed
> > >Watch out doug doesn't sue you for libel.
> >
> > This is highly unlikely on Usenet. The burden of proof rests with the
> > person being libeled. Anyone can sign any name in a Usenet posting.
> > Even if you prove that a post came from a certain computer via an IP
> > address, you still have to prove that *that* *person* made the
> > posting. The only way of defending would be to build a case against
> > the poster if libelous postings continue. IOW, N8WWN should be patient
>
> That's wishful thinking. People have already been sued for libel, BASED
> UPON THE CONTENTS OF ONE POST, and have lost the suit. You simply have
> to do a little Google searching to find the cases, so I won't do that
> job for you.
>
> People have even been sued before their names were known (so-called
> "John Doe" filings, complete with subpoenas to the involved ISPs).

Please provide the links. That is totally opposite from accepted
practices and cases to date. Most cases involving libel are simply too hard
for the plaintive to prove. Sueing someone is one thing. Winning the suit is
totally another.

Dave
"Sandbagger"

2649. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-21 21:43:36 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0302211343.4abdd92c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61682

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E553338.C2DE600C@earthlink.net>...
> N2EY wrote:
>
> > Great story! Here's some of mine (you started this, Bert!).....
> >
> > First experience with homebrew radio was building a "foxhole" set from
> > instructions found in a thrift-store book, "All About Radio and
> > Television".
>
> Still have the book?

Somewhere. Doesn't matter, I memorized the plans long ago. 120 turns
#26 enameled on cardboard tube, white razor blade, safety pin,
graphite from a #2 pencil. High impedance phones, coupla nails and
thumbtacks, bit of wood for a base.

> I made one from the very same book and later
> modified it with a store-bought diode. Until our local station went on
> the air, all I heard was WOWO in Fort Wayne, a pretty good haul from
> southern West Virginia.

Fort Wayne Indiana?
>
> There was a kid in our town who had a shortwave receiver and a pair of
> Part 15 walkie-talkies. By the time I met him, I was studying to become
> a ham. Talking to a kid a couple of blocks away on a walkie-talkie
> didn't hold much fascination. Maybe that's why I don't spend much time
> on two meter repeaters to this day.
>
I knew kids who had those things. Good for maybe a 1000 feet with a
new battery. My little one-tuber would do thousands of times that
distance reliably.

> > Passed the Novice test in the early summer of 1967 at the ripe old age
> > of 13 and built a 10 watt transmitter from other NRI parts. The old TV
> > set provided the power supply. Only part I had to buy for the
> > transmitter was the xtal. Tuned it up with a dial lamp in the antenna
> > lead as RF indicator, plus the plate milliameter. Not a rock crusher
> > but had a lot of fun. By that time the antenna had been upgraded to
> > use "real antenna wire", those same glass insulators and went from the
> > attic window to much higher up in the crab apple tree.
> >
> > Total cost - maybe $14 for everything...You wanna talk about doing
> > radio on a shoestring budget, you came to the right place!
>

> My gear was store bought and used. Both the receiver and transmitter
> came from Allied's used equipment list. My deal with my dad was that
> I'd save the money for the receiver from my paper route and he and Mom
> would get me that transmitter for Christmas. I bought a Knight R-100
> general coverage receiver and Pop ordered me a Knight T-60 transmitter a
> couple of weeks later.

If I'd had parnets like that I'd have been licensed years earlier. How
old were ya when the Novice license arrived? For me it was October 14,
1967.

> Oddly enough, when the new UPS delivery service
> driver brought the parcel from Allied, there was a Heath DX-40 inside.
> A note explained that they'd sold the T-60 and hoped that the DX-40
> would be a suitable substitute.
>
> Every tube in the DX-40 was broken in shipping but a trip to K8CFT's TV
> service shop yielded replacements (at no charge). A few days after I'd
> begun using the DX-40, another parcel from Allied arrived at our door.
> Inside was a Knight T-60. Allied had fouled up. My dad suggested that
> I try the T-60 and decide which one I wanted to keep. The DX-40 won,
> hands down.

No surprise, the guy who bought the T-60 must sent it back!

I remember the Allied catalog and the T-60, T-150, R-55 and R-100. All
were way beyond my means, as were the coveted HR-10/DX-60 twins or the
2-C/2-NT favored by the ver rich. Turns out that was a good thing,
because except for the Drake those rx's were terrible.

DX-40 was a decent rig but that weird series-exciter thing was a bad
idea. Many hams have since converted them to economy power supply (TV
trans, again) and conventional B+.

> We didn't own an extension ladder and the old apple tree in the yard was
> only twenty or so feet high so my first antenna was quite low running
> from the tree to the house. K8CFT came to my rescue again. He stopped
> by the house with his service truck and a 40 foot extension ladder. We
> had a line of tall fir trees around the perimeter of the yard. Buzz
> installed an 80m dipole at what seemed to me to be extreme altitude.

oh mama! I learned to climb the gingkos that surrounded the property
and put all sorts of wires aloft in the following years.

First non-homebrew ham gear I had was an AR-2/QF-1 combo ($20) and a
DX-20 (also $20, thank you W2FNT). Somewhere in there was a VF-1,
SX-99, Viking Adventurer, various Command sets, and of course serious
homebrewing.
>
> > Now here's the part that relates to the subject line:
> >
> > All through this time, I was working with high voltages and dangerous
> > tools like soldering irons and razor blades. (Still have some of the

> > scars...;-))
>
> There's nothing like having molten solder drip on your leg while you're
> wearing a pair of shorts! My scar is from an Exacto knife to the right
> thumb. A drunken doctor, on call at the local hospital, broke a needle
> off in the thumb before managing a few stitches.

AAARRRRGGGHHHH!!

I never had any injuries that required medical attention. Luckily.
>
> > Also climbing trees to put up antennas and such. Parental supervision?
> > Bah!
>
> Trees are made to be climbed.

Yup.
>
> > The Feds saw fit to grant me the license and I didn't electrocute
> > anyone nor burn the house down. Nor did my 10 watter bother any other
> > radio services. I knew and worked other hams who were younger than me,
> > too.
>
> My mother was sure that I was GOING to burn the house down. Her opinion
> was reinforced the day we went to church and I left the DX-40 on
> standby. The entire house was filled with the melted tar smell of the
> potted power transformer when we returned (again K8CFT to the rescue
> with an old TV power transformer).

I never left anything on for just that reason!
>
> > But some folks would have denied us our licenses based on age alone.
> > Odd, really odd.
>
> It makes perfect sense if you're a fellow with half a century of
> PROFESSIONAL experience and you're embarrassed to be shown up by a bunch
> of telegraph key wielding CHILDREN!

HAW!!!

But it's been possible to get a ham license in the USA for over a
dozen years now with no code test at all.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2650. Re: N8WWM BUSTED SAYS RAIN REPORT

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-21 21:58:47 UTC
From: "... ... _..."
Message-ID: <ktqdnfCp052LPMujXTWc2Q@comcast.com>
Source record: 61683
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Dave Hall" <nojunk_n3cvj@worldlynx.net> wrote in message
news:3E567743.10F0@worldlynx.net...

> Please provide the links. That is totally opposite from accepted
> practices and cases to date. Most cases involving libel are simply too
hard
> for the plaintive to prove. Sueing someone is one thing. Winning the suit
is
> totally another.
>
> Dave
> "Sandbagger

I agree, as does Nancy, In fact one could use the excuse landshark did, it
was a co worker using a terminal from work. LOL. but hey you may have a
case against twisty, his incessant calling you a liar etc may be libelous
as well. he even made a new email address on account of you,
deckthehall@webtv.com

2651. Re: N8WWM BUSTED SAYS RAIN REPORT

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-21 23:14:46 UTC
From: richcranus@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <c5ecbb69.0302211514.4da55533@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61684
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Dave Hall <nojunk_n3cvj@worldlynx.net> wrote in message
news:<3E567743.10F0@worldlynx.net>...
> Lloyd wrote:
> >
> > On Fri, 21 Feb 2003 00:51:37 -0500, Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote:
> > > On Thu, 20 Feb 2003 21:59:28 -0500, "... ... _..." <.@... .com> wrote:
> > >
> > > >wow pretty neat trick Twistedhed
> > > >Watch out doug doesn't sue you for libel.
> > >
> > > This is highly unlikely on Usenet. The burden of proof rests with the
> > > person being libeled. Anyone can sign any name in a Usenet posting.
> > > Even if you prove that a post came from a certain computer via an IP
> > > address, you still have to prove that *that* *person* made the
> > > posting. The only way of defending would be to build a case against
> > > the poster if libelous postings continue. IOW, N8WWN should be patient
> >
> > That's wishful thinking. People have already been sued for libel, BASED
> > UPON THE CONTENTS OF ONE POST, and have lost the suit. You simply have
> > to do a little Google searching to find the cases, so I won't do that
> > job for you.
> >
> > People have even been sued before their names were known (so-called
> > "John Doe" filings, complete with subpoenas to the involved ISPs).
>
>
> Please provide the links. That is totally opposite from accepted
> practices and cases to date. Most cases involving libel are simply too hard
> for the plaintive to prove. Sueing someone is one thing. Winning the suit is
> totally another.
>
> Dave
> "Sandbagger"

Try reading what he posted, Dave. He said he wasn't going to "do that
job for you." Sounds like plain English to me; what's your problem?

2652. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-22 00:16:16 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E56C140.56F3591B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61685

N2EY wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E553338.C2DE600C@earthlink.net>...
> > N2EY wrote:
> >
> > > Great story! Here's some of mine (you started this, Bert!).....
> > >
> > > First experience with homebrew radio was building a "foxhole" set from
> > > instructions found in a thrift-store book, "All About Radio and
> > > Television".
> >
> > Still have the book?
>
> Somewhere. Doesn't matter, I memorized the plans long ago. 120 turns
> #26 enameled on cardboard tube, white razor blade, safety pin,
> graphite from a #2 pencil. High impedance phones, coupla nails and
> thumbtacks, bit of wood for a base.

It matters! If you don't have yours, I have two. I'll send you one.

> > I made one from the very same book and later
> > modified it with a store-bought diode. Until our local station went on
> > the air, all I heard was WOWO in Fort Wayne, a pretty good haul from
> > southern West Virginia.
>
> Fort Wayne Indiana?

Yep. You'd think with the Charleston, Oak Hill, Beckley and Huntington
stations in the "local" area, I'd have heard one of them. Instead, I
heard Fort Wayne, Indiana--even in the daytime. That all changed after
WMTD fired up right in town but it was a 1,000 watt daytimer so WOWO
took over at night.

> > There was a kid in our town who had a shortwave receiver and a pair of
> > Part 15 walkie-talkies. By the time I met him, I was studying to become
> > a ham. Talking to a kid a couple of blocks away on a walkie-talkie
> > didn't hold much fascination. Maybe that's why I don't spend much time
> > on two meter repeaters to this day.
> >
> I knew kids who had those things. Good for maybe a 1000 feet with a
> new battery. My little one-tuber would do thousands of times that
> distance reliably.

...and you didn't have to talk to the same kid over and over and over.
After a week or so, we'd run out of things to say.

> > > Passed the Novice test in the early summer of 1967 at the ripe old age
> > > of 13 and built a 10 watt transmitter from other NRI parts. The old TV
> > > set provided the power supply. Only part I had to buy for the
> > > transmitter was the xtal. Tuned it up with a dial lamp in the antenna
> > > lead as RF indicator, plus the plate milliameter. Not a rock crusher
> > > but had a lot of fun. By that time the antenna had been upgraded to
> > > use "real antenna wire", those same glass insulators and went from the
> > > attic window to much higher up in the crab apple tree.
> > >
> > > Total cost - maybe $14 for everything...You wanna talk about doing
> > > radio on a shoestring budget, you came to the right place!
> >
> > My gear was store bought and used. Both the receiver and transmitter
> > came from Allied's used equipment list. My deal with my dad was that
> > I'd save the money for the receiver from my paper route and he and Mom
> > would get me that transmitter for Christmas. I bought a Knight R-100
> > general coverage receiver and Pop ordered me a Knight T-60 transmitter a
> > couple of weeks later.
>
> If I'd had parnets like that I'd have been licensed years earlier. How
> old were ya when the Novice license arrived? For me it was October 14,
> 1967.

Fourteen. The license was dated November 22, 1963. I turned fifteen
three months later. That was the beginning of my sophomore year of high
school.
Selling my dad wasn't easy. I was told that both ham radio and playing
the guitar were "kicks" and that all that stuff would be cluttering up a
closet after I'd lost interest. I ask him periodically if he thinks
I'll ever get tired of either one. He's now 78 and I'm pushing 54
really hard.

> > Oddly enough, when the new UPS delivery service
> > driver brought the parcel from Allied, there was a Heath DX-40 inside.
> > A note explained that they'd sold the T-60 and hoped that the DX-40
> > would be a suitable substitute.
> >
> > Every tube in the DX-40 was broken in shipping but a trip to K8CFT's TV
> > service shop yielded replacements (at no charge). A few days after I'd
> > begun using the DX-40, another parcel from Allied arrived at our door.
> > Inside was a Knight T-60. Allied had fouled up. My dad suggested that
> > I try the T-60 and decide which one I wanted to keep. The DX-40 won,
> > hands down.
>
> No surprise, the guy who bought the T-60 must sent it back!

...and after comparing the insides of both, I could see why he would do
so. The T-60 was chintzy looking.

> I remember the Allied catalog and the T-60, T-150, R-55 and R-100. All
> were way beyond my means, as were the coveted HR-10/DX-60 twins or the
> 2-C/2-NT favored by the ver rich. Turns out that was a good thing,

> because except for the Drake those rx's were terrible.

One of my pals locally had the Lafayette HE-30. It had better
bandspread tuning than my R-100 but the R-100's product detector and
Q-Multiplier could be used simultaneously. The biggest R-100 handicap
was the tuning rate. I wish I'd known enough to get a ham bands only
receiver. That would come later in the form of a Mosley CM-1, xtal
controlled front end, no RF stage (antenna to first mixer) and only five
tubes, all of them 6AW8A's.

> DX-40 was a decent rig but that weird series-exciter thing was a bad
> idea. Many hams have since converted them to economy power supply (TV
> trans, again) and conventional B+.

The DX-40's design also lead to a couple of OO reports of my 80m sigs
being 559 on 7.4 megs--not a good thing.

> > We didn't own an extension ladder and the old apple tree in the yard was
> > only twenty or so feet high so my first antenna was quite low running
> > from the tree to the house. K8CFT came to my rescue again. He stopped
> > by the house with his service truck and a 40 foot extension ladder. We
> > had a line of tall fir trees around the perimeter of the yard. Buzz
> > installed an 80m dipole at what seemed to me to be extreme altitude.
>
> oh mama! I learned to climb the gingkos that surrounded the property
> and put all sorts of wires aloft in the following years.

I'd pay someone before I'd climb a male gingko during the fruit-bearing
season.
Nothing stinks quite like Gingko fruit.

> First non-homebrew ham gear I had was an AR-2/QF-1 combo ($20) and a
> DX-20 (also $20, thank you W2FNT). Somewhere in there was a VF-1,
> SX-99, Viking Adventurer, various Command sets, and of course serious
> homebrewing.

I had a DX-20 later while living in Miami. I still remember that iron
vane meter clunking against the peg.

> > > Now here's the part that relates to the subject line:
> > >
> > > All through this time, I was working with high voltages and dangerous
> > > tools like soldering irons and razor blades. (Still have some of the
> > > scars...;-))
> >
> > There's nothing like having molten solder drip on your leg while you're
> > wearing a pair of shorts! My scar is from an Exacto knife to the right
> > thumb. A drunken doctor, on call at the local hospital, broke a needle
> > off in the thumb before managing a few stitches.
>
> AAARRRRGGGHHHH!!
>
> I never had any injuries that required medical attention. Luckily.

I'd at least hoped for a bullet to bite on. I received no local
anesthesia. I hurt myself with the knife less than the pain from
getting sewn up.

> > > Also climbing trees to put up antennas and such. Parental supervision?
> > > Bah!
> >
> > Trees are made to be climbed.
>
> Yup.
> >
> > > The Feds saw fit to grant me the license and I didn't electrocute
> > > anyone nor burn the house down. Nor did my 10 watter bother any other
> > > radio services. I knew and worked other hams who were younger than me,
> > > too.
> >
> > My mother was sure that I was GOING to burn the house down. Her opinion
> > was reinforced the day we went to church and I left the DX-40 on
> > standby. The entire house was filled with the melted tar smell of the
> > potted power transformer when we returned (again K8CFT to the rescue
> > with an old TV power transformer).
>
> I never left anything on for just that reason!

...and I was under parental edict to ensure that everything was off
before we left the house to go anywhere after my one and only incident.

> > > But some folks would have denied us our licenses based on age alone.
> > > Odd, really odd.
> >
> > It makes perfect sense if you're a fellow with half a century of
> > PROFESSIONAL experience and you're embarrassed to be shown up by a bunch
> > of telegraph key wielding CHILDREN!
>
> HAW!!!
>
> But it's been possible to get a ham license in the USA for over a
> dozen years now with no code test at all.

That just doesn't cut it if you have your heart set on HF ham radio and
you are faced with the enormous wall which a five word per minute morse
exam presents.

Dave K8MN

2653. Re: eBay removes legal 10m ham gear but allows illegal CB equipment

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-22 00:23:27 UTC
From: Robin <robinzegg@mindless.com>
Message-ID: <b36g4h$81o$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 61686
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

Belcher from 75 Meters <fartinechobox3@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:3e5548e3@snipnews.snip.net...
> Legal action? Come down from out
> of your gum ball tree and catnip

I dont' know if you have ever seen those stupid signs
downtown which said Trees By Atlanta, some stupid
outfit apparently proud of its efforts to replace what
should never have been removed.

I'm just really disappointed that this happened.

2654. Re: N8WWM BUSTED SAYS RAIN REPORT

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-22 00:31:30 UTC
From: Scott <scott@scotti.sh!t>
Message-ID: <7BicnWmNw8R9WcujXTWcoQ@comcast.com>
Source record: 61687
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"... ... _..." wrote:
>
> I agree, as does Nancy, In fact one could use the excuse landshark did, it
> was a co worker using a terminal from work. LOL. but hey you may have a
> case against twisty, his incessant calling you a liar etc may be libelous
> as well. he even made a new email address on account of you,
> deckthehall@webtv.com

The pathological part kicked in again.

In one post, He's not George.

Here he is George with wife Nancy.

Hmmmm...

(I'm ready for the insult. LOL!)

2655. Re: eBay removes legal 10m ham gear but allows illegal CB equipment

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-22 01:37:45 UTC
From: cheesecutter@webhideout.com
Message-ID: <fef386d5.0302211737.37d321b8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61688
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net> wrote in message news:<BA7B59E0.F981%stewart@say.net>...
> "WW" wrote:
>
> > From what I hear, the CBs are fighting back.
>
>
> Actually, no. According to what I heard (from an eBay employee), eBay was
> given a list of which radios were "easily modified to operate on frequencies
> outside the CB band" and are therefore questionable (read eBay's rules on
> electronic devices). This list included Uniden and Ranger radios like the
> ones mentioned ("HR2600s, HR2510s, RCIs"), resulting in these radio auctions
> being routinely removed when discovered.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>
>
> ----------== Posted via Newsfeed.Com - Uncensored Usenet News ==----------
> http://www.newsfeed.com The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> -----= Over 100,000 Newsgroups - Unlimited Fast Downloads - 19 Servers =-----

you know duck.....i sure am glad that you are moving to
europe.....that aaron voobner crap was getting pretty old..

2656. Lloyd Davies in action.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-22 01:39:48 UTC
From: kv4fzlloydsowner@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030221203948.17323.00000051@mb-bg.aol.com>
Source record: 61689

Sam had been in business for 25 years and is finally sick of the
stress.

He quits his job and buys 50 acres of land near Athens, Alabama as far from
humanity as possible. Sam sees the postman once a week and gets no visitors.
After six months or so of almost total isolation, someone knocks on his
door. He opens it and there is a balding, obese man standing there.
"Name's Lloyd Davies, your neighbor from forty miles up the road... Having a
Christmas party Friday night... Thought you might like to come. About
5:00..."
"Great," says Sam, "after six months out here I'm ready to meet some
local folks. Thank you.
As Lloyd is leaving, he stops. "Gotta warn you... There's gonna be some
drinkin'."
"Not a problem," says Sam. "After 25 years in business, I can drink
with
the best of em."
Again, as he starts to leave, Lloyd stops. "More 'n' likely gonna be
some
fightin' too."
Sam says, "Well, I get along with people, I'll be alright. I'll be
there. Thanks again."
Once again Lloyd turns from the door. "I've seen some wild sex at these
parties, too."
"Now that's really not a problem," says Sam, laughing. "I've been all
alone for six months! I'll definitely be there. By the way, what should
I bring?"
Lloyd stops in the door again and says, "Whatever you want. Just gonna
be the two of us."

I'll say one thing about lloyd,

Lloyd Davies was the best sponge boy I ever had!

2657. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-22 02:36:42 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030221213642.05048.00000755@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 61690

In article <3E554544.78559BF9@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>N2EY wrote:

>> The funniest part is that the mere possession of an Advanced simply
>> proves the holder passed 5 wpm and the old writtens.

>Thought it was 13 wpm.

Medical waivers came about in 1990. The mere possession of an Advanced doesn't
prove that the holder passed 13 wpm - you need more info.
>
>> There may also be some sour grapes because the restructuring doesn't
>> give Advanceds any more credit towards Extra than a General.
>
>Well, they could have taken the old extra test up to a year before April
>15, 2000 and cashed the CSCE in on April 15, 2000 and have an extra.

Yup. But the window of opportunity was much smaller - about 3.5 months (the
time between the R&O announcement and April 15).

>I did something similar: Had the old style tech (general written and 5wpm).
>Took the advanced and the extra writtens in Jan 2000. Got the CSCEs
>and cashed them in on April 15, 2000 at a special VE event set up for
>this purpose. And got the extra ticket a week later in the mail (The VEs
>were quick to submit the paperwork, obviously).

Lots of those "paperwork-only" VE sessions in April 2000 - a very good idea.
Fortunately your VEs were quick to submit, and missed the big backlog.
>
>Well, the above advanceds missed the boat.
>
All depends on whether you consider the new 50 question Extra (Element 4) to be
"harder" than than the old 40 question Extra (old Element 4B).

Of course one of the biggest unknowns in amateur radio demographics is just how
many ACTIVE hams there are. With 10 year license terms, a ham who loses
interest or dies can still show up on the database for years unless someone
takes action to cancel the license.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2658. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-22 03:38:16 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030221223816.03943.00000906@mb-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 61692

In article <EF02DE40C81EDD65.8FD122C04D2252CE.89DDC25D232BA098@lp.airnews.net>,
"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>> Len:
>>
>> You've just been given bad advice. You ARE a "dumbed down Extra Lite"
>
>Sure--in *Larry's* eyes; and we all know with what clarity Larry sees.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

I was quite distressed to learn of your recent illness. My most fervent
hopes for your full and speedy recovery!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2659. Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-22 03:38:16 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030221223816.03943.00000905@mb-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 61693

In article <3E54F40C.5090903@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>
>
> <A whole bunch of other stuff snipped>
>
> heh heh, Larry, you're bad! Good post.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Mike:

As I've told everyone in here numerous times, I post here for three reasons -- to entertain and enlighten my readers, and to amuse myself. Some posts, such as the one in question, are quite sincere and accurately reflect my own thoughts and feelings without the least bit of ironic twist.
Post-Restructuring Extras ARE "dumbed-down Extra-Lites." We DID, in fact, go from a more challenging and comprehensive license testing system to one which is significantly simpler to prepare for and achieve a passing grade. It also de-emphasizes one of our most important communications skills, and, in fact, will totally eliminate same whenever S25.5 is finally voted out of existence.
I realize and acknowledge that the New World Order Extra Lites have no choice but to be subjected to the reduced status caused by the lowering of standards, but those who are old enough to have been licensed under Pre-Restructuring standards are held accountable for not upgrading prior to the change. Therefore, they must admit to and accept their reduced status among their fellow hams. The fact that we accept them as fellow hams is merely a convenience and a courtesy; their plebeian status is nevertheless in force. They are the vulgar proletariat of amateur radio, made that way by the whining of lazy knuckle-draggers who lusted after HF phone privileges, but couldn't muster the intellectual and moral capacity to learn and master a simple communications skill proven to be achievable by people of all ages and from all walks of life. They truly deserve the pity of their intellectual and moral superiors in amateur radio. We may have no choice but to allow them to circulate among us, and even communicate with them on-the-air, but they will have to accept the fact that any respect they receive must be earned by their showing us a willingness to become technically and operationally competent -- including mastering Morse/CW at a speed of at least 20 WPM.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2660. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-22 05:08:53 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.52.0302220504460.149@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 61694

On Sat, 22 Feb 2003, N2EY wrote:
>In article <3E554544.78559BF9@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
><wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
>>N2EY wrote:
>
>>> The funniest part is that the mere possession of an Advanced simply
>>> proves the holder passed 5 wpm and the old writtens.
>
>>Thought it was 13 wpm.
>
>Medical waivers came about in 1990. The mere possession of an Advanced doesn't
>prove that the holder passed 13 wpm - you need more info.

But as I said, we know who has the waivers and who doesn't - because there is a
field in the FCC data that addresses whether or not one was issued.

>>> There may also be some sour grapes because the restructuring doesn't
>>> give Advanceds any more credit towards Extra than a General.
>>
>>Well, they could have taken the old extra test up to a year before April
>>15, 2000 and cashed the CSCE in on April 15, 2000 and have an extra.
>
>Yup. But the window of opportunity was much smaller - about 3.5 months (the
>time between the R&O announcement and April 15).

Not necessarily. There may have been certain individuals who were working on
the code element and already had the written element credit in hand when the
ruling came out (though very few - doubtful if over 100).

>>I did something similar: Had the old style tech (general written and 5wpm).
>>Took the advanced and the extra writtens in Jan 2000. Got the CSCEs
>>and cashed them in on April 15, 2000 at a special VE event set up for
>>this purpose. And got the extra ticket a week later in the mail (The VEs
>>were quick to submit the paperwork, obviously).
>
>Lots of those "paperwork-only" VE sessions in April 2000 - a very good idea.
>Fortunately your VEs were quick to submit, and missed the big backlog.

I know of some April 15, 2000 sessions that didn't get processed until mid June
2000. It all depends on how each VEC stacked their piles of unprocessed work.

>>Well, the above advanceds missed the boat.
>>
>All depends on whether you consider the new 50 question Extra (Element 4) to be
>"harder" than than the old 40 question Extra (old Element 4B).
>

>Of course one of the biggest unknowns in amateur radio demographics is just how
>many ACTIVE hams there are. With 10 year license terms, a ham who loses
>interest or dies can still show up on the database for years unless someone
>takes action to cancel the license.

Then we shall see as they fail to renew....

2661. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-22 05:31:02 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.haotvo3.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 61695

On 20 Feb 2003 20:02:22 -0800, Brian wrote:

>Phil, I just didn't want you running off to Spain for something that's
>a domestic matter. ;))
>
>Anyway, what did you find out?

I found out that you don't know what an EA is (it's NOT a
Spanish radio amateur in this context). Ask your CPA to define
it for you.

Anyhow, my friend has not heard anything about this at all.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2662. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-22 06:14:29 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E571543.55865AC9@att.net>
Source record: 61696

Brian wrote:

> Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E55D000.1107CA1@att.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> >
> > > "Aspiring Elmer" <elmer@nowhere.com> wrote in message
news:<2mN4a.53666$Rx3.2151954@news1.west.cox.net>...
> > > > "Len Budney" <lbudney-google@nb.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:417b917a.0302190636.e464c20@posting.google.com...
> > > > > Hello,
> > > > >
> > > > > I'm not a ham, but my parents are: AB2OA and AB2OB. I'd like to get
> > > > > the general opinion of the group about callsigns.
> > > > >
> > > > > Later this year I'll be getting my "nickle extra". Despite the lowly,
> > > > > dumbed down status of the Extra ticket today, I'm thinking about
> > > > > getting a 1x2 callsign. :-)
> > >
> > > Len, get in line. I'm waiting for W0EX.
> > >
> > > Brian
> >
> > Ah, poor Somolia Slim. Been waiting for something or the other in the way of ham radio
for most of his adult
> > life, simply because he didn't have what it took to do otherwise.. Dunno what he waited
on as a kid. Probably
> > adulthood, which seems to escaped him
> > Some of us just did it. Oh BTW, what makes you think anyone cares what you're waiting
for?
>
> You care. You're still reading even if you're not replying all the
> time.
>
> A dude who can't
> > understand "permission" wouldn't be likely to know how to go about properly applying.
Then there's always the
> > matter of being first in line. And your own personal task of outfoxing the actuarial
tables yourself.....
>
> I've got permission, and I've got the time to wait.
>
> > Seems Phil was right about your default mode. Should you ever want to rent a clue for a
moment or two yer
> > buddy Putz will be eager to fix you up with a special deal. You'll have to call him on

the landline, tho, he
> > doesn't have a ham radio license. Come to think of it, you still don't have much of one either. You sure do
> > generate a lot of QRN though.
>
> Welp, if I were invited to use my favorite mode... and didn't. If I
> kept tooting my horn about emergency comms... and couldn't oerate a
> radio away from the electric company. If... If... If.
>
> 73, Brian

Slim you really DO make Forrest Gump look like a genius.

2663. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-22 06:18:07 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030222011807.26320.00000029@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 61697

In article <3E553338.C2DE600C@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>It makes perfect sense if you're a fellow with half a century of
>PROFESSIONAL experience and you're embarrassed to be shown up by a bunch
>of telegraph key wielding CHILDREN!

Poor baby. Way back in time he got his snow job melted...all
about using CW as an order-wire for an RTTY circuit in some
small embassy (?) in the middle of Africa in the 1980s.

I'll rank his radio expertise with those "seven hostile action"
heroes.

Forget sending those cashews. You're nuts.

2664. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-22 06:18:08 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030222011808.26320.00000030@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 61698

In article <3E553A2E.859D91C9@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>We don't have a collective mind.

Do you have hives?

>No, I simply called attention to your playing fast and loose with the
>truth.

"Fast and loose?" Heavens no...everything is Strict and Proper,
in formation, dressed right and covered down. Hut-too-tree-foah!

>Those aren't commands either.

Oh, that's right! You issue Commandments!

>Only dodges from you, Leonard?

No, I only drive Chevrolets...

>Somebody can. You can't. I have no obligation to accept your input on
>amateur radio matters. As far as I'm concerned, you aren't anything to
>amateur radio.

Ah, "there you have it!" Dismissal. The Commandment issuer
now dismisses the "inferiors." :-)

>Ham: An amateur radio operator.

Does Porky the Pig have a license?

>Yeah, those damned control freaks at the FCC.

You want ARRL or Department of State to grant ham licenses?

Gee, I thought the FDA licensed hams?

>No, but I have a birthday at the end of the month.

Will you be four years old then? Or just three? If three you can
get a nice news factoid on ARRL Letter, maybe even a hug from
a kindly, grandfatherly-looking VE. :-)

>That shouldn't surprise you.

<Gomer Pyle voice-over>

"Surprize...sur-priaze!"

<segue to theme from "The Untouchables">

>Then you just aren't doing a very good job of it.

I'm retired from regular hours, not on a contract assignment now.
How can I be doing any sort of job? :-)

>It makes about as much sense as anything else you've done toward
>obtaining a license.

I got a First Phone in 1956...got an Illinois driver's license in 1950.

Wanna see a scan of my Poetic License? :-)

Tsk, tsk, tsk, still no rain outside the window...

2665. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-22 06:18:09 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030222011809.26320.00000031@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 61801

In article <c2356669.0302201432.3a32d44b@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
(N2EY) writes:

>Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3E54629A.D484A704@earthlink.net>...
>> Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >
>> > In article <c2356669.0302180920.6d0ef744@posting.google.com>,
>N2EY@AOL.COM
>> > (N2EY) writes:
>> >
>> > >"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
>> > >news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hah4ji9.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
>> > >> On 17 Feb 2003 17:53:32 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> > >Anybody can comment, propose rule changes, etc., not just hams.
>> > >However, it is a mystery why an individual who has never held an
>> > >amateur license and obviously has little interest in getting one is so
>> > >interested in changing the rules.
>> >
>> > Tsk, tsk, tsk, it's a mystery to me why someone who is an
>> > amateur will hide his profession. :-)
>
>Who does that? Can't be me. My profession has been reported here
>several times. Here it is again:
>
>I'm an electrical engineer. I've been employed full time in design
>(and a few other EE-related activities) since graduation from college.

In what field of electricity or electronics? Table lamp design?
Spaceship control systems? Miniature R/C cars? Power
transmission? Industrial control electric things? $3.50 AC
outlet strips with built-in surge protectors?

No company mentioned (for various fearfull reasons), no field
within electricity or electronics mentioned, yet Mr. N2EY
gave talks to industry according to himself and his bosom
buddy Kellie. Excuse me, Mr. Kellie. Talks about what?

>> > Must be some schizoid fantasy thing going around... :-)
>
>lessee...who needs multiple screen names?

Why does AOL make them available? :-)

Poor baby. My full USPS mailing address was in every byline
in Ham Radio magazine. Same in BYTE. No problem for me,
no fear.

>Len is very civil - until somebody disagrees with him.

Awww. Counselor Troi, do you sense disagreement,
irritation, and fear?
:-)

My Honorable Discharge was given me in April, 1960.
I've been a civilian ever since...

2666. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-22 06:18:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030222011810.26320.00000032@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 61700

In article <c2356669.0302201445.1b11025c@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>I was born at night, but not last night.

How about last week?

>Len has recently dropped to the level of racial epithets as well,
>repeatedly calling me "boy".

Boy...ah say BOY, yu nevah huhd of Allen's Alley?

Tut tut.

>Note that he does not provide any evidence, just repeats the same
>false claim.

Full of "errors" on the "factual state of the art?" :-)

>> You're no Jim Kehler.
>
>Neither am I.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, you guys ought to visit Guam...or right now,
some place in Florida. Kehler lives! :-)

>Len demonstrates his logical processes by the above example. Some ham
>named Jim with a 2-land call used a pejorative phrase 5 years ago, so
>he thinks he's justified in tossing it at me. Four-year-olds see the
>logical faults in that. ;-)

One of the larger DXers (literally), KH2D spoke much in here
and still does on his website today. He isn't for four-year-olds.
Or, for that matter, "Clueless Newbies" and "Brain-dead Old
Farts." :-)

Most decidedly a PCTA. :-)

2667. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-22 06:18:12 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030222011812.26320.00000033@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 61699

In article <c2356669.0302201423.3400b616@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
(N2EY) writes:

>vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
>news:<20030217201610.04532.00000254@mb-fx.aol.com>...
>> From N2EY:
>
>Get your attributions right, Vipul. You wrote the following, not me:
>
>> >>Learning the code is a waste of time.
>> >>
>> >I have BSEEand MSEE and I say it's not a waste of time at all.
>>
>> It is a waste of time for those that have a degree or are just interested in
>> the technical aspect.
>
>I have two degrees in electrical engineering and I say it's not a
>waste of time.
>
>You were the one who started waving degrees around.

Incorrect. Mr. N2EY was waving his certificates in here well
before Shah entered the newsgroup. :-)

>And I'm interested in the technical aspect.

Yes, through "Electric Radio," a fanzine not for sale at
national newsstands or retail periodical outlets, of fan
interest to vacuum tube oriented hobbyists.

>> The exception is if you TRULY enjoy it.
>
>I didn't enjoy it until I learned it.

If Mr. N2EY learned it and enjoyed it, everyone must learn
it and enjoy it. Abundantly clear.

>>In that case, it
>> is not a waste of time. You may truly enjoy it,so it is not a waste of time
for
>> you. I do not truly enjoy Morse code.
>
>Then why not simply say it's not fun FOR YOU?

Why doesn't Mr. N2EY? :-)

>How would YOU structure the licenses, Vipul, given the following
>facts:
>
>1) Currently, all amateur privileges above 30 MHz are granted with a
>Tech license that has no code test.

That's already been explained by the FCC in Part 97, Title 47 CFR.

It does not require interpretation by Mr. N2EY.

>2) FCC says that the treaty requires a code test for any amatuer
>license with HF/MF privileges.

Error by omission. The FCC said in 1990 and again in 1999 that
a morse code test does NOT serve any purpose for them in
determining license qualifications for amateur radio. See FCC
90-53 and FCC 99-412.

The US Administration representatives to the ITU-R are obligated
to honor ITU-R Recommendations. That is all. The FCC made
mention of the "treaty" only to show why the morse test is
retained...otherwise the FCC just doesn't consider a morse test
worthwhile in determining qualifications for any amateur license.

Note: The FCC grants amateur licenses and ARRL is NOT part
of the US Administration that votes at WRCs.

>Would you have the code test tied to the entry level license class? Or
>would you limit VHF-UHF privileges?

Do you still beat your wife? :-)

>Tell us how YOU would solve the problem and not violate the
>constraints.

Mr. N2EY considers an international treaty "constraints?" :-)

>Whether the TEST is a necessary requirement is a different thing.

"It's the LAW!" :-)

The subject is the MORSE CODE TEST, not the entire written
test elements. Try to stay focussed.

>> Not for one who wants to increase technical skills
>> and does not enjoy Morse code.
>
>So how should the license structure be set up?

Mr. N2EY would probably want it exactly as ARRL wants it. :-)

>Give us some examples of courses that were irrelevant.

This is not an academic institution newsgroup. It is an
institution of amateurs. :-)

The FCC is not an academic institution and the amateur radio
license test is not an academic test.

>I still remember every course I took and every teacher in EE school.
>Some of the things I learned there I did not fully appreciate until
>years later.

...when you were working at that undisclosed location? :-)

>> There is not need to do the same thing to amateur radio.
>
>I'm beginning to understand why you dislike the code so much.

Everyone understands why Mr. N2EY *loves* morsemanship
so much. :-)

>How? Solve the problem I posted above.

What problem? There's a problem?

>You say you're interested in "the technical aspect" and "homebrewing",
>but I don't see you describing what it is you want to build.

I don't see Mr. N2EY describing his work in any detail. Isn't
he proud of his work? Why keep silent with so much pride?

2668. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL support it ??)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-22 09:14:10 UTC
From: Zombie Wolf <zmbwf@acadia.net>
Message-ID: <v5efqt462eej1f@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 61802
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

"chessecutter" <cheesecutter@webhideout.com> wrote in message
news:fef386d5.0302081539.37247a58@posting.google.com...
> "Stephen C. Robbins" <srobbinsNoSPaMDUDES@netacc.net> wrote in message
news:<3e448df8@news.netacc.net>...
> > > > "Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
> > news:<8VE0a.7858$mo6.1529@FE03>...
> > > > > If you haven't done anything wrong, then you have nothing to worry
> > about. So
> > > > > what's the big problem??
> > > > >
> >
> > Hmm, the name Richard Jewel comes to mind. Remember the security guard
in
> > Atlanta who discovered a bomb and warned people away, probably saving a
> > dozen lives. The FBI destroyed the man in an attempt to convict him of
> > placing the bomb. They got him fired from his job, destroyed his
> > reputation in the community by releasing false stories about him, and
even
> > tried to get his family to turn on him. The real bomber is still on the
> > loose and went on to bomb two more establishments while the FBI ignored
> > him and went after the innocent.
> >
> > And now we also have all the death row prisoners who have been released
> > since the advent of DNA evidence. Yea, right, if you havent done
anything
> > wrong, then you have nothing to worry about. Now that is one ignorant
> > statement!
>
>
> yeh they ruined that security guard guy, and i think eric rudolph did
> that, and they tried for years to find him and have not as yet, and i
> got a strange feeling they are doing the same thing to that white guy
> who they blamed for that anthrax stuff.....the world's best police
> force is just not living up to its billing.......j edgar must be
> turning over in his grave.......of course he was rumored to be a cross
> dresser but he did like to bust crooks and ran a tight ship........

And keep enemies lists and compile records to blackmail just about anyone
that did not agree with him - ah yes, J Edgar was quite a laudible figure...
He controlled president after president and politician after politician with
his knowledge, simply blackmailing them into submission.

2669. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-22 14:02:25 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302220602.117a3101@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61803

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E565A51.B1C29552@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:

> > Yet its Jim's radio. You're the one who cannot keep things straight.
> > Don't sit up all night tuning the 160M band endlessly trying to snag a
> > new one, then try to be coherent in replies. Doesn't work.
>
> I understand that ",Brian" gave you a problem.

Brian only gives you problems.

> > > > So now unplugged cans makes it more enjoyable? Dave, give him the
> > > > message yourself.
> > >
> > > I thought maybe you were up to the task. I was wrong.
> >
> > Dave was wrong. Probably first time ever. Welp, at least we have it
> > in writing.
>
> I've been wrong about your ability to comprehend before.

Dave admits he was wrong again.

> > I was not home when replying. Jump, jump, jump.
>
> Oh. Correct my statement to read: "We're not all gathered whereever it
> is that you are". You can explain your second sentence, the incomplete
> one, later if you have any interest in anyone being able to understand
> it.

You're supposed to be a bright boy.

> > Why would I turn on Jim's radio? You're still confused, aren't you?
>
> Phil may be on to something. Stupid seems to be your default mode. Ed
> Hare lost interest in the group when you ran extended versions of your
> nonsense replies.

That's really too bad. Law of unintended consequences. I liked Ed.

On the other hand, how many other people have been run off this group?
I don't see any litttle violins playing for them.

2670. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-22 14:04:37 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302220604.25e39d16@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61804

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E565A9F.1804896A@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030220021037.29944.00000029@mb-fi.aol.com>...
> > > In article <f45722ac.0302191918.52d72040@posting.google.com>,
> > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> > >
> > > >> > Anything else you would like me to pass on to Len?
> > > >>
> > > >> No, you'd likely get it screwed up too.
> > > >
> > > >Just like you to jump to conclusions.
> > >
> > > Pssst...mention the cashews... :-)
> >
> > Dave, I've got a message for you from Len: "Cashews."
>
> Here's a Brianesque reply: "Gesundheit!"

Bless you.

2671. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-22 14:10:14 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302220610.127446cc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61805

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E571543.55865AC9@att.net>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E55D000.1107CA1@att.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > > "Aspiring Elmer" <elmer@nowhere.com> wrote in message
news:<2mN4a.53666$Rx3.2151954@news1.west.cox.net>...
> > > > > "Len Budney" <lbudney-google@nb.net> wrote in message
> > > > > news:417b917a.0302190636.e464c20@posting.google.com...
> > > > > > Hello,
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I'm not a ham, but my parents are: AB2OA and AB2OB. I'd like to get
> > > > > > the general opinion of the group about callsigns.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Later this year I'll be getting my "nickle extra". Despite the lowly,
> > > > > > dumbed down status of the Extra ticket today, I'm thinking about
> > > > > > getting a 1x2 callsign. :-)
> > > > >
> > > > > Len, get in line. I'm waiting for W0EX.
> > > > >
> > > > > Brian
> > > >
> > > > Ah, poor Somolia Slim. Been waiting for something or the other in the way of ham
radio for most of his adult
> > > > life, simply because he didn't have what it took to do otherwise.. Dunno what he
waited on as a kid. Probably
> > > > adulthood, which seems to escaped him
> > > > Some of us just did it. Oh BTW, what makes you think anyone cares what you're waiting
for?
> > >
> > > You care. You're still reading even if you're not replying all the
> > > time.
> > >
> > > A dude who can't
> > > > understand "permission" wouldn't be likely to know how to go about properly applying.
Then there's always the
> > > > matter of being first in line. And your own personal task of outfoxing the actuarial
tables yourself.....
> > >
> > > I've got permission, and I've got the time to wait.
> > >
> > > > Seems Phil was right about your default mode. Should you ever want to rent a clue for
a moment or two yer

> > > buddy Putz will be eager to fix you up with a special deal. You'll have to call him on the landline, tho, he
> > > doesn't have a ham radio license. Come to think of it, you still don't have much of one either. You sure do
> > > generate a lot of QRN though.
> >
> > Welp, if I were invited to use my favorite mode... and didn't. If I
> > kept tooting my horn about emergency comms... and couldn't oerate a
> > radio away from the electric company. If... If... If.
> >
> > 73, Brian
>
> Slim you really DO make Forrest Gump look like a genius.

Thanks Gump.

2672. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-22 15:15:54 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <A38FDA96D1C6D017.A2E05248B85E39D4.21BD9B99B52FEC82@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 61807

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030221223816.03943.00000906@mb-fj.aol.com...
> In article
<EF02DE40C81EDD65.8FD122C04D2252CE.89DDC25D232BA098@lp.airnews.net>,
> "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:
>
> >> Len:
> >>
> >> You've just been given bad advice. You ARE a "dumbed down Extra Lite"
> >
> >Sure--in *Larry's* eyes; and we all know with what clarity Larry sees.
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Kim:
>
> I was quite distressed to learn of your recent illness. My most fervent
> hopes for your full and speedy recovery!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

My recent illness hasn't changed my attitude one bit about how hateful I
believe you are. Your sincerity is truly doubted.

Kim W5TIT

2673. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-22 15:18:31 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <55A991AF2A2A541D.7551DD2911B0137D.9DC22BFACA640886@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 61808

Larry whines quite well...eh, Mike?

See how hateful Larry is...See Larry hate.

Kim W5TIT

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030221223816.03943.00000905@mb-fj.aol.com...
> In article <3E54F40C.5090903@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
> > >
> > >
> > > <A whole bunch of other stuff snipped>
> > >
> > > heh heh, Larry, you're bad! Good post.
> > >
> > > - Mike KB3EIA -
>
> Mike:
>
> As I've told everyone in here numerous times, I post here for three
reasons --
> to entertain and enlighten my readers, and to amuse myself. Some posts,
such
> as the one in question, are quite sincere and accurately reflect my own
> thoughts and feelings without the least bit of ironic twist.
> Post-Restructuring Extras ARE "dumbed-down Extra-Lites." We DID, in fact,
go
> from a more challenging and comprehensive license testing system to one
which
> is significantly simpler to prepare for and achieve a passing grade. It
also
> de-emphasizes one of our most important communications skills, and, in
fact,
> will totally eliminate same whenever S25.5 is finally voted out of
existence.
> I realize and acknowledge that the New World Order Extra Lites have no
choice
> but to be subjected to the reduced status caused by the lowering of
standards,
> but those who are old enough to have been licensed under Pre-Restructuring
> standards are held accountable for not upgrading prior to the change.
> Therefore, they must admit to and accept their reduced status among their
> fellow hams. The fact that we accept them as fellow hams is merely a
> convenience and a courtesy; their plebeian status is nevertheless in

force.
> They are the vulgar proletariat of amateur radio, made that way by the
whining
> of lazy knuckle-draggers who lusted after HF phone privileges, but
couldn't
> muster the intellectual and moral capacity to learn and master a simple
> communications skill proven to be achievable by people of all ages and
from all
> walks of life. They truly deserve the pity of their intellectual and
moral
> superiors in amateur radio. We may have no choice but to allow them to
> circulate among us, and even communicate with them on-the-air, but they
will
> have to accept the fact that any respect they receive must be earned by
their
> showing us a willingness to become technically and operationally
competent --
> including mastering Morse/CW at a speed of at least 20 WPM.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

2674. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-22 15:22:20 UTC
From: "Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now>
Message-ID: <Xns932A4AFE5E716pookster@216.168.3.50>
Source record: 61806

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in
news:20030221223816.03943.00000905@mb-fj.aol.com:

> Post-Restructuring Extras ARE "dumbed-down Extra-Lites."

Larry, if you really care about Amateur Radio, the best thing you could do to improve it is tear up your license and take up some other hobby. Your kind are nothing but a detriment.

Does that "LT" in your callsign stand for "lite"? Just wondering.

--
Bill, W7TI

2675. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-22 16:02:49 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030222110249.05048.00000758@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 61809

In article <Pine.LNX.4.52.0302220504460.149@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>, "D. Stussy"
<kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> writes:

>On Sat, 22 Feb 2003, N2EY wrote:
>>In article <3E554544.78559BF9@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
>><wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
>>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>>> The funniest part is that the mere possession of an Advanced simply
>>>> proves the holder passed 5 wpm and the old writtens.
>>
>>>Thought it was 13 wpm.
>>
>>Medical waivers came about in 1990. The mere possession of an Advanced
>>doesn't
>>prove that the holder passed 13 wpm - you need more info.
>
>But as I said, we know who has the waivers and who doesn't - because there is
>a field in the FCC data that addresses whether or not one was issued.

Of course - but that requires additional information beyond "mere possession of
an Advanced". If we need additional info, then there's no reason to keep the
Advanced itself as proof of anything. Could just as easily look at the
"previous license class" field, or a pre-1990 license or Callbook page.

Or there's the ultimate test: show what skills and knowledge the ham has now.
There are probably hams who once-upon-a-time passed 20 wpm who would have a
hard time with 10 wpm today. And others who barely passed 5 wpm in the recent
past but who today cruise along at 40 per or better. Similar stuff with the
writtens.
>
>>>> There may also be some sour grapes because the restructuring doesn't
>>>> give Advanceds any more credit towards Extra than a General.
>>>
>>>Well, they could have taken the old extra test up to a year before April
>>>15, 2000 and cashed the CSCE in on April 15, 2000 and have an extra.
>>
>>Yup. But the window of opportunity was much smaller - about 3.5 months (the
>>time between the R&O announcement and April 15).
>
>Not necessarily. There may have been certain individuals who were working on
>the code element and already had the written element credit in hand when the
>ruling came out (though very few - doubtful if over 100).

Doesn't really matter unless the "new" Extra written was significantly more difficult than the "old" one.

>>>I did something similar: Had the old style tech (general written and
>5wpm).
>>>Took the advanced and the extra writtens in Jan 2000. Got the CSCEs
>>>and cashed them in on April 15, 2000 at a special VE event set up for
>>>this purpose. And got the extra ticket a week later in the mail (The VEs
>>>were quick to submit the paperwork, obviously).
>>
>>Lots of those "paperwork-only" VE sessions in April 2000 - a very good idea.
>>Fortunately your VEs were quick to submit, and missed the big backlog.

In case I forgot to mention it at the time: Congrats on your upgrade! Hope you are enjoying the new privileges.

>I know of some April 15, 2000 sessions that didn't get processed until mid
>June
>2000. It all depends on how each VEC stacked their piles of unprocessed
>work.

Yup - and how quickly they were able to send it in.
>
>>>Well, the above advanceds missed the boat.
>>>
>>All depends on whether you consider the new 50 question Extra (Element 4) to
>>be
>>"harder" than than the old 40 question Extra (old Element 4B).
>>
>>Of course one of the biggest unknowns in amateur radio demographics is just
>>how
>>many ACTIVE hams there are. With 10 year license terms, a ham who loses
>>interest or dies can still show up on the database for years unless someone
>>takes action to cancel the license.
>
>Then we shall see as they fail to renew....
>
AH0A lists expirations, renewals and grace-period renewals separately on his website. Some interesting trends - worth a look.

My money says if the FCC doesn't simply wipe out the license classes, the last Novice will disappear from the database before the last Advanced does.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2676. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-22 16:16:32 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <AnN5a.5367$hj.1361944@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 61810

"Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now> wrote in message
news:Xns932A4AFE5E716pookster@216.168.3.50...
> yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in
> news:20030221223816.03943.00000905@mb-fj.aol.com:
>
> > Post-Restructuring Extras ARE "dumbed-down Extra-Lites."
>
> ----------
>
> Larry, if you really care about Amateur Radio, the best thing you could do
> to improve it is tear up your license and take up some other hobby. Your
> kind are nothing but a detriment.
>
> Does that "LT" in your callsign stand for "lite"? Just wondering.
>
> --
> Bill, W7TI

Bill,

I agree with your analysis of how Larry could best improve ham radio.
His tirades against "lesser life forms" as he seems to view them are
certainly not the sort of "welcome wagon" to newcomers that makes
a good first impression ...

I would submit a couple of alternatives for Larry's "LT". How about:

Lacking Tolerance
Less Technical
Lid/Tyrant

I'm sure that others can think of other possibilities that also fit ...

Carl - wk3c

BTW ... my call was selected as "all American" with both W and K
in the prefix and C for the initial of my first name.

2677. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-22 16:32:42 UTC
From: "Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now>
Message-ID: <Xns932A56ECC1CE0pookster@216.168.3.50>
Source record: 61811

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in news:AnN5a.5367$hj.1361944
@nnrp1.ptd.net:

> His tirades against "lesser life forms" as he seems to view them are
> certainly not the sort of "welcome wagon" to newcomers that makes
> a good first impression ...
>

He must be one sick puppy. Anyone with that great a need to put others
down has some serious problems with self-esteem.

--
Bill, W7TI

2678. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-22 17:03:34 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <1A67CAEC81C97B51.F4548C5CCCA3BD86.8FEF59295FCCCF28@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 61813

"Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now> wrote in message
news:Xns932A56ECC1CE0pookster@216.168.3.50...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in news:AnN5a.5367$hj.1361944
> @nnrp1.ptd.net:
>
> > His tirades against "lesser life forms" as he seems to view them are
> > certainly not the sort of "welcome wagon" to newcomers that makes
> > a good first impression ...
> >
>
> ----------
>
> He must be one sick puppy. Anyone with that great a need to put others
> down has some serious problems with self-esteem.
>
> --
> Bill, W7TI

Ya got that one right on the nailhead...

Kim W5TIT

2679. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-22 17:06:24 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030222120624.12173.00000651@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 61812

In article <3E56C140.56F3591B@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>It matters! If you don't have yours, I have two. I'll send you one.

Thanks, but lemme see if I can find mine first.
>
>> > I made one from the very same book and later
>> > modified it with a store-bought diode. Until our local station went on
>> > the air, all I heard was WOWO in Fort Wayne, a pretty good haul from
>> > southern West Virginia.
>>
>> Fort Wayne Indiana?
>
>Yep. You'd think with the Charleston, Oak Hill, Beckley and Huntington
>stations in the "local" area, I'd have heard one of them. Instead, I
>heard Fort Wayne, Indiana--even in the daytime. That all changed after
>WMTD fired up right in town but it was a 1,000 watt daytimer so WOWO
>took over at night.

Oughta figure out the air-line distance...

>> > There was a kid in our town who had a shortwave receiver and a pair of
>> > Part 15 walkie-talkies. By the time I met him, I was studying to become
>> > a ham. Talking to a kid a couple of blocks away on a walkie-talkie
>> > didn't hold much fascination. Maybe that's why I don't spend much time
>> > on two meter repeaters to this day.
>> >
>> I knew kids who had those things. Good for maybe a 1000 feet with a
>> new battery. My little one-tuber would do thousands of times that
>> distance reliably.
>
>...and you didn't have to talk to the same kid over and over and over.
>After a week or so, we'd run out of things to say.

Never happened on 80 CW...
>
>> > > Passed the Novice test in the early summer of 1967 at the ripe old age
>> > > of 13 and built a 10 watt transmitter from other NRI parts. The old TV
>> > > set provided the power supply. Only part I had to buy for the
>> > > transmitter was the xtal. Tuned it up with a dial lamp in the antenna
>> > > lead as RF indicator, plus the plate milliameter. Not a rock crusher
>> > > but had a lot of fun. By that time the antenna had been upgraded to
>> > > use "real antenna wire", those same glass insulators and went from the
>> > > attic window to much higher up in the crab apple tree.
>> > >

>> > > Total cost - maybe $14 for everything...You wanna talk about doing
>> > > radio on a shoestring budget, you came to the right place!
>> >
>> > My gear was store bought and used. Both the receiver and transmitter
>> > came from Allied's used equipment list. My deal with my dad was that
>> > I'd save the money for the receiver from my paper route and he and Mom
>> > would get me that transmitter for Christmas. I bought a Knight R-100
>> > general coverage receiver and Pop ordered me a Knight T-60 transmitter a
>> > couple of weeks later.
>>
>> If I'd had parnets like that I'd have been licensed years earlier. How
>> old were ya when the Novice license arrived? For me it was October 14,
>> 1967.
>
>Fourteen. The license was dated November 22, 1963.

Famous date.

>I turned fifteen
>three months later. That was the beginning of my sophomore year of high
>school.

Shoot, you wuz old! I turned 13 in April of '67 and it took three months to go through the exam process (pass the code, wait 6-8 weeks for the written to show up at the volunteer examiner's house, pass the written, wait 6-8 weeks for the license to show up). And ya didn't know if ya failed the written until the FCC letter arrived.

>Selling my dad wasn't easy. I was told that both ham radio and playing
>the guitar were "kicks" and that all that stuff would be cluttering up a
>closet after I'd lost interest.

Different era. Today a lot of parents would be glad for something that would keep a kid interested for a while.

>I ask him periodically if he thinks
>I'll ever get tired of either one. He's now 78 and I'm pushing 54
>really hard.

HAW! Sweet, really sweet.

>> > Oddly enough, when the new UPS delivery service
>> > driver brought the parcel from Allied, there was a Heath DX-40 inside.
>> > A note explained that they'd sold the T-60 and hoped that the DX-40
>> > would be a suitable substitute.
>> >
>> > Every tube in the DX-40 was broken in shipping but a trip to K8CFT's TV
>> > service shop yielded replacements (at no charge). A few days after I'd
>> > begun using the DX-40, another parcel from Allied arrived at our door.
>> > Inside was a Knight T-60. Allied had fouled up. My dad suggested that
>> > I try the T-60 and decide which one I wanted to keep. The DX-40 won,
>> > hands down.
>>

>> No surprise, the guy who bought the T-60 must sent it back!
>
>...and after comparing the insides of both, I could see why he would do
>so. The T-60 was chintzy looking.

Some of those old Novice rigs were not well designed, while others were amazingly good. Cost was not always a good indicator, either.

One thing those kits did was eliminate the financial advantages of homebrewing with new parts. Unless you could get some of the expensive components from sources other than Allied, Newark, or the local radio emporium, it was cheaper to buy a kit. Lookit the DX-20: $36 as a new kit. You'd spend that much for the power supply parts and chassis/cabint/hardware from Allied.
>
>> I remember the Allied catalog and the T-60, T-150, R-55 and R-100. All
>> were way beyond my means, as were the coveted HR-10/DX-60 twins or the
>> 2-C/2-NT favored by the ver rich. Turns out that was a good thing,
>> because except for the Drake those rx's were terrible.
>
>One of my pals locally had the Lafayette HE-30. It had better
>bandspread tuning than my R-100 but the R-100's product detector and
>Q-Multiplier could be used simultaneously. The biggest R-100 handicap
>was the tuning rate.

I learned that one real early.

>I wish I'd known enough to get a ham bands only
>receiver. That would come later in the form of a Mosley CM-1, xtal
>controlled front end, no RF stage (antenna to first mixer) and only five
>tubes, all of them 6AW8A's.

Neat little rx, no selectivity but otherwise not bad. With a QF-1, almost a poor man's 2-B.

Best simple rx lashup for the effort and $$ from those days: BC-453 Command set preceded by homebrew xtal controlled converter. Discovered that idea about 1970, sold my SX-99 soon after. Surplus xtals permit covering 80 and 40, '453 has excellent stability, tuning rate and dial. My first converter was built on the chassis from an old AA5 BC rx - 12BA6 RF amp, 12BE6 mixer, 12AV6 xtal osc in the Pierce circuit. Tuned circuits were BC caps and coils wound on plastic pill bottles. No dipper - got really good at calculating coil dimensions and turns by pencil and paper. Only thing I had to buy were the '453 itself and the xtals.

Still have one of those lashups.
>
>> oh mama! I learned to climb the gingkos that surrounded the property
>> and put all sorts of wires aloft in the following years.
>
>I'd pay someone before I'd climb a male gingko during the fruit-bearing
>season.
>Nothing stinks quite like Gingko fruit.

Antenna work was coordinated with the season...
>
>> First non-homebrew ham gear I had was an AR-2/QF-1 combo ($20) and a
>> DX-20 (also $20, thank you W2FNT). Somewhere in there was a VF-1,
>> SX-99, Viking Adventurer, various Command sets, and of course serious
>> homebrewing.
>
>
>I had a DX-20 later while living in Miami. I still remember that iron
>vane meter clunking against the peg.

Adventurer was the same way.
>
>> > > Now here's the part that relates to the subject line:
>> > >
>> > > All through this time, I was working with high voltages and dangerous
>> > > tools like soldering irons and razor blades. (Still have some of the
>> > > scars...;-))
>> >
>> > There's nothing like having molten solder drip on your leg while you're
>> > wearing a pair of shorts! My scar is from an Exacto knife to the right
>> > thumb. A drunken doctor, on call at the local hospital, broke a needle
>> > off in the thumb before managing a few stitches.
>>
>> AAARRRRGGGHHHH!!
>>
>> I never had any injuries that required medical attention. Luckily.
>
>I'd at least hoped for a bullet to bite on. I received no local
>anesthesia. I hurt myself with the knife less than the pain from
>getting sewn up.

We Catholic kids were told to "offer it up".

>> > > But some folks would have denied us our licenses based on age alone.
>> > > Odd, really odd.
>> >
>> > It makes perfect sense if you're a fellow with half a century of
>> > PROFESSIONAL experience and you're embarrassed to be shown up by a bunch
>> > of telegraph key wielding CHILDREN!
>>
>> HAW!!!
>>
>> But it's been possible to get a ham license in the USA for over a
>> dozen years now with no code test at all.
>
>That just doesn't cut it if you have your heart set on HF ham radio and
>you are faced with the enormous wall which a five word per minute morse
>exam presents.

Maybe, to folks like that, ham radio really IS all about working...you know the
rest.

Just remember:

"His hobby is wasting time. Your time"

73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

2680. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-22 17:37:41 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E57B565.5010203@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 61816

```
Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> "Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now> wrote in message
> news:Xns932A4AFE5E716pookster@216.168.3.50...
>
>>yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in
>>news:20030221223816.03943.00000905@mb-fj.aol.com:
>>
>>
>>>Post-Restructuring Extras ARE "dumbed-down Extra-Lites."
>>
>>_____________________________________________________________
>>
>>Larry, if you really care about Amateur Radio, the best thing you could do
>>to improve it is tear up your license and take up some other hobby. Your
>>kind are nothing but a detriment.
>>
>>Does that "LT" in your callsign stand for "lite"? Just wondering.
>>
>>--
>>Bill, W7TI
>
>
> Bill,
>
> I agree with your analysis of how Larry could best improve ham radio.
> His tirades against "lesser life forms" as he seems to view them are
> certainly not the sort of "welcome wagon" to newcomers that makes
> a good first impression ...
>
> I would submit a couple of alternatives for Larry's "LT". How about:
>
> Lacking Tolerance
> Less Technical
> Lid/Tyrant
>
> I'm sure that others can think of other possibilities that also fit ...
>
> Carl - wk3c

What he said.
```

2681. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-22 17:42:57 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030222124257.00299.00000119@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 61814

>I'm sure that others can think of other possibilities that also fit ...
>
>Carl - wk3c

Probably the best would be "KARL" a sure sign of Ignorance.

>BTW ... my call was selected as "all American" with both W and K
>in the prefix and C for the initial of my first name.
>

I thought the "C" was for CBer

2682. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-22 17:44:35 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E57B711.7060702@adelphia.net>
Source record: 61815

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> In article <3E54F40C.5090903@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
>
>>
>> <A whole bunch of other stuff snipped>
>>
>> heh heh, Larry, you're bad! Good post.
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>
> Mike:
>
> As I've told everyone in here numerous times, I post here for three reasons --
> to entertain and enlighten my readers, and to amuse myself. Some posts, such
> as the one in question, are quite sincere and accurately reflect my own
> thoughts and feelings without the least bit of ironic twist.
> Post-Restructuring Extras ARE "dumbed-down Extra-Lites." We DID, in fact, go
> from a more challenging and comprehensive license testing system to one which
> is significantly simpler to prepare for and achieve a passing grade. It also
> de-emphasizes one of our most important communications skills, and, in fact...

<more snippage>

Okay Larry.

If you were sincere, allow me to note what I think.

Aside from my physical problems that interfered somewhat with my Morse code takeup, the tests weren't that hard. Unless the earlier tests were many orders of magnitude harder, I'm still not impressed with how hard they were.

They were and always have been entry level tests, and to guage superiority by comparing one to the other is amusing. The tests are first grade stuff. If you want to fell superior to others based on what you did in first grade, well then go ahead.

I'll judge hams on what they did afterwards.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2683. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-22 19:06:33 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030222140633.12173.00000653@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 61817

In article <3E558636.5060809@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

>>> And I know of a few who don't upgrade because they want people to know
>>>that they passed the "tougher" test.
>>>
>>
>> Tougher test? "Lite" license? Big deal. Kinda like saying "I paid $500
>> for this VCR 20 years ago, so it's gotta be 'better' than the one you
>> just got for $100".
>
>
> Oh, for sure. (whispering) I really think its cuz their just getting
>cranky! (back to normal) Nice guys all, but they have this thing yaknow?

I prefer to think they are simply "not serious". Just like ol' Cecil, who swore
he'd never get an Extra...

>> The important thing is what the licensee does after the license is
>> earned.

> Absolutely. I'm having a ball learning more stuff.

Me too, even after 35+ years (32 of 'em as an Extra).

>> The funniest part is that the mere possession of an Advanced simply
>> proves the holder passed 5 wpm and the old writtens.

> Heh, not to hear them talk!

But it's true. Medical waivers and all that. Like I wrote, big deal,. Kinda
like saying "I paid $500 for this VCR 20 years ago, so it's gotta be 'better'
than the one you just got for $100".

>> There may also be some sour grapes because the restructuring doesn't
>> give Advanceds any more credit towards Extra than a General.

> Bingo! As we can see here in the group, there are still hams who are
>p****d off about that.

There are still folks p****d off about the incentive licensing changes of 35
years ago. There was even a proposal sent to the FCC to grandfather all hams
who held General, Conditional or Advanced back then to Extra. Good heavens...
>
>> Plus the leg-pulling factor.

> Well, they seemed pretty serious, and the joke is on them in hte end.

The best leg-pullers seem to be pretty serious. But after a while it's clear they're just trying to get people cranked up. Ask Len or Larry ;-)
>
>>>Go figure.

> Yeah.
>
I wonder how many Advanceds are still around today who got theirs back in "Class A" days, and saw the license class renamed, closed to new issues, reopened, and now reclosed. A 14 year old 1951 Class A would only be 66 today.....

73 de Jim, N2EY

2684. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-22 19:06:33 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030222140633.12173.00000652@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 61818

In article <20030222011809.26320.00000031@mb-fx.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>>> > Tsk, tsk, tsk, it's a mystery to me why someone who is an
>>> > amateur will hide his profession. :-)
>>
>>Who does that? Can't be me. My profession has been reported here
>>several times. Here it is again:
>>
>>I'm an electrical engineer. I've been employed full time in design
>>(and a few other EE-related activities) since graduation from college.
>
> In what field of electricity or electronics? Table lamp design?
> Spaceship control systems? Miniature R/C cars? Power
> transmission? Industrial control electric things? $3.50 AC
> outlet strips with built-in surge protectors?

You don't need to know, Len. Electrical engineering is my profession, and it's
not hidden, so you could not have been talking about me anyway.
>
> No company mentioned (for various fearfull reasons),

"Fearfull"? Of what? Certainly not you, Len. I don;t even take you seriously,
let alone fear you or any thing you could do.

> no field
> within electricity or electronics mentioned, yet Mr. N2EY
> gave talks to industry according to himself and his bosom
> buddy Kellie.

"Talks"? Where do you get such ideas, Len?

> Excuse me, Mr. Kellie. Talks about what?

You don't need to know, Len.

>>> > Must be some schizoid fantasy thing going around... :-)
>>
>>lessee...who needs multiple screen names?
>
> Why does AOL make them available? :-)

So that different family members can use the same account yet retain different
email accounts and online identities. For some reason, you need multiple
identities to deal with ham radio. Could the reason be that you are afraid of
something? Sure seems like it.
>

> Poor baby.

Hmmm... I get called 'baby', 'boy', and 'old fart'......Ageist,
racist..........

> My full USPS mailing address was in every byline
> in Ham Radio magazine. Same in BYTE.

Both of which are now defunct, are they not? If not, where can I buy the March,
2003 issue of Ham Radio fanzine?

> No problem for me,
> no fear.
>
My full name and address in every US Callbook and CD-ROM since 1968, and are on
the FCC database. Did you have trouble accessing the database to find my name?
>
>>Len is very civil - until somebody disagrees with him.

His hobby is wasting time....

Jim, N2EY

2685. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-22 21:14:54 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E57E82F.2EE444A5@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61819

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E553338.C2DE600C@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >It makes perfect sense if you're a fellow with half a century of
> >PROFESSIONAL experience and you're embarrassed to be shown up by a bunch
> >of telegraph key wielding CHILDREN!
>
> Poor baby. Way back in time he got his snow job melted...all
> about using CW as an order-wire for an RTTY circuit in some
> small embassy (?) in the middle of Africa in the 1980s.

You mean the order wire circuit which you claimed on numerous occasions
that I had originated--the one I corrected about repeatedly? That claim
of yours was pasted by a repost from the Google archives. Watch out for
those six-year-olds waving the straight keys around. You could get
hurt.

> I'll rank his radio expertise with those "seven hostile action"
> heroes.

What do you know about my radio expertise? How does it relate to your
position on a minimum age for radio amateurs?

> Forget sending those cashews. You're nuts.

I never planned to send you any cashews and never stated that I would do
so.
Which one of us is nuts?

Dave K8MN

2686. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-22 21:29:00 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E57EB7C.A0596401@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61820

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E565A51.B1C29552@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
>
> > > Yet its Jim's radio. You're the one who cannot keep things straight.
> > > Don't sit up all night tuning the 160M band endlessly trying to snag a
> > > new one, then try to be coherent in replies. Doesn't work.
> >
> > I understand that ",Brian" gave you a problem.
>
> Brian only gives you problems.

Zat so? When did your stupidity or your playing dumb become my problem?
You alone have to take the responsibility for what you write.

> > > > > So now unplugged cans makes it more enjoyable? Dave, give him the
> > > > > message yourself.
> > > >
> > > > I thought maybe you were up to the task. I was wrong.
> > >
> > > Dave was wrong. Probably first time ever. Welp, at least we have it
> > > in writing.
> >
> > I've been wrong about your ability to comprehend before.
>
> Dave admits he was wrong again.

> > > I was not home when replying. Jump, jump, jump.
> >
> > Oh. Correct my statement to read: "We're not all gathered whereever it
> > is that you are". You can explain your second sentence, the incomplete
> > one, later if you have any interest in anyone being able to understand
> > it.
>
> You're supposed to be a bright boy.

It is tough to fill in the blanks on a supposed sentence which contains
only the same three words. Those three repeated words of yours have
about the same meaning as "Tree, tree, tree" or "Lift, lift, lift". If
you can't complete an idea, don't expect others to do it for you.

> > > Why would I turn on Jim's radio? You're still confused, aren't you?
> >
> > Phil may be on to something. Stupid seems to be your default mode. Ed

> > Hare lost interest in the group when you ran extended versions of your
> > nonsense replies.
>
> That's really too bad. Law of unintended consequences. I liked Ed.

It wasn't apparent.

> On the other hand, how many other people have been run off this group?
> I don't see any litttle violins playing for them.

I don't know of anyone who has been "run off this group". Ed left of
his own volition. His tolerance for crap had been exceeded.

Dave K8MN

2687. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-22 23:06:15 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030222180615.23598.00000437@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 61821

In article <1A67CAEC81C97B51.F4548C5CCCA3BD86.8FEF59295FCCCF28@lp.airnews.net>,
"<seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>> He must be one sick puppy. Anyone with that great a need to put others
>> down has some serious problems with self-esteem.
>>
>> --
>> Bill, W7TI
>
>Ya got that one right on the nailhead...
>
Sounds like you're describing someone who, when faced with strong opposition to
their rigid opinion, resorts to insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual
errors, ethnic/racial slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile
behavior.

Fortunately, folks like that are relatively few on rrap. Many of us have
learned not to take them seriously.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2688. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-23 00:21:19 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302221621.36022fd7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61822

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.haotvo3.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> On 20 Feb 2003 20:02:22 -0800, Brian wrote:
>
> >Phil, I just didn't want you running off to Spain for something that's
> >a domestic matter. ;))
> >
> >Anyway, what did you find out?
>
> I found out that you don't know what an EA is (it's NOT a
> Spanish radio amateur in this context). Ask your CPA to define
> it for you.

You're "smiley challenged."

2689. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-23 00:23:45 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302221623.21c78fdd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61823

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message news:<20030222140633.12173.00000653@mb-mr.aol.com>...

>
> I prefer to think they are simply "not serious". Just like ol' Cecil, who swore
> he'd never get an Extra...

First you'se guys incessantly "encourage" lower class hams to upgrade,
then complain when they do.

2690. Re: David Colostomy jams 14.275

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-23 00:30:05 UTC
From: Moana Liza <RKBA@Anon.com>
Message-ID: <b394mdbir0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 61824
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Edward Norton" <haaaynorton@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030222160214.27882.00000063@mb-ff.aol.com...
> << Subject: David Colostomy jams 14.275
> From: "Lloyd, N0VFP" brother_lloyd_99@yahoo.com
> Date: Sat, Feb 22, 2003 2:30 PM
> Message-id: <3e57da52$1_2@corp-goliath.newsgroups.com>
>
> When will he ever learn? Maybe never! I have you recorded! Just goto
back
> 14.313!
>

Poor little Evie...got his shorts all atwitter because those big, mean,
nasty Hams wouldn't let him have the frequency, and this after HE broke in
on THEM! So what does he do? Well, the next logical thing, to him, is if
they won't let him have the frequency he will just jam everybody. That way,
you see, if he can't use it, they can't use it either.
What a twit.

2691. Re: County Issuing Radio Licenses

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-23 00:58:55 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302221658.49d90b39@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61825
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.shortwave

"Stan" <k6rmr@dslextreme.com> wrote in message news:<v5droe6ns6el5f@corp.supernews.com>...
> In 1934 The Congress of the United States gave
> sole Authority to control and license all radio Transmissions
> in the Country to the FCC.
> Stan

Cept military.

2692. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-23 01:20:53 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.haqdpk0.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 61826

On 22 Feb 2003 16:21:19 -0800, Brian wrote:

>> I found out that you don't know what an EA is (it's NOT a
>> Spanish radio amateur in this context). Ask your CPA to define
>> it for you.
>
>You're "smiley challenged."

There are smileys and there are smileys. The trick is to know when
to NOT use one.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2693. Where's Libby Net tonite?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-23 02:57:55 UTC
From: 75 meter shi+s <hamradiofun@aol.com>
Message-ID: <3e5838b9@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 61827
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

So... what freq is the lib net
gonna be on tonite, and more
importantly, is that pothead puke
and his midwest 9-land screwball pal gonna
qrm them like dey did 14.275 all day 2-day ?

While ur lookin for em on the dial, check
this site out for some nifty toons!

http://www.happytreefriends.com/index.html

2694. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-23 02:59:31 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0302221859.3fa300c9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61828

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message news:<20030222140633.12173.00000652@mb-mr.aol.com>...

>
> > no field
> > within electricity or electronics mentioned, yet Mr. N2EY
> > gave talks to industry according to himself and his bosom
> > buddy Kellie.

Pssst, hey Putz, here's a hint: Jim recently implemented Spread
Spectrum comms on at least one of the recent projects he's managed.
When was the last time YOU implemented any kind of radio comms?

> My full name and address in every US Callbook and CD-ROM since 1968, and are on
> the FCC database. Did you have trouble accessing the database to find my name?

Ummm . . In what current radio publication and/or
industrial/military/hobby radio organization website is there even a
mention of the Putz?

> His hobby is wasting time....

That's all he has left.

> Jim, N2EY

w3rv

2695. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-23 03:11:30 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0302221911.70355fdc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61829

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030219203800.10560.00000013@mb-ma.aol.com>...
> In article <20030219061144.25651.00000506@mb-fm.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
> Robeson K4YZ) writes:
>
> >>Subject: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran
> >>From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart)
> >>Date: 2/18/03 10:35 PM Central Standard Time
> >>Message-id: <5f4fe4c2.0302182035.417a07ff@posting.google.com>
>
> >>Just as the "fight" between the North and the South, to see who would
> >>"win the battle" of becoming the last living Civil War Veteran, became
> >>a national obsession in the last century... could the ongoing battle
> >>between Advanced and Novices to see who will be the last surviving
> >>member of those two classes breath exciting new life into the hobby?
> >
> > Would it be too much to ask "who cares" and what relevence it has to ANY
> >thing?
>
> Yeah!! No relevance!!! Just like CAP, TN SG, and seven hostile
> actions!!!

Includes the complete irrelevance attached to posting experience in
baby-sitting Army RTTY repeaters over a half century ago as some kinda
"credentials". Except more so.

w3rv

2696. Re: County Issuing Radio Licenses

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-23 03:30:13 UTC
From: Stan <k6rmr@dslextreme.com>
Message-ID: <v5droe6ns6el5f@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 61691
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.shortwave

In 1934 The Congress of the United States gave
sole Authority to control and license all radio Transmissions
in the Country to the FCC.
Stan
"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:atr624$pj2$0@208.206.142.95...
>
>
> Brian Running wrote:
>
> > > It'll never fly. The answerer was just another bureaucrat who really
> > didn't
> > > know what it was they were putting out.
> > > Federal courts long ago ruled that since radio has the capacity to
cross
> > state
> > > lines with no regard for jurisdictions it will be regulated on the
Federal
> > > level. A single letter from any functionary won't change that.
> > > Somewhere along the way someone heavy from DC will get wind of it all
and
> > will
> > > grab them and straghten them out.
> >
> > But you know, Dick, it's absolutely true that 47 USC 152 says that the
FCC
> > has no jurisdiction over intrastate radio transmissions.
Notwithstanding
> > any court decisions, if your transmissions do not cross state lines,
then
> > the FCC can't regulate you. Of course, this is a problem of proof, but
the
> > burden is on the FCC to prove their jurisdiction, not the other way
around.
> > Telephones are instruments of interstate commerce, even if you only call
> > across town, but telephones are all interconnected, worldwide. Radios
> > aren't. Looks like a little recreational legal research project comin'
up.
>
> So how do you propose to prevent any radio wave from crossing state
lines?
> Even UHF/SHF will do it. There is nothing magic in a state line, they're
only

> visible when deliberately marked by some human.
>
> It's a smoke screen. Nothing has changed. If it has, then GMRS away from
a
> state line doesn't require a license, as does not a UHF TV broadcast
station in
> the center of a state. But occasional propagation vagaries make it just
possible
> for even that RF to cross state lines, thus the court ruling. NOTHING has
> changed, but I imagine Phil Kane might be in better position to comment.
>
> Dick
>

2697. Re: Where's Libby Net tonite?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-23 03:48:12 UTC
From: 75 meter shi+s <hamradiofun@aol.com>
Message-ID: <3e5844d2@snipnews.snip.net>
Source record: 61830
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"75 meter shi+s" <hamradiofun@aol.com> wrote in message
news:3e5838b9@snipnews.snip.net...
> So... what freq is the lib net
> gonna be on tonite

3.947.4

Some blowhard is on there now saying that
there are "foreign Norwegian UN troops" in
the southwest USA or something.

The strange thing about this is I thought that on the
LN, they'all liked those blond haired-blue eyed
aryan type Norwegians! Why they bellyachin
about this? Would they rather have a chevy
van full or 30 mexicans in UN blues instead?

Same shit different weekend on 3.947.4 - OyVey!

> While ur lookin for em on the dial, check
> this site out for some nifty toons!
>
> http://www.happytreefriends.com/index.html

VERY funny! Thanks for this URL - it's bookmarked.

2698. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-23 04:52:40 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030222235240.09921.00002313@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 61833

In article <Xns932A4AFE5E716pookster@216.168.3.50>, "Bill, W7TI"
<jamspam@upyours.now> writes:

>Larry, if you really care about Amateur Radio, the best thing you could do
>to improve it is tear up your license and take up some other hobby. Your
>kind are nothing but a detriment.
>
>Does that "LT" in your callsign stand for "lite"? Just wondering.
>
>--
>Bill, W7TI

Bill:

You see, right there is the difference between me and the liberal, whining Extra Lites. I'm not asking any of the Extra Lites to tear up their tickets and push off -- in fact, I am perfectly willing to "tolerate" their presence in ham radio. However, the Extra Lites and their apologists surely don't show any willingness to "tolerate" my opinions. I guess, as it usually is with liberals, it's a one-way street.

Definition of a Liberal: Someone who can tolerate anything except a difference of opinion. -- Rush Limbaugh

73 de Larry, K3LT

2699. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-23 04:52:41 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030222235241.09921.00002314@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 61834

In article <AnN5a.5367$hj.1361944@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>> Larry, if you really care about Amateur Radio, the best thing you could do
>> to improve it is tear up your license and take up some other hobby. Your
>> kind are nothing but a detriment.
>>
>> Does that "LT" in your callsign stand for "lite"? Just wondering.
>> --
>> Bill, W7TI
>
>Bill,
>
>I agree with your analysis of how Larry could best improve ham radio.
>His tirades against "lesser life forms" as he seems to view them are
>certainly not the sort of "welcome wagon" to newcomers that makes
>a good first impression ...

Carl:

It is not my need or desire to be a "welcome wagon" to ham radio's dumbed-
down, Welfare State "newcomers." If they get a ticket and get on the air,
fine -- they have a legal right to do so and I'm not here to stop them. Nobody
fell over backwards when I walked into my first radio club meeting with my
fresh new Novice ticket, and I had to show the initiative, motivation, and
persistence needed to gain acceptance on my own terms. Today's ham
radio "newcomers" want, and largely get, the Red Carpet Treatment, then
go on to spend the rest of their ham radio careers kerchunking away. Try
to get them involved in anything challenging from a technical or operational
standpoint, and they suddenly become wrapped up in family commitments,
or simply couldn't be bothered. It's been the same everywhere I've gone,
and I've been in a lot of places.

>I would submit a couple of alternatives for Larry's "LT". How about:
>
>Lacking Tolerance

I'll definitely admit to that one. Just exactly what is it I'm supposed to be
"tolerating" anyway? Ignorance? Laziness? Perfected whining technique?

73 de Larry, K3LT

2700. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-23 04:52:42 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030222235242.09921.00002316@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 61831

In article <f45722ac.0302221624.4537433a@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> > I would submit a couple of alternatives for Larry's "LT". How about:
>> >
>> > Lacking Tolerance
>> > Less Technical
>> > Lid/Tyrant
>> >
>> > I'm sure that others can think of other possibilities that also fit ...
>> >
>> > Carl - wk3c
>>
>> What he said.
>
>Less Than

Actually, it stands for "Lotsa Talent."

73 de Larry, K3LT

2701. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-23 04:52:42 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030222235242.09921.00002315@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 61835

In article <3E57B711.7060702@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

>
> <more snippage>
>
> Okay Larry.
>
> If you were sincere, allow me to note what I think.
>
> Aside from my physical problems that interfered somewhat with my Morse
>code takeup, the tests weren't that hard. Unless the earlier tests were
>many orders of magnitude harder, I'm still not impressed with how hard
>they were.
>
> They were and always have been entry level tests, and to guage
>superiority by comparing one to the other is amusing. The tests are
>first grade stuff. If you want to fell superior to others based on what
>you did in first grade, well then go ahead.
>
> I'll judge hams on what they did afterwards.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Mike:

In a way, you helped me make my point. The Pre-Restructuring license
tests WERE "first-grade" stuff compared to what an experienced radio
amateur should know after even a few years of operating time. The problem
that I'm addressing is the fact that a lot of prospective Entry-Level hams
have been whining about the licensing requirements, particularly code
testing, in spite of the fact that compared to the knowledge required
of professional electronic communicators, they ARE quite basic. Anyone
with a rudimentary understanding of electronics could most likely get
a passing score on the "theory" simply by applying common sense.

I'm not really one tiny bit concerned about my "superiority" over any other
ham at any level. However, I and many others in this newsgroup have
had to endure over a decade of whining and complaining by people who
want full amateur privileges but are totally disinterested in learning and
developing simple, practical communications skills. Therefore, the
Extra Lites have to prove themselves to ME. Nobody else seems to
want to "judge" them, for the sake of political correctness, but I'm up to
the task!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2702. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-23 04:52:43 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030222235243.09921.00002317@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 61832

In article <A38FDA96D1C6D017.A2E05248B85E39D4.21BD9B99B52FEC82@lp.airnews.net>,
"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>> Kim:
>>
>> I was quite distressed to learn of your recent illness. My most fervent
>> hopes for your full and speedy recovery!
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>My recent illness hasn't changed my attitude one bit about how hateful I
>believe you are. Your sincerity is truly doubted.
>
>Kim W5TIT

How charming. I hope this is some indication that you are feeling better.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2703. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-23 05:04:25 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E585659.6010406@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 61837

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> Try
> to get them involved in anything challenging from a technical or operational
> standpoint, and they suddenly become wrapped up in family commitments,
> or simply couldn't be bothered. It's been the same everywhere I've gone,
> and I've been in a lot of places.

That is because, unlike you, most hams consider ham radio for what
it is, a hobby, and have a life that isn't completely consumed by
ham radio and don't get hung up on some status thing about how the
testing was when they got their license.

>
>>I would submit a couple of alternatives for Larry's "LT". How about:
>>
>>Lacking Tolerance

Or maybe "Little Turd"

2704. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-23 05:10:41 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E5857D1.9090608@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 61838

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>
> I'm not really one tiny bit concerned about my "superiority" over any other
> ham at any level. However, I and many others in this newsgroup have
> had to endure over a decade of whining and complaining by people who
> want full amateur privileges but are totally disinterested in learning and
> developing simple, practical communications skills.

Aw, poor thing having to put up with all that whining. You know
Larry, a newsgroup is sorta like a radio, if you don't like what
you hear change the frequency or turn it off. If you don't like
what you read in a newsgroup then find another group.

> Therefore, the
> Extra Lites have to prove themselves to ME.

No experienced ham, new ham, or prospective ham has to prove
ANYTHING to you, they don't even owe you the time of day.

2705. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-23 05:47:11 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E58605C.41600DD8@att.net>
Source record: 61836

Mike Coslo wrote....

>
> >
> > They were and always have been entry level tests

'Taint so, Mike. Disturbs me a bit each time I hear that mantra regurgitated here. In fact the FCC examiner who administered my Extra told me at that time that the Extra written was generally acknowledged to be a tougher test than the First Phone - which I already had passed several years previously. And that examiner was the FCC's District Engineer for the Kansas City district. (Before some wag signs in insisting that District Engineers don't lower themselves to administering tests - that one did. He made a point of it. He was an Extra class ham himself and an EE to boot).

> The tests are
> >first grade stuff

I don't see any way that anyone could have ever made such a statement concerning the Extra class written I took in '69. There was a whole lot of quite advanced and involved radio theory that demanded considerable comprehensive learning of complex material. Definitely way beyond entry level. That you say it today seems to me to validate what Larry has to say on the subject- the tests truly ARE reduced severely in content and quality.

Seems worth saying one more time- If the Extra class is not going to mean anything, it's no more than a farce. What else could it be when everyone today wants to say the test for it means no more than the Novice test?

>
> >
> > I'll judge hams on what they did afterwards.

For some strange reason that refrain was NEVER heard before the late restructuring. Another point in favor of Larry's point of view.

Then we have geniuses like Slim Burke to offer up as genuine, current evidence.

Dick

2706. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-23 13:06:37 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030223080637.25403.00000521@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 61840

In article <3E58605C.41600DD8@att.net>, Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> writes:

>In fact the FCC examiner who administered my Extra told me at that time
>that the Extra written was generally acknowledged to be a tougher test than
the
>First Phone - which I already had passed several years previously. And that
>examiner was the FCC's District Engineer for the Kansas City district. (Before
>some wag signs in insisting that District Engineers don't lower themselves to
>administering tests - that one did. He made a point of it. He was an Extra
class
>ham himself and an EE to boot).

>I don't see any way that anyone could have ever made such a statement
>concerning the Extra class written I took in '69. There was a whole lot of
quite
>advanced and involved radio theory that demanded considerable
>comprehensive learning of complex material. Definitely way beyond entry level.

Hmmm.. I passed the Extra in 1970 at the age of 16. Tougher than the First
Phone......

Next time somebody starts waving their First Phone around...

>Then we have geniuses like Slim Burke to offer up as genuine, current
>evidence.

Only if you take him seriously, which many of us don't. After all, he can't or
won't answer these simple questions about his alleged T5 operation:

What callsign was used?
What rigs and antennas were used?
Who did the equipment belong to?
What amateur bands and modes were used?
What countries and continents were worked?
How were the QSLs delivered?

Simple, straightforward questions, but you'll not see a simple, straightforward
answer to any of them.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2707. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-23 13:16:39 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <XQ36a.5691$hj.1472641@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 61839

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030222235241.09921.00002314@mb-md.aol.com...
> In article <AnN5a.5367$hj.1361944@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
> >> Larry, if you really care about Amateur Radio, the best thing you could
do
> >> to improve it is tear up your license and take up some other hobby.
Your
> >> kind are nothing but a detriment.
> >>
> >> Does that "LT" in your callsign stand for "lite"? Just wondering.
> >> --
> >> Bill, W7TI
> >
> >Bill,
> >
> >I agree with your analysis of how Larry could best improve ham radio.
> >His tirades against "lesser life forms" as he seems to view them are
> >certainly not the sort of "welcome wagon" to newcomers that makes
> >a good first impression ...
>
> Carl:
>
> It is not my need or desire to be a "welcome wagon" to ham radio's dumbed-
> down, Welfare State "newcomers."

Gee ... I thought we were supposed to welcome and "Elmer" newcomers,
not deride them ...

> If they get a ticket and get on the air, fine -- they have a legal right
to
> do so and I'm not here to stop them.

How benevolent of you ...

> Nobody fell over backwards when I walked into my first radio club meeting
> with my fresh new Novice ticket, and I had to show the initiative,
motivation,
> and persistence needed to gain acceptance on my own terms.

Oh, now I think I see what this is all about ... you got less than a totally
warm
welcome at your first ham club encounter and now you're intent on "sharing
the wealth."

Did you ever think maybe your attitude and personality had something to
do with it? (I think you should stop taking your own shortcomings out
on newbies ...)

> Today's ham
> radio "newcomers" want, and largely get, the Red Carpet Treatment,

I don't agree ... but I think that any new attendee at any ham club should
be treated as a welcome guest and welcomed to the fold ... not derided,
as you do so often, with "kunckle-dragging, lazy, low-life, welfare state,"

etc.

> then
> go on to spend the rest of their ham radio careers kerchunking away.

Another gross mischaracterization intended as a slur ... how typical for
you Larry ... I think the others are right ... you DO have a serious
self-esteem problem ... I'd encourage you to seek counseling to help
you overcome it so you can stop being so downright obnoxious to others
in your futile efforts to overcompensate.

> Try
> to get them involved in anything challenging from a technical or
operational
> standpoint, and they suddenly become wrapped up in family commitments,
> or simply couldn't be bothered. It's been the same everywhere I've gone,
> and I've been in a lot of places.

Again ... maybe it's your attutude and personality ... maybe they just don't
want to be involved with YOU.

Carl - wk3c

2708. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-23 13:23:48 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302230523.22f58add@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61841

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E58605C.41600DD8@att.net>...
> Mike Coslo wrote....
>
> >
> > >
> > > They were and always have been entry level tests
>
> 'Taint so, Mike. Disturbs me a bit each time I hear that mantra regurgitated
> here. In fact the FCC examiner who administered my Extra told me at that time that
> the Extra written was generally acknowledged to be a tougher test than the First
> Phone - which I already had passed several years previously. And that examiner was
> the FCC's District Engineer for the Kansas City district. (Before some wag signs
> in insisting that District Engineers don't lower themselves to administering tests
> - that one did. He made a point of it. He was an Extra class ham himself and an EE
> to boot).

And there it is. A hobby exam that is tougher than the professional
exam. A career electronics person telling hobbyists what they should
know and to what level they should know it. Who does that sound like?

> > The tests are
> > >first grade stuff
>
> I don't see any way that anyone could have ever made such a statement concerning
> the Extra class written I took in '69. There was a whole lot of quite advanced and
> involved radio theory that demanded considerable comprehensive learning of complex
> material. Definitely way beyond entry level. That you say it today seems to me
> to validate what Larry has to say on the subject- the tests truly ARE reduced
> severely in content and quality.

Dick, the exam still includes tubes, plus a whole bunch of things you
never heard of in 1962.

> Seems worth saying one more time- If the Extra class is not going to mean
> anything,

What do you want it to mean?

> it's no more than a farce. What else could it be when everyone today
> wants to say the test for it means no more than the Novice test?

There is no Novice test.

> > > I'll judge hams on what they did afterwards.
>
> For some strange reason that refrain was NEVER heard before the late
> restructuring. Another point in favor of Larry's point of view.

>
> Then we have geniuses like Slim Burke to offer up as genuine, current evidence.

Dick, you're supposed to be the biggest, baddest Extra with a
professional career in electronics, plus lots and lots of emergency
comms experience. Yet you can't seem to be able to get a radio to
work away from the power mains.

2709. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-23 13:32:36 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302230532.13a86a3f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61842

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030222235242.09921.00002316@mb-md.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0302221624.4537433a@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >> > I would submit a couple of alternatives for Larry's "LT". How about:
> >> >
> >> > Lacking Tolerance
> >> > Less Technical
> >> > Lid/Tyrant
> >> >
> >> > I'm sure that others can think of other possibilities that also fit ...
> >> >
> >> > Carl - wk3c
> >>
> >> What he said.
> >
> >Less Than
>
> Actually, it stands for "Lotsa Talent."
>
And Looney Tunes.

2710. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-23 13:51:11 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302230551.45da6b02@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61843

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E57EB7C.A0596401@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E565A51.B1C29552@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> >
> > > > Yet its Jim's radio. You're the one who cannot keep things straight.
> > > > Don't sit up all night tuning the 160M band endlessly trying to snag a
> > > > new one, then try to be coherent in replies. Doesn't work.
> > >
> > > I understand that ",Brian" gave you a problem.
> >
> > Brian only gives you problems.
> >
> Zat so? When did your stupidity or your playing dumb become my problem?
> You alone have to take the responsibility for what you write.

Dave, I can only respond to what you write. If its too inane, or too
smug, you get what you get.

> > > > > > So now unplugged cans makes it more enjoyable? Dave, give him the
> > > > > > message yourself.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I thought maybe you were up to the task. I was wrong.
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave was wrong. Probably first time ever. Welp, at least we have it
> > > > > in writing.
> > > >
> > > > I've been wrong about your ability to comprehend before.
> > >
> > > Dave admits he was wrong again.
> >
> > > > > I was not home when replying. Jump, jump, jump.
> > > >
> > > > Oh. Correct my statement to read: "We're not all gathered whereever it
> > > > is that you are". You can explain your second sentence, the incomplete
> > > > one, later if you have any interest in anyone being able to understand
> > > > it.
> > >
> > > You're supposed to be a bright boy.
> >
> It is tough to fill in the blanks on a supposed sentence which contains
> only the same three words. Those three repeated words of yours have
> about the same meaning as "Tree, tree, tree" or "Lift, lift, lift". If

> you can't complete an idea, don't expect others to do it for you.

Dave, try using context. Like when I said "Jump, jump, jump" (to
conclusions).

> > > > Why would I turn on Jim's radio? You're still confused, aren't you?
> > >
> > > Phil may be on to something. Stupid seems to be your default mode. Ed
> > > Hare lost interest in the group when you ran extended versions of your
> > > nonsense replies.
> >
> > That's really too bad. Law of unintended consequences. I liked Ed.
>
> It wasn't apparent.

Perhaps not to you, Mr Obtuse.

> > On the other hand, how many other people have been run off this group?
> > I don't see any litttle violins playing for them.
>
> I don't know of anyone who has been "run off this group". Ed left of
> his own volition. His tolerance for crap had been exceeded.

As did mine.

2711. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-23 14:10:26 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@ptialaska.net>
Message-ID: <8765rbw0j1.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 61845

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:
>Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote:
>> > > I'll judge hams on what they did afterwards.
>>
>> For some strange reason that refrain was NEVER heard before the late
>> restructuring. Another point in favor of Larry's point of view.
>>
>> Then we have geniuses like Slim Burke to offer up as genuine, current evidence.
>
>Dick, you're supposed to be the biggest, baddest Extra with a
>professional career in electronics, plus lots and lots of emergency
>comms experience. Yet you can't seem to be able to get a radio to
>work away from the power mains.

I've been reading this thread, and frankly it is not amusing at
all. I've been licensed as KL7GPS for awhile and thought
amateur radio might be something to take up as a hobby now that
I'm retired (from a professional career in communications, which
included both commercial radiotelegraph and radiotelephone
licenses).

I haven't gotten around to putting together a rig to get on the
air, and this type of exchange is cause to question whether it
would be worth the bother.

It's a hobby folks. Those tests are *all* meaningless to anyone
who has worked in the field. Someone mentioned getting an Extra
Class at age 16 and that it was tougher than a 1st Phone. I had
a 1st Phone at age 16, but by age 20 I'd met at least a dozen
people who'd been to a 6 week school that taught that test, and
even though they didn't understand a bit of electronics, they
were just as legal (and frankly at least a useful to the boss)
for standing a transmitter watch as I was! I can't see either
the Extra test or the 1st Phone as significant... compared to
something like working in a modern telecommunications center.

As for code, the military could teach the average GI to read
code at 35 wpm, so I can't see much significance to that either,
except that it required time and dedication that nobody except a
GI just out of boot camp is likely to have once they reach age
18 or so.

I personally like that idea of an Elmer. It's a hobby, it is
supposed to be fun. And it is when people at various levels
get together and exchange ideas, help each other, and generally
do whatever part of it they are capable of enjoying.

I'd suggest the Larry and Dick dump the chip on the shoulder
routine.

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://www.ptialaska.net/~floyd>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

2712. ARNewsline 1332 - Feb 21 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-23 14:11:37 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030223091137.08549.00000141@mb-mu.aol.com>
Source record: 61844

Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1332 – February 21, 2003

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1332 with a release date of Friday, February 21 2003 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T. Snow causes outages in the East and ham radio comes to the reascue. Hear the details on Amateur Radio Newsline™ report number 1332 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

RESCUE RADIO: THE NORTH-EASTER OF 2003

Snow plowing crews struggled to clear roads and airport runways on Tuesday February 18th. This after one of the worst storms in decades buried parts of the United States eastern states in 2 to 4 feet of snow. And in some areas ham radio was called out as we hear in this report:

--
Snowdrifts were piled high from the Ohio Valley to New England, mudslides and floods wreaked havoc in the southern Appalachians, and layers of ice snapped trees and power lines. At least 47 deaths had been blamed on the storm since it charged out of the mid-West Plains states over the previous weekend. Schools were closed from West Virginia to Connecticut and more than 250,000 homes and businesses lost power and telephone service. Enter ham radio.

During the height of the storm on the 17th, two communications emergencies were declared by the Federal Communications Commission in conjunction with the ARRL. The first was in Virginia to protect amateur emergency communications on 3.947 and 7.243 Mhz -- plus or minus 3 Khz. Also included were 145.430 MHz and 146.880 MHz repeaters in Richmond, the 147.360 MHz machine near Chesterfield and the 146.760 Mhz repeater serving Williamsburg at times when each was handling emergency traffic. It was only in effect for a few hours and terminated at 19:00 hours UTC the same day.

The second communications emergency was declared for Kentucky. Former ARRL President George Wilson, W4OYI, lives in the city of Owensboro. He says that his area recieved about 2 inches of glare ice and quite a bit of sleet on top of it.

But the big problem was in Fayetteville near the city of Lexington. Again the problem was mainly ice related and radio amateurs were ordered to keep from using repeaters on 146.760 Mhz, 147.165 and 444.125, MHz unless they were specifically taking part in the handling of emergency traffic

Further to the North, Bob Josuwait, WA3PZO tells ARNewsline™ that Montgomery County in suburban Philadelphia Pennsylvania had about 20 inches of snow. Montgomery County RACES was activated at 1800 on Sunday, February 16 th.

Bob Lees, W3ZQN, is Montgomery County RACES Radio Officer. He reports that members with four wheel drive vehicles were told to help, as possible, by providing transportation for essential hospital and nursing home workers within the county.

The Radio Officer sent an alert via the pagers carried by over 50 members, convened a net on the county two meter repeater and began making phone calls to determine specific needs.
RACES responded or attempted to respond to 17 different requests for transportation services until about 10 P.M. local on February 17th. A total of 21 people were transported by six different drivers in their personal vehicles. Each vehicle was in constant contact with net control by radio as they traveled.

Lees says that six hams acted as net control stations from their homes. Another 14 who did not have four wheel drive vehicles checked into a net called at noon on February 17th. Each operator indicated that they were monitoring and could possibly help in other jobs if requested. In all it was a good job done by RACES and ARES in the face of one of the worst North-Easter’s of the past hundred years.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I’m Blair Alper, KA9SEQ.
--

For the region as a whole, it was the worst snowstorm since the blizzard of 1996. In that one at least 80 deaths were blamed on the weather.
(ARNewsline™, ARRL, WA3PZO, W4OYI, VHF Reflector, Repeater Owners Remailer, published news reports.)

**

INTRUDERS: DRUG RUNNERS ALONG THE VK COASTLINE

What appear to be illegal drug runners have taken to the ham bands along the Australian coastline. Q-News Graham Kemp, VK4BB and Chris Wright, VK2UW, have the latest details:

--

“14.044 daily at 08:30 U-S-B are "Big Voice" -- must be thee HQ Stn.. and "Low Voice" Supply Boat ?? On the 23rd January "Big Voice" was joined by another Big Voice -- signal 59+ -- also in the same direction...

The N.T.News carried an article about the "roadside drug distribution points in Western Australia. Maybe these two 'Big Voices' are running the distribution points and the 'smaller Voice' keeps up the supply to the Distributors ??

There was a video report on Darwin TV picturing an 'abandoned' Chinese Fishing Boat along the West Aust. Coast tied up to the Shore. No Crew and No Cargo. And there are some Indonesian Voices 'Hopping' in on the Frequency when it is not in use. Maybe they have a part to play in the business?

If my bearing of 250 degrees and VK6XW bearing of 360 degrees were used, they would cross in the vicinity of Broome.
--

According to Q-News, Australian hams are being encouraged to report anything they hear to the nations Intruder Watch Coordinator. (Q-News)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: JAPAN ARISS CONTACT TO THE ISS

Ham radio contacts with the International Space Station continue. One of the latest took place on Tuesday February 18th when 8N3HES at the Hirano Elementary School in Kobe Japan succeeded in connecting its students with the ISS crew using Amateur Radio curcuits. One of the first questions answered had to do with ecology. How do you dump your garbage in space?

--
CONTACT AUDIO
--

That recording was made by JN1GKZ and you can only hear the I-S-S side of the contact. And some of the questions brought more information than many needed to know like when one student asked: “How do you take a bath in space?

--
CONTACT AUDIO HERE
--

This is the 3rd ARISS School contact with a school in Japan. To see a list of questions and herar all of the answers you only need to take your web browser over to the JN1GKZ website. You will find it at: http://www.qsl.net/jn1gkz/sound/ariss/8n3hes.htm (ARNewsline™ with sound from JN1GKZ))

**

Break 1

From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including the W3BN Reading Amateur Radio Club repeater serving Reading Pennsylvania.

(5 sec pause here)

**

ENFORCEMENT: PIRATES CANNOT EVER HOLD RADIO LICENSES

Pirate radio operators cannot ever get licenses to operate a legitimate radio station. So says a court of appeals. Amateur Radio Newsline’s Ken Locke, N8PJN, has more:

--

A United States appeals court has upheld as constitutional a law that bans a pirate broadcaster from ever obtaining a license for a low-power FM radio

station. In fact, it bars a current or former pirate broadcaster from even being involved with a station.

In its action, the full court reversed a ruling last year by a three-judge panel of a court that had struck the law down. By a 7 to 1 vote it ruled the law and the government regulations implementing it do not violate free speech rights under the First Amendment.

Back in 2001 Congress mandated that the FCC adopt rules to ban anyone who had been a pirate broadcaster or currently was broadcasting illegally from obtaining a license for a new low-power station. The appeals court appears to have taken this one step further in banning any affiliation bu current or former pirates with a legitimate FCC licensed broadcast operation.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Ken Locke, N8PJN, reporting.

--

Thanks Ken. (FCC)

**

ENFORCEMENT: NO TWO METER SETS FOR HUNTING SEASON

The FCC has written to the manager of a Radio Shack store to warn against selling ham gear to unlicensed persons.

The letter went to Dennis Wilfong who manages the Radio Shack at the Valley point Shopping Center in Elkins West Virginia. In it the FCC says that it has information indicating that numerous individuals are purchasing Amateur radio Service Two-Meter radio units from that store for use during hunting season and the purchasers are using them without the required license.

But thats not all. The FCC says that those purchasing the radios are either not being told that the units require a license, or are being misinformed as to the licensing requirements.

The FCC tells Wilfong that he should advise purchasers of Amateur Radio transmitting equipment that unlicensed radio operation is a violation of Section 301 of the Communications Act. That using the transceivers without first obtaining an Amateur Service license may result in a monetary fine of $7,500 to $10,000. (FCC)

**

ENFORCEMENT: FLORIDA UPGRADE SET ASIDE

John S. Gregory, W3ATE, of Lake Worth Florida has had his General class upgrade set aside. This, based on complaints about the operation of his station on frequencies not authorized by his Technician class license.

According to the FCC, at various times in 2002 Gregory apparently checked into a net on 14.300 Mhz while still a Technician class license holder. He was issued two warning letters but the FCC says that both were returned as unclaimed. (FCC, W5YI Report)

**

ENFORCEMENT: FCC ISSUES A RASH OF FINES

Hams are not the only ones hearing from the FCC. The Commission is continuing to flex its enforcement muscle by issuing a number of monetary forfeitures. Here are some recent examples courtesy of the CGC Communicator:

How about $2,500 to a telephone company for failing to exhibit prescribed tower painting. Or $4,000 to a CATV operator for failing to retransmit the EAS required monthly test.

But those are small in compariason to a $10,000 fine issued to a communications operator for failing to exhibit prescribed obstruction lighting on its antenna structure. Another $10,000 was issued to to an FM pirate while a $15,000 fine was issued to to an AM radio station for failing to maintain operational E-A-S equipment, and for failing to enclose the station's antenna tower within an effective locked fence. The whole story is in cyberspacve at http://www.fcc.gov/Daily_Releases/Daily_Digest/2003/dd030204.ht (CGC Communicator)

**

RADIO POLITICS: ARRL TRYING AGAIN WITH SPECTRUM PROTECTION ACT

If at first you don’t succeed, try try again may be an old addage, but it applies in the case of te 2003 Amateur Radio Spectrum Protection Act. This is a bill that has been introduced in the US House of Representatives by Michael Bilirakis of Florida.

According to the ARRL. Bilirakis filed the latest version of the bill, HR 713, on February 12th. It has been referred to the House Committee on Energy and Commerce. Like its predecessor, HR 713 is aimed at ensuring the availability of spectrum to Amateur Radio operators. It would protect existing Amateur Radio spectrum against reallocations to or sharing with other services unless the FCC provides equivalent replacement spectrum elsewhere.

The previous version of the Spectrum Protection Act attracted more than 50 cosponsors. An effort will be made to encourage additional House members to sign onto HR 713 as cosponsors. Additional details are on the web at www.arrl.org. (ARRL)

**

RADIO LAW: HAM PETITIONS TO KEEP EQUIPMENT ASALES DATE ON FILE

Dale Reich, K8AD, of Seville Ohio, has petitioned the FCC to require sellers of two-way voice or data equipment to keep on file a buyer's name, address, telephone number and any future information. This, when selling a radio that required licensing under the current FCC rules.

Accordiong to an ARRL bulletin, the information collected would remain private, available only to the FCC or law enforcement. Reich said in his petition that any retail vendor would be able to ask local police for an investigation if the retailer suspected the radios were not going to be used in compliance with the

law.

Included in the petition is a requirement for "ownership and license tagging" for gear operating under Parts 5, 15, 18, 74, 80, 90, 95 and 97. In his petition, Reich said such tagging used to be an FCC requirement and that his proposed change was a needed tool for local law enforcement.

The full text of Reich's petitions is available on the FCC Web site. Search for petition number RM-1064. Comments are due no later than February 28th. (K8AD, ARRL Letter)

**

HAM RADIO ENTERTAINMENT: WRTC 2002 VIDEO NOW AVAILABLE IN THE USA

The World Radiosport Team Championship 2002 video had its United States premiere on Wednesday, February 5th. This, before a standing-room-only crowd in Washington state hosted by the Western Washington DX Club.

With photography by James Brooks, 9V1YC, and Dave Bell, W6AQ, the video covers WRTC 2002 from the perspective of a professional sporting event. The show begins with the arrival of competitors from more than 30 countries. It then takes the viewer behind the scenes for the various pre-competition activities and into the actual competition.

The video is available on VHS tape and DVD with extra material on the DVD. You can place your order on-line at http://home1.pacific.net.sg/~jamesb (WRTC)

**

CONVENTIONS AND CONFERENCES: SEVHFS IN HUNTSVILLE IN APRIL

If you have been trying to register on-line for the upcoming Southeastern VHF Society conference and getting a reply of no such website, try again. It will work the way its supposed to.

The problem was caused by an Internet Service Provider outage at the most inoportune time. The repair: Everything was moved to different server but that took a few days to accomplish. And now that its all back up and collecting bits and bytes in cyberspace, you will want to visit www.sevhfs.org for the latest conference update. This includes word that Steve Kostro, N2CEI of Down East Microwave Incorporated will be hosdting a surface mount soldering class on the opening Friday morning of the gathering.

The when and the where? This is the 7th Annual Southeastern VHF Conference. It is slated for April 25th and 26th at the Huntsville Marriott in Huntsville, Alabama. For further information and to register, visit that now up and running website at www.sevhfs.org. (SEVHFS)

**

BREAK 2

This is ham radio news for today’s radio amateur. From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our

only official website at www.arnewsline.org and being relayed by the volunteer services of the following radio amateur:

(5 sec pause here)

**

RESCUE RADIO: THIS IS HDSCS

Last week Amateur Radio Newsline’s Joe Moell, K0OV told you that members of the Hospital Disaster Support Communications System of Orange County, California had been included in a new documentary series on the Discovery Channel. The show is called "Critical Rescue" and it aired on Thursday February 20th and on Saturday February 22nd. But what is the the Hospital Disaster Support Communications System or HDSCS and how does it work? Back with the answers is Joe Moell, K0OV:

--

HDSCS is a specialty group of ARES. It was formed in 1979 with the specific mission of providing backup communications that are critical to patient care. Since then, HDSCS has responded in 75 communications emergencies, ranging from single-hospital telephone system failures to area-wide disasters.

For its service, HDSCS has received awards and commendations from many hospitals and agencies, including FEMA. The most recent is the National Certificate of Merit from ARRL, awarded at the Board of Directors meeting in January 2003.

From southern California, this is Joe Moell K-zero-Oscar-Victor for Amateur Radio Newsline.

--

For more about the Hospital Disaster Support Communications System of Orange County, California and information about how hams can best support hospitals, point your Web browser to www.hdscs.org. (ARNewsline™)

**

EMERGING TECHNOLOGY: RC-110 REPEATER CONTROLLER GOES OPEN SOURCE

How would you like to be able to customize a repeater controller your way? Well, according to Ken Arck, AH6LE, There has been considerable interest from folks wanting to customize their RC-110 repeater controllers. So Arck, who is both president and CTO of Arcom Communications says that he has decided to make the source code available to any ham who wishes to take a stab at 'hacking' it for their own use.

Writing to the Repeater Owners Reflector, Arck says that as far as he knows, no other repeater controller offers this open source archecture. Of course there are certain conditions, but they're pretty straightforward.

If you are interested in getting the source code, Arck says that you simply need to join RC-110 mail list. To do this send an e-mail to

rc110-subscribe@yahoogroups.com. The source is available in the files section of the list. More information is at Ken’s website – www.ah6le.net (Repeter Owners Remailer)

**

INTERNATIONAL – UK: REPEATER STOLEN

A repeater in the United Kingdom is off the air due to theft. According to the RSGB, the GB3NC two meter repeater and its site companion the GB3MCB 1296 MHz beacon have not been heard since someone made off with the equipment. Both were co-located in Cornwall and the RSGB says that its not known if either will ever come back on the air. (RSGB)

**

INTERNATIONAL: YUGOSLAVIA: THE NEW NATION OF SERBIA-MONTENEGRO

Yugoslavia has become Serbia-Montenegro. This, after Yugoslavia's parliament voted to formally abolish that nation and replace it with a new country called Serbia-Montenegro.

According to the ARRL Letter, the new arrangement will have little immediate impact on Amateur Radio. For D-X-C-C purposes, Serbia and Montenegro will be considered a single entity, at least for the time being. Also, amateurs there are expected to continue using Y-U and Y-T prefixes. (ARRL)

**

CONTESTING:: UT5UDX ON THE MOVE

Ukrainian international football player Sergei Rebrov, UT5UDX, who moved to England in a multi-million-dollar deal in 2000, has moved again. This time to Turkish side Fenerbahçe.

Word is that Rebrov has signed an 18-month loan deal with the Turkish club on January 28th. The Turkish club now has the right to buy him at the end of the loan period.

Rebrov is a High Frequency contest operator. He and has been very active as M0SDX from his home in the U-K and from other locations in the British Isles over the last two years. He is reportedly now in the process of obtaining a Turkish callsign. (RSGB)

**

DX

In D-X, GB2RS says that a group of Swedish amateurs will be active as JW slash SM0BSO, JW slash SM0LQB and JW slash SM1TDE from Svalbard through the 23rd of March. Activity will be on 160 through 6 meters on CW, SSB, RTTY and other digital modes. Q-S-L this one as directed on the air. (GB2RS)

And F5PAC is returning to Panama from the 23rd of February until the 24th of March. He will also operate from several Islands on the Air groups including

from the 25th to 27th of February. You can fopllow his exploits on the web at www.qsl.net/f5pac (Via e-mail)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: EXTENDING MORE THAN A WELCOME

And finally this week, the story of a ham radio dream thats about to come true. Its also the story of what Amateur Radio is all about. Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, has the details:

--
Audio story only. Hear it at http://www.arnewsline.org
--

And after that, what else is there to say? (K6PZW)

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, Amateur News Weekly, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline™. Our e-mail address is newsline @arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's™ only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline™, P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I’m Ken Butler, W1NNR, saying 73 and we thank you for listening." Amateur Radio Newsline™ is Copyright 2002. All rights reserved.

2713. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-23 16:14:20 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <9398F1CBB7231343.26472D7A23C696BB.E66A77C339A043E6@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 61848

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030222235240.09921.00002313@mb-md.aol.com...
> In article <Xns932A4AFE5E716pookster@216.168.3.50>, "Bill, W7TI"
> <jamspam@upyours.now> writes:
>
> >Larry, if you really care about Amateur Radio, the best thing you could
do
> >to improve it is tear up your license and take up some other hobby. Your
> >kind are nothing but a detriment.
> >
> >Does that "LT" in your callsign stand for "lite"? Just wondering.
> >
> >--
> >Bill, W7TI
>
> Bill:
>
> You see, right there is the difference between me and the liberal, whining
> Extra Lites. I'm not asking any of the Extra Lites to tear up their
> tickets and push off -- in fact, I am perfectly willing to "tolerate"
their
> presence in ham radio. However, the Extra Lites and their apologists
> surely don't show any willingness to "tolerate" my opinions. I guess, as
> it usually is with liberals, it's a one-way street.
>
> Definition of a Liberal: Someone who can tolerate anything except a
> difference of opinion. -- Rush Limbaugh
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

It is not your difference of opinion that is intolerable or scorned here,
Larry. It is your intolerance of others who differ from and with you...

Perhaps one day you'll become human enough to understand that.

Kim W5TIT

2714. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-23 16:18:31 UTC
From: Jackie <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com>
Message-ID: <rv66a.230004$be.204752@rwcrnsc53>
Source record: 61846

> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> Therefore, the
> Extra Lites have to prove themselves to ME.

Hahah! You really need to take a bottle of Get Over Yourself. If you don't want to talk to newer Extras or those of lesser license classes, then turn the knob.

Jackie
KC0ODY

2715. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-23 16:23:03 UTC
From: Jackie <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com>
Message-ID: <Hz66a.227329$HN5.945020@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 61847

"Floyd Davidson" <floyd@ptialaska.net> wrote in message
news:8765rbw0j1.fld@barrow.com...

> I'd suggest the Larry and Dick dump the chip on the shoulder
> routine.

Floyd, they won't. They believe that they are better than the rest of us and their primary goal here is to let us all know it, so as to make sure we don't crawl out from under the rocks where they think we live. Better to just ignore their blatherings about "dumbed-down" tests and Extra-Lites, because they will never accept anyone who had to take an "easier" test than they did.

Jackie

2716. Re: N8WWM BUSTED SAYS RAIN REPORT

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-23 16:24:02 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <e7th5v0eb0n6b96af0rh6se737qkbcf4aj@4ax.com>
Source record: 61849
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On 21 Feb 2003 15:14:46 -0800, richcranus@yahoo.com (Richard Cranium)
wrote:

>> Please provide the links. That is totally opposite from accepted
>> practices and cases to date. Most cases involving libel are simply too hard
>> for the plaintive to prove. Sueing someone is one thing. Winning the suit is
>> totally another.
>>
>> Dave
>> "Sandbagger"
>
>Try reading what he posted, Dave. He said he wasn't going to "do that
>job for you." Sounds like plain English to me; what's your problem?

If Lloyd is going to make a statement, then he should have the
courtesy to provide the link info instead expecting someone else to do
his homework for him.

2717. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-23 16:24:38 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <2FDC07BD4F914DDA.A5065375F3EEEABC.218DE52BA0D82195@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 61850

"Jackie" <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> wrote in message
news:rv66a.230004$be.204752@rwcrnsc53...
> > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> > Therefore, the
> > Extra Lites have to prove themselves to ME.
>
> Hahah! You really need to take a bottle of Get Over Yourself. If you
don't
> want to talk to newer Extras or those of lesser license classes, then turn
> the knob.
>
> Jackie
> KC0ODY
>
>

Jackie: He's been begging for someone to "prove theirself" to him ever since I found this newsgroup--probably before that. I envision Larry as a very lonely person because of it. But, he's too arrogant to get it... He also is under the delusion that those whom he attacks are truly offended or upset by him. That's the *real* joke...

Kim W5TIT

2718. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-23 17:19:00 UTC
From: Jackie <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com>
Message-ID: <8o76a.233627$Ec4.232497@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 61751

"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:2FDC07BD4F914DDA.A5065375F3EEEABC.218DE52BA0D82195@lp.airnews.net...

> Jackie: He's been begging for someone to "prove theirself" to him ever
since
> I found this newsgroup--probably before that.

Why he assumes anyone would want to waste their time doing so is really
funny.

Larry envisions himself as part of "real" ham radio. He's not. He is part of
the problem. His attitude, multiplied, will do more to keep prospective ops
out of the AR ranks than any of the tests themselves. I'm thankful for the
kind elmers I've met so far. Larry could use a lesson or two from them on
how to treat others, but I 'spect he's simply too arrogant to even consider
such a thing as being helpful instead of condescending to a new ham.

Jackie

Jackie

2719. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-23 17:30:13 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E590525.8040709@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 61756

WA8ULX wrote:
>>That's the *real* joke...
>>
>>Kim W5TIT
>
>
> The Real Joke Is all the rest of the CBplussers

Your right, you're are a real joke.

2720. Why I operate essentially 100% CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-23 17:49:32 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <MQ76a.230898$vm2.171917@rwcrnsc54>
Source record: 61752

Perhaps maybe perhaps to avoid this kind of crap???

73 God Bless KI3R Port Vue Pa. nr Pittsburgh

"Moana Liza" <RKBA@Anon.com> wrote in message
news:b394mdbir0@pita.alt.net...
>
> "Edward Norton" <haaaynorton@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030222160214.27882.00000063@mb-ff.aol.com...
> > << Subject: David Colostomy jams 14.275
> > From: "Lloyd, N0VFP" brother_lloyd_99@yahoo.com
> > Date: Sat, Feb 22, 2003 2:30 PM
> > Message-id: <3e57da52$1_2@corp-goliath.newsgroups.com>
> >
> > When will he ever learn? Maybe never! I have you recorded! Just goto
> back
> > 14.313!
> >
>
> Poor little Evie...got his shorts all atwitter because those big, mean,
> nasty Hams wouldn't let him have the frequency, and this after HE broke in
> on THEM! So what does he do? Well, the next logical thing, to him, is if
> they won't let him have the frequency he will just jam everybody. That
way,
> you see, if he can't use it, they can't use it either.
> What a twit.
>
>

2721. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-23 18:21:57 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030223132157.25154.00000483@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 61753

In article <8765rbw0j1.fld@barrow.com>, Floyd Davidson <floyd@ptialaska.net>
writes:

>I've been reading this thread, and frankly it is not amusing at
>all. I've been licensed as KL7GPS for awhile and thought
>amateur radio might be something to take up as a hobby now that
>I'm retired (from a professional career in communications, which
>included both commercial radiotelegraph and radiotelephone
>licenses).
>
>I haven't gotten around to putting together a rig to get on the
>air, and this type of exchange is cause to question whether it
>would be worth the bother.

Don't let take this NG as a representative sample of what you'll encounter on
the air. It's not.
>
>It's a hobby folks. Those tests are *all* meaningless to anyone
>who has worked in the field. Someone mentioned getting an Extra
>Class at age 16 and that it was tougher than a 1st Phone.

That was me who got the Extra at 16. FCC office, 20 wpm send and receive, 2
years as an Advanced, secret tests, yada yada yada. Big deal, that was just one
accomplishment. Which was not unusual at all back then anyway, there were 12
year old Extras in those days. The "tougher than the First Phone" thing was a
quote from an FCC examiner.

>I had
>a 1st Phone at age 16, but by age 20 I'd met at least a dozen
>people who'd been to a 6 week school that taught that test, and
>even though they didn't understand a bit of electronics, they
>were just as legal (and frankly at least a useful to the boss)
>for standing a transmitter watch as I was! I can't see either
>the Extra test or the 1st Phone as significant... compared to
>something like working in a modern telecommunications center.

I went on to EE school at age 18, and discovered that amateur radio background
was a big help in EE. But it was only a beginning - there was a lot more to
learn, of course. Radio is but a small part of electrical engineering.
>
>As for code, the military could teach the average GI to read
>code at 35 wpm, so I can't see much significance to that either,
>except that it required time and dedication that nobody except a
>GI just out of boot camp is likely to have once they reach age
>18 or so.

The "toughest" code test ever required for a US ham license was 20 wpm plain language, needing one minute solid copy out of five minutes. By professional or serious amateur standards, that's not very much skill at all, compared to what is expected in the real world. Such tests are all gone, anyway.
>
>I personally like that idea of an Elmer. It's a hobby, it is
>*supposed* to be fun. And it is when people at various levels
>get together and exchange ideas, help each other, and generally
>do whatever part of it they are capable of enjoying.

Which goes on all over the place. Try reading the Elecraft or Glowbug reflectors - all sorts of folks helping each other out with information, experience, parts sources, etc.
>
>I'd suggest the Larry and Dick dump the chip on the shoulder
>routine.
>
Let's say, just for the point of argument, that those old tests really were tougher/more comprehensive/whatever than today's tests. (There's no really objective way to tell, because we don't have the old tests available for comparison anyway!)

We still have the following situations:

- It's not the "fault" of new hams that today's tests and test methods are not like the old ones.

- Both the old and new tests were not comprehensive EE-level exams, but rather a compilation of things FCC thought to be important for licensees to know. That's true for both the commercial and amateur exams

- (This one's the biggie) There's little chance we'll go back to the old way of taking the exams. We're pretty much stuck with the VE system, so we might as well make the best of it.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2722. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-23 18:25:47 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030223132547.11325.00000213@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 61754

>That's the *real* joke...
>
>Kim W5TIT

The Real Joke Is TIT and all the rest of the CBplussers

2723. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-23 18:34:27 UTC
From: lbudney-google@nb.net
Message-ID: <417b917a.0302231034.1d2733ff@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61755

Hi Larry,

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote:
>
> You see, right there is the difference between me and the liberal, whining
> Extra Lites. I'm not asking any of the Extra Lites to tear up their
> tickets and push off -- in fact, I am perfectly willing to "tolerate" their
> presence in ham radio.

I have no problem with your viewpoint. I reject your characterization,
though: I am not now, nor ever have been, a whiner. I plan to take the
extra exam, but that's only because it's the highest one they offer.

Here's a thought: If the FCC won't make tougher tests mandatory, maybe
the ARRL should offer voluntary "certifications". They give out
wallpaper to people who work all states, etc.; why can't they give out
some wallpaper to people who voluntarily sit for an examination on
theory, deeper theory, and super-duper tough theory? Or who
demonstrate the ability to build a rig starting with two busted TVs
and a roll of tin-foil?

Then if they did that, you and I could have a show-down. :-)

--Len.

2724. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-23 18:57:03 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@ptialaska.net>
Message-ID: <87wujqvn9c.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 61757

"Jackie" <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> wrote:
>"Floyd Davidson" <floyd@ptialaska.net> wrote in message
>news:8765rbw0j1.fld@barrow.com...
>
>> I'd suggest the Larry and Dick dump the chip on the shoulder
>> routine.
>
>Floyd, they won't. They believe that they are better than the rest of us and
>their primary goal here is to let us all know it, so as to make sure we
>don't crawl out from under the rocks where they think we live. Better to
>just ignore their blatherings about "dumbed-down" tests and Extra-Lites,
>because they will never accept anyone who had to take an "easier" test than
>they did.
>
>Jackie

Actually I highly suspect that what they "know" is that they are
not as good as the rest of us. The root of that type of
behavior is almost always a huge inferiority complex. They need
to find a way to set up artificially absurd distinctions to set
themselves apart from others because they can't find any sense
of accomplishment in what they actually do on a day to day
basis. The distinctions have to be emphasized by insults
directed at others who approach the phony line they've drawn in
the sand, otherwise they cannot view themselves as having any
value.

Going through life thinking you have no value is not a picnic,
and I do feel sorry for them.

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://www.ptialaska.net/~floyd>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

2725. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-23 20:42:31 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302231242.203ee0a9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61758

Floyd Davidson <floyd@ptialaska.net> wrote in message news:<8765rbw0j1.fld@barrow.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:
> >Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote:
> >> > > I'll judge hams on what they did afterwards.
> >>
> >> For some strange reason that refrain was NEVER heard before the late
> >> restructuring. Another point in favor of Larry's point of view.
> >>
> >> Then we have geniuses like Slim Burke to offer up as genuine, current evidence.
> >
> >Dick, you're supposed to be the biggest, baddest Extra with a
> >professional career in electronics, plus lots and lots of emergency
> >comms experience. Yet you can't seem to be able to get a radio to
> >work away from the power mains.
>
> I've been reading this thread, and frankly it is not amusing at
> all.

Floyd, it really wasn't meant to be. I put "smiley's" when I aim to
amuse.

I've been licensed as KL7GPS for awhile and thought
> amateur radio might be something to take up as a hobby now that
> I'm retired (from a professional career in communications, which
> included both commercial radiotelegraph and radiotelephone
> licenses).

You've picked a fine hobby. Assuming you're in Alaska, you'll never
want for a QSO.

> I haven't gotten around to putting together a rig to get on the
> air, and this type of exchange is cause to question whether it
> would be worth the bother.

Unless you live in a restricted development (like much of America),
you should Get On The Air Immediately, and ignore us "netgroup
whiners" completely. Seriously. We'll do nothing but drag you down.

> It's a hobby folks.

Yet it can be useful for emergency communications.

Those tests are *all* meaningless to anyone
> who has worked in the field.

Many of the Extras on here, whom most of work in the field as
electronics engineers, want the rest of us to learn everything to

their level of professional detail, without getting paid a handsome salary for the effort. They really do want something for nothing.

Someone mentioned getting an Extra
> Class at age 16 and that it was tougher than a 1st Phone. I had
> a 1st Phone at age 16, but by age 20 I'd met at least a dozen
> people who'd been to a 6 week school that taught that test, and
> even though they didn't understand a bit of electronics, they
> were just as legal (and frankly at least a useful to the boss)
> for standing a transmitter watch as I was! I can't see either
> the Extra test or the 1st Phone as significant... compared to
> something like working in a modern telecommunications center.

Which is why I think one license, "Amateur," is a sufficient license for all of amateur radio (unless we want to include a learners/beginners license).

> As for code, the military could teach the average GI to read
> code at 35 wpm, so I can't see much significance to that either,
> except that it required time and dedication that nobody except a
> GI just out of boot camp is likely to have once they reach age
> 18 or so.

I think that many, many recruits became Cooks and MPs after the 1st week of ditty-bopper school.

But suppose they made it. Then getting the old Extra at 20 words per was a walk in the park, w/o much career electronics knowledge.

These are many of the guys that have come on here telling the rest of us how lazy we are when we max out at 10wpm, or don't get it at all. They forgot about all the cooks that fed them all the years they were ditty-boppers.

> I personally like that idea of an Elmer.

I love that idea. And I think if the OFs on here had a more nurturing attitude... instead of nothing but "slam-dunks."

They call everyone that isn't CW oriented stupid cb-plussers, the exams we took are "dumbed down," we're lazy knuckle draggers with 4-land accents, hands out, ...

It's a hobby, it is
> *supposed* to be fun. And it is when people at various levels
> get together and exchange ideas, help each other, and generally
> do whatever part of it they are capable of enjoying.

True words.

> I'd suggest the Larry and Dick dump the chip on the shoulder
> routine.

The problem isn't confined to r.r.a.policy. Have you followed the similar exchanges on r.r.a.Antennas? It would appear to take at least one Extra to have a really vicious argument. Most are old 20wpm Extras, so much for the riff-raff filter.

You should have seen them on here, fawning over Val, a newcomer who came on here with an instant love of Code, and unkind words for those that don't or won't worship the Code.

I'm afraid the only corrective action are the unforgiving actuarial tables, where they will take their attitudes, bile, and "tough love Elmering" to their graves.

73, Brian

2726. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-23 20:45:24 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302231245.f5e9cb0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61759

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0302221911.70355fdc@posting.google.com>...

> Includes the complete irrelevance attached to posting experience in
> baby-sitting Army RTTY repeaters over a half century ago as some kinda
> "credentials". Except more so.
>
> w3rv

Sounds like "-real- military experience" to me. Got any?

2727. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-23 20:49:56 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302231249.17c36d81@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61760

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0302221859.3fa300c9@posting.google.com>...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030222140633.12173.00000652@mb-mr.aol.com>...
>
> >
> > > > no field
> > > > within electricity or electronics mentioned, yet Mr. N2EY
> > > > gave talks to industry according to himself and his bosom
> > > > buddy Kellie.
>
> Pssst, hey Putz, here's a hint: Jim recently implemented Spread
> Spectrum comms on at least one of the recent projects he's managed.
> When was the last time YOU implemented any kind of radio comms?

Now, now, now. Stop giving clues. Jim doesn't want to be found out.

> > My full name and address in every US Callbook and CD-ROM since 1968, and are on
> > the FCC database. Did you have trouble accessing the database to find my name?
>
> Ummm . . In what current radio publication and/or
> industrial/military/hobby radio organization website is there even a
> mention of the Putz?

And you? List them. I'll consider anything in this century as "current."

> > His hobby is wasting time....
>
> That's all he has left.

Actually, no. He enjoys travel.

2728. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-23 21:25:17 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b3beg8$c3t$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 61762

"Floyd Davidson" <floyd@ptialaska.net> wrote in message
news:8765rbw0j1.fld@barrow.com...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:
> >Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote:
> >> > > I'll judge hams on what they did afterwards.
> >>
> >> For some strange reason that refrain was NEVER heard before the late
> >> restructuring. Another point in favor of Larry's point of view.
> >>
> >> Then we have geniuses like Slim Burke to offer up as genuine, current
evidence.
> >
> >Dick, you're supposed to be the biggest, baddest Extra with a
> >professional career in electronics, plus lots and lots of emergency
> >comms experience. Yet you can't seem to be able to get a radio to
> >work away from the power mains.
>
> I've been reading this thread, and frankly it is not amusing at
> all. I've been licensed as KL7GPS for awhile and thought
> amateur radio might be something to take up as a hobby now that
> I'm retired (from a professional career in communications, which
> included both commercial radiotelegraph and radiotelephone
> licenses).
>
> I haven't gotten around to putting together a rig to get on the
> air, and this type of exchange is cause to question whether it
> would be worth the bother.
>
> It's a hobby folks. Those tests are *all* meaningless to anyone
> who has worked in the field. Someone mentioned getting an Extra
> Class at age 16 and that it was tougher than a 1st Phone. I had
> a 1st Phone at age 16, but by age 20 I'd met at least a dozen
> people who'd been to a 6 week school that taught that test, and
> even though they didn't understand a bit of electronics, they
> were just as legal (and frankly at least a useful to the boss)
> for standing a transmitter watch as I was! I can't see either
> the Extra test or the 1st Phone as significant... compared to
> something like working in a modern telecommunications center.
>
> As for code, the military could teach the average GI to read
> code at 35 wpm, so I can't see much significance to that either,
> except that it required time and dedication that nobody except a
> GI just out of boot camp is likely to have once they reach age
> 18 or so.

>
> I personally like that idea of an Elmer. It's a hobby, it is
> *supposed* to be fun. And it is when people at various levels
> get together and exchange ideas, help each other, and generally
> do whatever part of it they are capable of enjoying.
>
> I'd suggest the Larry and Dick dump the chip on the shoulder
> routine.
> Floyd L. Davidson <http://www.ptialaska.net/~floyd>
> Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

Floyd,

WELL SAID!!!

Unfortunately there are a minority of hams that are on their
own ego trip and apparently need to think they have special
credentials that make them better than others.

Bottom line, I don't give a hoot what anyone's license is. It
is what they do as hams that count in my view.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2729. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-23 21:29:29 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <Z2b6a.3284$8f7.2103@nwrdny02.gnilink.net>
Source record: 61761

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0302200956.d3cdafa@posting.google.com...
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:<Mms4a.23493$Yv2.14310@nwrddc02.gnilink.net>...
> > They were awfully fun though and had the 'International Morse Code'
> > placarded on the front of the rig with a bright orange button labeled
'Morse
> > Code Key.' After sending some very slow code back and forth for awhile,
we
> > wanted a little more range. (Here is where I admit my very first
violation
> > of a FCC rule.) So I read up a little on outdoor antennas and decided
that a
> > dipole would be best on a 13-yr. old's lawn-cutting/snow-shoveling
earnings.
> > Dad provided supervised access to his soldering iron and the h/t's
> > telescoping whip was replaced by RG-58 coax feeding a half-wave dipole.
My
> > friend's whip was replaced by a commercial quarter-wave ground plane.
Ah,
> > those were the days!
>
> HAW! Of course the range may not have been that much better because of
> the mismatch.

Actually, that was the kicker. (no pun intended.) We went from a range of
only a couple of blocks to being able to reach one or two towns over. More
recently, my niece and I were able to copy each other over approx. 15 mi.,
albeit w/greatly elevated antennas. (Using the Morse feature only, no
voice.)

> > I'd be remiss if I didn't mention the trip to the local CB/ham shop to
buy
> > the necessary materials. When the owner asked me about my planned
> > "installation" and how much I had to spend, Mike (WB2 something or
other)
> > cheerfully supplied me with a Budwig-style center insulator, two dogbone
end
> > insulators, the required 14-gauge stranded copper antenna wire, 18 ft.
of
> > RG-58 coax, and a set of crystals for ch. 20, the local rag-chew freq.
"Yep,
> > fourteen bucks'll just about cover that." The ch. 20 crystals were $8.99
> > alone. That was my first exposure to the amicable spirit of radio. :-D
>

> Great story! Here's some of mine (you started this, Bert!).....

You kidding, I can read radio stuff for hour on end.

> First experience with homebrew radio was building a "foxhole" set from
> instructions found in a thrift-store book, "All About Radio and
> Television". I was maybe 10 years old at the time. Had a six-foot
> scrap of multiconductor telephone-type cable, which was taken apart,
> ends stripped, and square-knotted together to get a 70 foot length
> that would stretch from the bedroom window to the crab apple tree in
> the back yard. Insulators? What insulators? The detector in the
> "foxhole" set was a single-edged razor blade and a piece of pencil
> lead (actually graphite), held in place by thumb tacks and a safety
> pin.
>
> When I was about 12, my family went to an auction for some forgotten
> reason or other. I don't know what else was bought, but I went home
> with a J-37 key and what turned out to be the projects from an old NRI
> (remember them?) home-study course. Total cost: Less than a dollar.
> The projects were mostly built on nice aluminum chassis of various
> sizes, and there were a good assortment of tubes and parts in them.
> Over the next few months they were disassembled, and with a few small
> purchases at the local RESCO store, I had a 2 tube regenerative
> receiver for listening to the lower part of the HF spectrum. Also had
> parts from an old TV found on the trash, and the guidance of an old
> ARRL Handbook. Much redesign was needed to build the rx with the parts
> at hand, though. Coils wound on old pill bottles, tube sockets and
> bases for power connectors, etc.
>
> Learning the code with that crude 2 tube regen was an experience in
> itself, because you needed one hand to keep the station tuned in while
> writing the code down with the other. Helped me learn to build better
> receivers, though!
>
> Passed the Novice test in the early summer of 1967 at the ripe old age
> of 13 and built a 10 watt transmitter from other NRI parts. The old TV
> set provided the power supply. Only part I had to buy for the
> transmitter was the xtal. Tuned it up with a dial lamp in the antenna
> lead as RF indicator, plus the plate milliameter. Not a rock crusher
> but had a lot of fun. By that time the antenna had been upgraded to
> use "real antenna wire", those same glass insulators and went from the
> attic window to much higher up in the crab apple tree.
>
> Total cost - maybe $14 for everything...You wanna talk about doing
> radio on a shoestring budget, you came to the right place!
>
> Now here's the part that relates to the subject line:
>
> All through this time, I was working with high voltages and dangerous
> tools like soldering irons and razor blades. (Still have some of the
> scars...;-))

>
> Also climbing trees to put up antennas and such. Parental supervision?
> Bah!
> The Feds saw fit to grant me the license and I didn't electrocute
> anyone nor burn the house down. Nor did my 10 watter bother any other
> radio services. I knew and worked other hams who were younger than me,
> too.
>
> But some folks would have denied us our licenses based on age alone.
> Odd, really odd.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

All too kewl, thanks for sharing. :-)

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

2730. Re: Why I operate essentially 100% CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-23 21:59:42 UTC
From: "Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now>
Message-ID: <Xns932B8E5D2F120pookster@216.168.3.50>
Source record: 61763

"garigue" <garigue@attbi.com> wrote in news:MQ76a.230898$vm2.171917
@rwcrnsc54:

> Perhaps maybe perhaps to avoid this kind of crap???
>
> 73 God Bless KI3R Port Vue Pa. nr Pittsburgh
>
>

If that's the reason, maybe you shoud try the digital modes. There's
even less there - essentially zero.

--
Bill, W7TI

2731. Re: Extra-Lite Status

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-23 22:27:17 UTC
From: orf@msn.com
Message-ID: <b3bhs4$1k0a4i$1@ID-183073.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 61764

Larry Roll K3LT <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:
> In article <f45722ac.0302221624.4537433a@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>>> > I would submit a couple of alternatives for Larry's "LT". How about:
>>> >
>>> > Lacking Tolerance
>>> > Less Technical
>>> > Lid/Tyrant
>>> >
>>> > I'm sure that others can think of other possibilities that also fit ...
>>> >
>>> > Carl - wk3c
>>>
>>> What he said.
>>
>>Less Than

> Actually, it stands for "Lotsa Talent."

You misspelled "Licking Testicles."

> 73 de Larry, K3LT

88 de MY2NUTS

2732. Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-23 22:44:42 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b3bj5g$54e$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 61765

"Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
news:BA773A91.EE02%stewart@say.net...
> "Bill, W7TI" wrote:
> >
> > Is there actually anyone who's still on their
> > learner's permit after years of driving? I
> > would suggest that someone who can not progress
> > beyond that point may have insufficient driving
> > skills and should be put on the bus. Would you
> > like to be on the same road as that guy? Not me.
> > Would you like to be on the same band as someone
> > who can not acquire the skills needed to get a
> > "regular" ham license? Not me.
>
> You seem focused on the driver's license/learner's permit concept when
> neither compares to a ham license. There is no "regular" ham license -
each
> have the same goals and intent - only method changes (that eliminates the
> driver's license concept). Since there is no regular ham license, there is
> also no suggestion that the goal of the lower licenses is to upgrade to it
> (and there goes the learner's permit concept).

Well said!

> Further, I find your premise somewhat disingenuous. If you truly feel
the
> ultimate goal of the lower licenses is to upgrade to something else, why
> aren't you concerned about those who have not reached the Extra after many
> years. A quick search shows that many General licensees have been so for
> many years, yet I see nothing about this.

And that is especially true for all those generals that ONLY had to study
and pass a written test since there was NO higher code test associated
with becoming an Advanced fro a General.

> > Because the existing licensing structure is flawed,
> > IMHO. (snip) Having this authority carries
> > with it the responsibility to do so, well,
> > responsibly. (snip) Yes, some technical knowledge
> > is required, but the emphasis should be on:
> >
> > 1. Proper operating techniques (ID'ing, working
> > split, knowing band limits, etc)
> >
> > 2. Not causing interference (listen before

> > transmitting, avoiding splatter, etc)
> >
> > 3. Safety (RF exposure, high voltage precautions,
> > etc)
> >
> > 4. Neighborhood relations (TVI, etc)
>
> But, again, you haven't shown how the present license structure does not
> accomplish these things, or that the present licensees have not used their
> authority responsibly, or how your learner's permit concept would change
> either. Without these, you're offering a solution where no problem has
been
> shown.
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

Agree again.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2733. Petition for retail point-of-sales record keeping - transmitters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-23 22:57:26 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b3bjoquau1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 61766

The correct RM # is RM-10641

Someone else previously posted:
RADIO LAW: HAM PETITIONS TO KEEP EQUIPMENT AND
SALES DATE ON FILE

Dale Reich, K8AD, of Seville Ohio, has petitioned the FCC to require
sellers of two-way voice or data equipment to keep on file a buyer's
name, address, telephone number and any future information.
This, when selling a radio that
required licensing under the current FCC rules.

Accordiong to an ARRL bulletin, the information collected
would remain private, available only to the FCC or law enforcement.
Reich said in his petition that any retail vendor would be able to ask
local police for an investigation if the retailer suspected the radios
were not going to be used in compliance with the law.

Included in the petition is a requirement for "ownership and license
tagging" for gear operating under Parts 5, 15, 18, 74, 80, 90,
95 and 97. In his petition, Reich said such tagging used to be
an FCC requirement and that his
proposed change was a needed tool for local law enforcement.

The full text of Reich's petitions is available on the FCC Web site. Search
for petition number RM-1064. (Coorection - It's RM-10641)

Comments are due no later than February 28th.
(K8AD, ARRL Letter)

2734. Re: Why I operate essentially 100% CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-23 23:15:50 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <GCc6a.236869$Ec4.242784@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 61767

Agree 110% Bill ....I operated pactor et al for about 14 years until my PK232 bit the dust ....I should get another as I really enjoyed the digital modes ...have been using the sound card stuff but I guess I am used to the 232.

God Bless 73 Tom nr Pittsburgh
"Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now> wrote in message news:Xns932B8E5D2F120pookster@216.168.3.50...
> "garigue" <garigue@attbi.com> wrote in news:MQ76a.230898$vm2.171917
> @rwcrnsc54:
>
> > Perhaps maybe perhaps to avoid this kind of crap???
> >
> > 73 God Bless KI3R Port Vue Pa. nr Pittsburgh
> >
> >
>
> ---
>
> If that's the reason, maybe you shoud try the digital modes. There's
> even less there - essentially zero.
>
> --
> Bill, W7TI

2735. Re: County Issuing Radio Licenses

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-23 23:17:18 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <v5ilm4elhin13c@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 61768
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.shortwave

Brian, when I worked in circuit control on Guam Island, there was a **very**
nasty blast from the Chief of Naval Operations concerning putting military
transmissions on 75 meters. Seems it is an international ham band. Someone
complained to the FCC. Hmmmm ... there **are** international treaties.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0302221658.49d90b39@posting.google.com...
> "Stan" <k6rmr@dslextreme.com> wrote in message
news:<v5droe6ns6el5f@corp.supernews.com>...
> > In 1934 The Congress of the United States gave
> > sole Authority to control and license all radio Transmissions
> > in the Country to the FCC.
> > Stan
>
> Cept military.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.456 / Virus Database: 256 - Release Date: 2/18/03

2736. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 01:11:51 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030223201151.11431.00000215@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 61769

>Your right, you're are a real joke.
>

Your Mama is a bigger joke

2737. Re: Petition for retail point-of-sales record keeping - transmitters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 01:22:24 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.has8i24.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 61770

On Sun, 23 Feb 2003 17:57:26 -0500, Bill Sohl wrote:

>Reich said in his petition that any retail vendor would be able to ask
>local police for an investigation if the retailer suspected the radios
>were not going to be used in compliance with the law.

Since when has investigation of purchase and possession of radio
ewuipment which has not been stolen been a function of local law
enforcement? It's bad enough that the Feingold Bill (now law) gave
them permission to investigate unlicensed "CB" -operation-.

>In his petition, Reich said such tagging used to be an FCC
>requirement and that his proposed change was a needed tool for local
>law enforcement.

Needed by -whom- ? Certainly not local law enforcement which has a
full plate and not enough funds to do it right at present.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2738. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 01:22:24 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.has81l3.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 61771

On 23 Feb 2003 18:21:57 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>I went on to EE school at age 18, and discovered that amateur radio
>background was a big help in EE. But it was only a beginning - there
>was a lot more to learn, of course. Radio is but a small part of
>electrical engineering.

I found the same thing - I got my first ham and commercial licebnses
a year before I entered engineering school and I founf that I could
"ace" the electronics courses and be a mentor to some of my classmates
very easily, but the "power" courses - generation, transmission,
distribution, and machine design and application - were the ones
that I had to put some work into.

Forty plus years later, not working in design in either field, I
remember the "power engineering" stuff very well - it helps that my
wife is a pro in the power utility engineering field and talks about
her work quite often to keep me current. I've had continuing "hands
on" professional experience in modern wire and radio communications
which keeps me current in the "electronics" part of electrical
engineering.

But the secret is the -interest- that I have in the field, whether
I'm paid for it or not.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

Retired and loving every minute of it....
Work was getting in the way of my hobbies

2739. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 01:22:24 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.has6be2.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 61772

[No readable article body recovered]

2740. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 01:52:08 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030223205208.04578.00000069@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 61773

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/22/03 12:18 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030222011812.26320.00000033@mb-fx.aol.com>

>>You were the one who started waving degrees around.
>
> Incorrect. Mr. N2EY was waving his certificates in here well
> before Shah entered the newsgroup.

Sorry Lennie. Jim's correct (again). Your "degree waving" predates him
by quite a bit. Google refers.

>>How would YOU structure the licenses, Vipul, given the following
>>facts:
>>
>>1) Currently, all amateur privileges above 30 MHz are granted with a
>>Tech license that has no code test.
>
> That's already been explained by the FCC in Part 97, Title 47 CFR.
>
> It does not require interpretation by Mr. N2EY.

Well, I guess it was bound to happen that Lennie the Liar started
answering questions put to Vippy the Vacillitating, however without really
answering the question put to him in the first place.

>>2) FCC says that the treaty requires a code test for any amatuer
>>license with HF/MF privileges.
>
> Error by omission. The FCC said in 1990 and again in 1999 that
> a morse code test does NOT serve any purpose for them in
> determining license qualifications for amateur radio. See FCC
> 90-53 and FCC 99-412.

What "omission", Your Scumminess?

Regardless of what the FCC has stated thier opinion is on the need for
code testiong, they have also staed that they will honor the treaty.

No omission. It's a fact.

>Note: The FCC grants amateur licenses and ARRL is NOT part
> of the US Administration that votes at WRCs.

What part of Jim's statement was this meant to address, Lennie? He didn't
address it, so why did you feel compelled to say this?

> Do you still beat your wife?

Do you still sleep with yours?

>>Tell us how YOU would solve the problem and not violate the
>>constraints.
>
> Mr. N2EY considers an international treaty "constraints?"

Why not, Your Putziness? YOU do.

>>Whether the TEST is a necessary requirement is a different thing.
>
> "It's the LAW!"

Well Mr Sworn Defender Of The Flag And Rear Area Radio Hero, WHAT PART of obeying the law do YOU have a problem with?

>The subject is the MORSE CODE TEST, not the entire written
> test elements. Try to stay focussed.

The subject is AMATEUR RADIO POLICY, Lennie. A subject in which you repeatedly demonstrate a state of confusion about.

Of course if you were a licensed, ACTIVE Amateur Radio operator you might have SOME understanding of what youa re TRYING to talk about.

>Mr. N2EY would probably want it exactly as ARRL wants it.

I sure would like to see from which one of Jim's posts you glraned that one, Your Lameness.

>>Give us some examples of courses that were irrelevant.
>
> This is not an academic institution newsgroup. It is an
> institution of amateurs

Lennie-to-English translation: "Uh-oh...How do I duck out of this one?"

>The FCC is not an academic institution and the amateur radio
> license test is not an academic test

But as demonstrated before (with references to established secondary education facilities within spitting distance of Lennie's hole) the Amateur License MAY confer college credit as an elective.

>Everyone understands why Mr. N2EY *loves* morsemanship
> so much.

If Morsemanship means NOT being like Lennie and Company, sign me up!

>What problem? There's a problem?

Hard to see clearly with your head up there, eh Your Craniorecatllyinvertedness...?!?!

>I don't see Mr. N2EY describing his work in any detail. Isn't
> he proud of his work? Why keep silent with so much pride?

We see what SML (*) does with such information.

Ya Putz.

Steve

(*) New RRAP artist ScumMasterLennie

2741. Re: Petition for retail point-of-sales record keeping - transmitters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 02:07:52 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <Y7f6a.232660$HN5.998353@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 61774

We will just keep a little list at the federal. state and local levels just to be sure. No harm in that right ???? Besides we could give a lot of bureaucrats jobs ....who knows in time we could weave this into der Vaterland Sekurity bill. Then there would be a need for more bureaucrats to be armed members of the Peoples Radio Police. This will surely get those ingrates off of our frequencies. In fact I think that there might be a place for the ARRL in all of this. Paid radio informers ....neat idea ...maybe have a continuing ed class in monitoring and enforcement. You know that as a service we can get downright creative with all of this maybe even to the point where we can keep the news media "jumping" in between our acts of God duties.

I had an occasion a number of years ago to have a fellow over for dinner who was from Africa. He was and is a well educated professional. After dinner I invited him to se my radio room. He said he really enjoyed radio programs at home. I wish I would have had a camera to save the expression on his face when the light went on. It was fear ... bordering on panic. I thought something was wrong. He asked immediately if the authorities knew of this. It then hit me how blessed we really are here in America. One only has to look at the inroads on our freedoms especially in the 2nd amendment area to get a picture of what "well meaning" government help is.

God Bless and save us from ourselves ....

73 Tom KI3R Port Vue Pa. nr Pittsburgh
"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.has8i24.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On Sun, 23 Feb 2003 17:57:26 -0500, Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> >Reich said in his petition that any retail vendor would be able to ask
> >local police for an investigation if the retailer suspected the radios
> >were not going to be used in compliance with the law.
>
> Since when has investigation of purchase and possession of radio
> ewuipment which has not been stolen been a function of local law
> enforcement? It's bad enough that the Feingold Bill (now law) gave
> them permission to investigate unlicensed "CB" -operation-.
>
> >In his petition, Reich said such tagging used to be an FCC
> >requirement and that his proposed change was a needed tool for local
> >law enforcement.
>
> Needed by -whom- ? Certainly not local law enforcement which has a
> full plate and not enough funds to do it right at present.
>

> ---
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>

2742. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 02:12:14 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030223211214.05573.00001115@mb-mh.aol.com>
Source record: 61784

In article <2FDC07BD4F914DDA.A5065375F3EEEABC.218DE52BA0D82195@lp.airnews.net>,
"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>Jackie: He's been begging for someone to "prove theirself" to him ever since
>I found this newsgroup--probably before that. I envision Larry as a very
>lonely person because of it. But, he's too arrogant to get it... He also
>is under the delusion that those whom he attacks are truly offended or upset
>by him. That's the *real* joke...

"Nobody takes him seriously..." :-)

2743. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 02:12:14 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030223211214.05573.00001114@mb-mh.aol.com>
Source record: 62051

In article <20030223132157.25154.00000483@mb-cb.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (Mr. N2EY the Extra Pedant) writes:

>In article <8765rbw0j1.fld@barrow.com>, Floyd Davidson <floyd@ptialaska.net>
>writes:
>
>>I've been reading this thread, and frankly it is not amusing at
>>all. I've been licensed as KL7GPS for awhile and thought
>>amateur radio might be something to take up as a hobby now that
>>I'm retired (from a professional career in communications, which
>>included both commercial radiotelegraph and radiotelephone
>>licenses).
>>
>>I haven't gotten around to putting together a rig to get on the
>>air, and this type of exchange is cause to question whether it
>>would be worth the bother.
>
>Don't let take this NG as a representative sample of what you'll encounter on
>the air. It's not.

Unfortunately, that isn't that true. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

>>It's a hobby folks. Those tests are *all* meaningless to anyone
>>who has worked in the field. Someone mentioned getting an Extra
>>Class at age 16 and that it was tougher than a 1st Phone.
>
>That was me who got the Extra at 16. FCC office, 20 wpm send and receive, 2
>years as an Advanced, secret tests, yada yada yada. Big deal, that was just
>one
>accomplishment. Which was not unusual at all back then anyway, there were 12
>year old Extras in those days.

No four-year-olds aided, I mean, proctored by kindly grandfatherly VEs?

>The "tougher than the First Phone" thing was a quote from an FCC examiner.

Surrrre it was, long-timer.

>>I had
>>a 1st Phone at age 16, but by age 20 I'd met at least a dozen
>>people who'd been to a 6 week school that taught that test, and
>>even though they didn't understand a bit of electronics, they
>>were just as legal (and frankly at least a useful to the boss)
>>for standing a transmitter watch as I was! I can't see either
>>the Extra test or the 1st Phone as significant... compared to

>>something like working in a modern telecommunications center.
>
>I went on to EE school at age 18, and discovered that amateur radio background
>was a big help in EE. But it was only a beginning - there was a lot more to
>learn, of course. Radio is but a small part of electrical engineering.

So...do we assume you've never worked professionally in radio?

All we've heard is Jimmie's profession...never where he has
worked. Nothing. Zip. Nada.

>>As for code, the military could teach the average GI to read
>>code at 35 wpm, so I can't see much significance to that either,
>>except that it required time and dedication that nobody except a
>>GI just out of boot camp is likely to have once they reach age
>>18 or so.
>
>The "toughest" code test ever required for a US ham license was 20 wpm plain
>language, needing one minute solid copy out of five minutes. By professional
>or serious amateur standards, that's not very much skill at all, compared to
>what is expected in the real world. Such tests are all gone, anyway.

The US military never took "average" recruits for morse code
telegraphy. Since WW2 days they gave them an aptitude
test. Those showing no or little aptitude got sent to other
military schools.

There is NO "boot camp" in the US Army or USAF. Such is
Basic Training.

There IS morse code cognition training currently in the US
military...at Fort Huachuca as several courses in the Military
Intelligence school (enlisted, warrants, commissioned). The
rates are higher than 20 WPM there. All students are tested
during and after training. Civilian intercept operators for the
US government are trained at Fort Huachuca as well.

>>I personally like that idea of an Elmer. It's a hobby, it is
>>*supposed* to be fun. And it is when people at various levels
>>get together and exchange ideas, help each other, and generally
>>do whatever part of it they are capable of enjoying.
>
>Which goes on all over the place. Try reading the Elecraft or Glowbug
>reflectors - all sorts of folks helping each other out with information,
>experience, parts sources, etc.

Try doing actual designing instead of just mods or bragging
or kit-building...

>>I'd suggest the Larry and Dick dump the chip on the shoulder
>>routine.
>>
>Let's say, just for the point of argument, that those old tests really were

>tougher/more comprehensive/whatever than today's tests. (There's no really
>objective way to tell, because we don't have the old tests available for
>comparison anyway!)

I'd suggest that Larry and Dick dump the chips on their
shoulders as seconding the motion...

> We still have the following situations:
>
>- It's not the "fault" of new hams that today's tests and test methods are not
>like the old ones.

Class distinction is still very much rooted in the US amateur
psyche and some long-timers are demonstratably bragging
about their "superiority" as extras over all lesser life forms.

That is the major situation. Now. On-air, off-air.

>- Both the old and new tests were not comprehensive EE-level exams, but rather
>a compilation of things FCC thought to be important for licensees to know.
>That's true for both the commercial and amateur exams

The FCC was NEVER an academic institution.

NONE of the radio operator license tests, commercial or
amateur, were ever any academic tests. NEVER.

>- (This one's the biggie) There's little chance we'll go back to the old way
of
>taking the exams. We're pretty much stuck with the VE system, so we might as
>well make the best of it.

Write when you get work...

2744. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 02:12:15 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030223211215.05573.00001116@mb-mh.aol.com>
Source record: 61792

In article <20030223080637.25403.00000521@mb-fm.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <3E58605C.41600DD8@att.net>, Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
>writes:
>
>>In fact the FCC examiner who administered my Extra told me at that time
>>that the Extra written was generally acknowledged to be a tougher test than
>the
>>First Phone - which I already had passed several years previously. And that
>>examiner was the FCC's District Engineer for the Kansas City district.
>(Before
>>some wag signs in insisting that District Engineers don't lower themselves
>to
>>administering tests - that one did. He made a point of it. He was an Extra
>class
>>ham himself and an EE to boot).
>
>>I don't see any way that anyone could have ever made such a statement
>>concerning the Extra class written I took in '69. There was a whole lot of
>quite
>>advanced and involved radio theory that demanded considerable
>>comprehensive learning of complex material. Definitely way beyond entry
>level.
>
>
>Hmmm.. I passed the Extra in 1970 at the age of 16. Tougher than the First
>Phone......

:-) Prove that conclusively. Show your work. :-)

>Next time somebody starts waving their First Phone around...

Oooooo...do I detect some vexation and anxiety, old-timer?

>
>>Then we have geniuses like Slim Burke to offer up as genuine, current
>>evidence.
>
>Only if you take him seriously, which many of us don't. After all, he can't
>or won't answer these simple questions about his alleged T5 operation:
>
>What callsign was used?
>What rigs and antennas were used?
>Who did the equipment belong to?
>What amateur bands and modes were used?

>What countries and continents were worked?
>How were the QSLs delivered?
>
>Simple, straightforward questions, but you'll not see a simple,
>straightforward answer to any of them.

"You don't need to know."

Let us know if you find work, long-timer. Then we will find out
in what part of the electrical industry you work in... :-)

2745. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 02:12:16 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030223211216.05573.00001117@mb-mh.aol.com>
Source record: 61783

In article <3E5857D1.9090608@mailcity.moc>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
writes:

>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>> Therefore, the
>> Extra Lites have to prove themselves to ME.
>
>No experienced ham, new ham, or prospective ham has to prove
>ANYTHING to you, they don't even owe you the time of day.

Well, for the sake of a local paratranit (bus) organization,
someone ought to tell him at least the time of day. :-)

Without that, all the bus (paratransit) schedules would have to
be transmitted in morse code... :-)

2746. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 02:12:16 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030223211216.05573.00001118@mb-mh.aol.com>
Source record: 61791

In article <20030222235242.09921.00002315@mb-md.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>I'm not really one tiny bit concerned about my "superiority" over any other >ham at any level.

Of course...you are intrinsically "superior" to others.

That has been demonstrated time after time after time...

> However, I and many others in this newsgroup have >had to endure over a decade of whining and complaining by people who >want full amateur privileges but are totally disinterested in learning and >developing simple, practical communications skills.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. There's no need for telegraphy skills in using two tin cans and a string. [that's wire-less...]

Since 1990 and FCC 90-53 (easily over a decade) the FCC must be one of the "whiners," then. :-)

>Therefore, the Extra Lites have to prove themselves to ME.

Ooooooooooo! The God of Radio has spoken! :-)

>Nobody else seems to >want to "judge" them, for the sake of political correctness, but I'm up to >the task!

Yeah! Make them ride in the back of your bus!

2747. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 02:12:17 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030223211217.05573.00001119@mb-mh.aol.com>
Source record: 61775

In article <20030222180615.23598.00000437@mb-fz.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>Fortunately, folks like that are relatively few on rrap. Many of us have
>learned not to take them seriously.

Of course...they are beneath you...

2748. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 02:12:18 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030223211218.05573.00001121@mb-mh.aol.com>
Source record: 61785

In article <3E56C140.56F3591B@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3E553338.C2DE600C@earthlink.net>...
>> > N2EY wrote:

>Selling my dad wasn't easy.

What a terrible thing, selling your own father! Tsk, tsk, tsk.

Slavery and the sale of human beings has been illegal since
1865. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

Get a good price?

>...and I was under parental edict to ensure that everything was off
>before we left the house to go anywhere after my one and only incident.

Before or after selling your father?

2749. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 02:12:18 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030223211218.05573.00001120@mb-mh.aol.com>
Source record: 61794

In article <3E57E82F.2EE444A5@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <3E553338.C2DE600C@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:

>> Poor baby. Way back in time he got his snow job melted...all
>> about using CW as an order-wire for an RTTY circuit in some
>> small embassy (?) in the middle of Africa in the 1980s.
>
>You mean the order wire circuit which you claimed on numerous occasions
>that I had originated--the one I corrected about repeatedly? That claim
>of yours was pasted by a repost from the Google archives. Watch out for
>those six-year-olds waving the straight keys around. You could get
>hurt.

If an RTTY radio circuit has such bad performance that you
need manual telegraphy through OOK CW to communicate
schedules and orders, then it will not be a good RTTY circuit
for regular traffic. It should become an OOK CW circuit
instead.

If an RTTY radio circuit is passing TTY messages fine in
regular traffic, then it doesn't need any OOK CW for
schedules and orders in order-wire use.

That's logical. One or the other.

Even in the 1980s other HF radio users didn't do such illogical
procedures. Only, has the Oberst explained, the "State
Department."

>
>> I'll rank his radio expertise with those "seven hostile action"
>> heroes.
>
>What do you know about my radio expertise?

No one is impressed...except by getting away with a cushy
job with the government and sent to exotic locales such as
Guinea-Bisseau.

>> Forget sending those cashews. You're nuts.
>

>I never planned to send you any cashews and never stated that I would do so.
>Which one of us is nuts?

You still are.

2750. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 02:12:19 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030223211219.05573.00001122@mb-mh.aol.com>
Source record: 61799

In article <c2356669.0302211343.4abdd92c@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (Mr. N2EY the Pedant) writes:

>Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3E553338.C2DE600C@earthlink.net>...
>> N2EY wrote:
>>
>> > Great story! Here's some of mine (you started this, Bert!).....
>> >
>> > First experience with homebrew radio was building a "foxhole" set from
>> > instructions found in a thrift-store book, "All About Radio and
>> > Television".
>>
>> Still have the book?
>
>Somewhere. Doesn't matter, I memorized the plans long ago. 120 turns
>#26 enameled on cardboard tube, white razor blade, safety pin,
>graphite from a #2 pencil. High impedance phones, coupla nails and
>thumbtacks, bit of wood for a base.

High technology, state of the amateur radio art?

>
>> I made one from the very same book and later
>> modified it with a store-bought diode. Until our local station went on
>> the air, all I heard was WOWO in Fort Wayne, a pretty good haul from
>> southern West Virginia.
>
>Fort Wayne Indiana?

That's in the United States of America.

Large electronics company there manufactures the SINCGARS
radios for the US military. Ever hear of those? A quarter
million of the sets built since 1989. Uses frequency-hopping
spread spectrum.

Have you "implemented" such a thing?

>If I'd had parnets like that I'd have been licensed years earlier. How
>old were ya when the Novice license arrived? For me it was October 14,
>1967.

Were "parnets" available from the Allied catalog?

>> Trees are made to be climbed.
>

>Yup.

Something new from the Radio Gods. Everyone else considers
trees are meant to survive to make more trees...

>I never left anything on for just that reason!

No need. "CW gets through...etc."

>> It makes perfect sense if you're a fellow with half a century of
>> PROFESSIONAL experience and you're embarrassed to be shown up by a bunch
>> of telegraph key wielding CHILDREN!
>
>HAW!!!

...and some of them are still CHILDREN psychologically...and
unemployed.

>But it's been possible to get a ham license in the USA for over a
>dozen years now with no code test at all.

It's been possible to transmit voice on the 11m Citizens Band
without any sort of license for twice as long a time...

2751. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 02:12:20 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030223211220.05573.00001123@mb-mh.aol.com>
Source record: 61800

In article <d22b54c3.0302221859.3fa300c9@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Katapult Kellie) writes:

>> > no field
>> > within electricity or electronics mentioned, yet Mr. N2EY
>> > gave talks to industry according to himself and his bosom
>> > buddy Kellie.
>
>Pssst, hey Putz, here's a hint: Jim recently implemented Spread
>Spectrum comms on at least one of the recent projects he's managed.
>When was the last time YOU implemented any kind of radio comms?

"Implemented?!?" :-)

Spread spectrum technology has been around for over 20 years.

It wasn't "implemented recently." :-)

5 GHz cordless telephones using frequency-hopping spread spectrum are now on the consumer electronics market. Did the pedantic parson "implement" those?

>Ummm . . In what current radio publication and/or
>industrial/military/hobby radio organization website is there even a
>mention of the Putz?

Some kind of website for nurses...

2752. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 02:12:21 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030223211221.05573.00001124@mb-mh.aol.com>
Source record: 61798

In article <20030222140633.12173.00000652@mb-mr.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (Mr. N2EY the Pedant) writes:

>>>> > Tsk, tsk, tsk, it's a mystery to me why someone who is an
>>>> > amateur will hide his profession. :-)
>>>
>>>Who does that? Can't be me. My profession has been reported here
>>>several times. Here it is again:
>>>
>>>I'm an electrical engineer. I've been employed full time in design
>>>(and a few other EE-related activities) since graduation from college.
>>
>> In what field of electricity or electronics? Table lamp design?
>> Spaceship control systems? Miniature R/C cars? Power
>> transmission? Industrial control electric things? $3.50 AC
>> outlet strips with built-in surge protectors?
>
>You don't need to know, Len. Electrical engineering is my profession, and
>it's not hidden, so you could not have been talking about me anyway.

To have a profession implies being professional, of having an
income derived from someone or some entity receiving those
professional services.

Without any evidence of employment or no one receiving
professional services, we can consider you unemployed.

>> No company mentioned (for various fearfull reasons),
>
>"Fearfull"? Of what? Certainly not you, Len. I don;t even take you seriously,
>let alone fear you or any thing you could do.

Yes you are. I manage to sully that careful image of the
pedantic radio guru-wannabe that you try to cultivate.

Being unemployed is not a crime. Feel free to admit it.

>> no field
>> within electricity or electronics mentioned, yet Mr. N2EY
>> gave talks to industry according to himself and his bosom
>> buddy Kellie.
>
>"Talks"? Where do you get such ideas, Len?

Messages in this newsgroup.

>> Excuse me, Mr. Kellie. Talks about what?
>
>You don't need to know, Len.

Military stealth technology? How can one "give talks to
industry" when they are not employed by any industry?

Is this one of those secret navy intelligence things involving
photography of over-flying USSR military bombers?

>>>> > Must be some schizoid fantasy thing going around... :-)
>>>
>>>lessee...who needs multiple screen names?
>>
>> Why does AOL make them available? :-)
>
>So that different family members can use the same account yet retain
>different
>email accounts and online identities. For some reason, you need multiple
>identities to deal with ham radio. Could the reason be that you are afraid of
>something? Sure seems like it.

Oh, my, got a post-graduate degree in psychology too? :-)

Of course...EVERYONE has to have just ONE screen name
on any ISP, right? Did Case tell you this in-person? :-)

Is this screen name a "multiple" in this newsgroup?

Why did you insist and insist on a "signature" at the end of each
message when no newsgroup software allows anything to be
hand-written, just typed? Can you spell over-restrictive and
anal-retentive?

>> Poor baby.
>
>Hmmm... I get called 'baby', 'boy', and 'old fart'......Ageist,
>racist..........

"Poor baby" is a mild sarcasm that can be used against a
pedant with some anal-retentivity. It is common in American
English use.

>> My full USPS mailing address was in every byline
>> in Ham Radio magazine. Same in BYTE.
>
>Both of which are now defunct, are they not? If not, where can I buy the
>March, 2003 issue of Ham Radio fanzine?

All 22 years of Ham Radio articles are available on 3 CDs from
CQ and resold by ARRL for $150. Shipping charges EXTRA with
ARRL direct orders.

Ham Radio magazine quit publication in 1990 on the sale of
the parent company (Communications Technology, Inc.) to CQ.

CQ reorganized the assets of Communications Technology into
the Ham Radio Bookstore (still existing) and the formation of
Communications Quarterly magazine.

While Ham Radio is no longer being published monthly, it did
not disappear, vanish, or become absent in any way. The
three CDs prove that. Good information does not become
"defunct" like burned-out vacuum tubes.

>My full name and address in every US Callbook and CD-ROM since 1968, and are
>on
>the FCC database. Did you have trouble accessing the database to find my
>name?

No, but the information does not reveal your field of industry or
profession, either. :-)

I'll have to get a CIA World Factbook and check out if you are
listed in there, involved in stealth technology. :-)

>His hobby is wasting time....

Lots of offended beings waste their time replying, don't they? :-)

2753. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 02:12:23 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030223211223.05573.00001125@mb-mh.aol.com>
Source record: 61797

In article <3E5652A1.65D2C4DB@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> In article <G545a.187100$HN5.815085@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net>, "Jackie"
>> <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> writes:
>>
>> >"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>> >news:20030220021035.29944.00000027@mb-fi.aol.com...
>> >
>> >> "It's the LAW!" Right. Laws in force now cannot ever
>> >> be changed, cannot be talked about (absolutely never
>> >> by those without official authorized licenses!). Yup.
>> >
>> >Who sez?
>>
>> Heh...that phrase "It's the LAW!" turns up from time to
>> time in here, written by several. It's the "turf" mentality
>> of the old-timers.
>
>The turf in question is amateur radio, in which we are participants and
>in which you are not a participant.

...and I suppose you think you "own" your own callsign, too?

>
>> You, specifically, haven't written that, but others have. I'd
>> mention DejaNews but that is "defunct." :-) Google
>> bought out DejaNews. Google has most of the past
>> messages in newsgroups. Some of the regulars in here
>> virtually live there, virtual ego bruisings very painful,
>> demanding some sort of retribution or at least a chance
>> at more virtual combat. :-)
>
>Recent quotes posted here from the Google site reveal the ego which has
>been bruised to be yours.

Incorrect. Oberst Heil cannot take corrections or advice on
professional (non-amateur) radio procedure and tries to
misdirect the subject into one of "belonging to participants."

>> Some even go so far as to virtually claim ownership of an
>> activity, including the alleged authority to rule on who is
>> allowed to express opinions. They have no authority but
>> demand obeyance or they will meet the dissenters after
>> school is over and beat them up. :-)
>

>To state that I am a participant in amateur radio while you are not is
>just the iteration of a fact and has not been construed by any others as
>a statement of ownership of amateur radio.

The above is an example of "turf" claims.

>I don't demand anything of you.

Nonsense. Oberst Heil DEMANDS all the time, refuses to
acknowledge correction of professional (non-amateur) radio
procedures and techniques, then tries to misdirect the
subject to something else.

>You've been free to post your rants for quite a number of years.
>I've been laughing at them for years.

No. Oberst Heil, like a good prussian, has very little sense
of humor outside his inner circle of "participators."

>> All that about a hobby. :-)
>
>(...in which you have no stake.)

But the Oberst has a very large stake, one that is on fire for
burning heretics to "cleanse their spirit of evil."

There shall be NO dissent in the ranks. All shall obey the
correctness of the Oberst in all radio things, not just the
amateur ones.

2754. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 02:12:24 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030223211224.05573.00001126@mb-mh.aol.com>
Source record: 61786

In article <f45722ac.0302210503.716575a8@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> >> > Anything else you would like me to pass on to Len?
>> >>
>> >> No, you'd likely get it screwed up too.
>> >
>> >Just like you to jump to conclusions.
>>
>> Pssst...mention the cashews... :-)
>
>Dave, I've got a message for you from Len: "Cashews."

I don't think it does any good. The Oberst only listens to
what he wants to hear. He is not good about taking advice.
He is above such things.

2755. Re: New Field Day Entry Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 02:12:25 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030223211225.05573.00001127@mb-mh.aol.com>
Source record: 61788

In article <20030221104931.16405.00000042@mb-cs.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Sgt Putz the Diss Washer in Hunland) writes:

>>He's "in" amateur radio. Like "turf," man...don' boddah da Hood
>> bout whut dey gots as 'hood rights! Dey RULEZ!
>
> Well, so far this week you've "dissed" veterans, nurses, bus drivers,
>CBer's, Amateurs, volunteers, doctors and NOW you're "going ethnic".

Not "dissed." The only ones "dissed" were the same obsessive-compulsive beings who continually insult others not of their breed.

> Is there any possible indignity that you WON'T submit anyone to just
>because it fits YOUR needs at the moment?

?

What "needs?" I have no need to fight personalities. I see some beings in here who are obsessive-compulsive about fighting others who do not share their opinions.

They sometimes get back what they attempt to throw at others, then they get oh, so angry at shooting back. Poor babies.

2756. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 02:12:25 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030223211225.05573.00001128@mb-mh.aol.com>
Source record: 61790

In article <20030221122537.19498.00000034@mb-mj.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Sgt Attilla D.I. Ham) shouts out::

> I was wondering what that loud "BANG" sound was, but I see it was just
>the hammer hitting the mail squarely on the head.

Poor baby...hearing things that aren't there...must be all that prolonged beeping... [mail call!!! :-)]

> "DO" apply, Dave!
>
> Maybe we need to get Mrs. Lennie out of her self-induced coma and have
>her instruct The Putzy One on the meanings of "pathological liar" and
>"Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder".

No need, little creature. My wife is observant and reasoning, had a license to practice counseling in Washington, and was stuck with all those disturbed military people there (Bremerton, Lewis, etc.). YOU fit the label you try to pin on others. QED.

> Not that is would help, but at least we could say we tried.....

No. You haven't "tried." You and the Oberst are only trying.

Very trying.

And tiring...

2757. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 02:12:26 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030223211226.05573.00001130@mb-mh.aol.com>
Source record: 61776

In article <3E5657B7.CA553FE5@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>I had to wait for my laughter to subside before I could even comment on
>this one. Nice that you gave Steve a spelling lesson. Has it dawned on
>you that, while the word does have two "T"s, it only has one "L"?
>Attila, Foghorn.

Find a reputable Hun English teacher and prove it, Oberst.

What is the alphabet of the Hun language? Were you in the
"foreign service" in Hun land?

2758. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 02:12:26 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030223211226.05573.00001129@mb-mh.aol.com>
Source record: 61777

In article <20030221121510.19463.00000032@mb-mj.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Attilla the Heilian Ham) tries to write:

You are not a moderator of this newsgroup, have no authority to moderate it, cannot change it despite all the hundreds of epithets you have posted here

...and fails. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

2759. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 02:12:27 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030223211227.05573.00001132@mb-mh.aol.com>
Source record: 61780

In article <20030221113345.16405.00000049@mb-cs.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Sgt Attlla Putz the medal man) writes:

>
>
> ERROR WILL ROBINSON! ERROR!
>
> There is a ribbon for the PUC.
>
>>A Presidential Unit Citation is not a ribbon. Unit Citations are a
>> part of the uniform of all unit members, the same as all identifying
>> insignia of that unit
>
> Not at least since the 1970's, Lennie. The PUC is a ribbon.

For disputes with US Army awards and honors of the past, go to the US Army Historical Center. For disputes with awards to units in the past, go to the US Army Adjutant General.

2760. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 02:12:27 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030223211227.05573.00001131@mb-mh.aol.com>
Source record: 61787

In article <3E56566B.8DCCFB5B@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>That you have lied a number of times has been demonstrated through a
>number of Google reposts and through offering the offering of urls and
>quotes from web pages which all disprove various claims made on a
>repeated basis by you. I would not be inclined to accept as truth, the
>statements of someone who has repeatedly told lies in the past.

Poor baby...you will NEVER ever accept any correction on
government radio procedure or trying to pull a snow job on
the rest of the readers in here, will you? :-)

Well, it's a good thing the US government no longer has you on
some embassy or counsulate staff. Good for the USA, that is...

2761. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 02:12:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030223211228.05573.00001133@mb-mh.aol.com>
Source record: 61779

In article <3E56536D.1DE84A8D@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>You never did tell us, Len. To which ethnic minority do you belong?

It's a majority, Herr Oberst...the rest of the human race not
afflicted with this sense of ethnic cleansing to keep US amateur
radio sacred, held to the thoughts of those already licensed
in it.

You must have the same problems with property as Attilla.
Poor guy...thinks he "owns" judgemental edicts in a
newsgroup.

2762. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 02:12:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030223211228.05573.00001134@mb-mh.aol.com>
Source record: 61781

In article <20030221110738.16405.00000048@mb-cs.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Attilla the Owned Ham) writes:

> They took the post down, Lennie, but I still have the screen name if I >want it.

Do you "own" that screen name, too? :-) :-) :-)

How much would you still "own" after you lost a civil court case of libel and had to pay damages?

AOL took that libelous HOME PAGE down, not your "post."

You do NOT "own" your own home page...you are only paying a lease for services. AOL owns the home pages.

You have a LOT of problems with property ownership.
Tsk, tsk, tsk.

2763. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 02:12:29 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030223211229.05573.00001136@mb-mh.aol.com>
Source record: 61778

In article <20030221110118.16405.00000045@mb-cs.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Attilla the Hummmmmm) writes:

>>Who is this "Vippy," Attilla?
>
> Who's "Atilla", Your Scuminess?

His reflection is in your monitor. :-)

2764. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 02:12:29 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030223211229.05573.00001135@mb-mh.aol.com>
Source record: 61795

In article <20030221110550.16405.00000046@mb-cs.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Sgt Attilla Putz) writes:

> You keep making this insinuation that I said I was a doctor, Lennie, yet >have never provided a cite of a post wherein I said I was.

Okay, I'll agree...you are definitely NOT a medical doctor.

You are a candy.

A life-saver...complete with a void in the center...but the sour flavor version.

> More lying. The days are getting longer again, and so is the list of >things you have yet again manufactured for your own satisfaction.

Your time is getting short despite the tilt in the earth's axis.

Three decades a ham with your "own callsign" and you haven't learned anything about electronics-radio theory? Tsk, tsk, tsk.

You've learned to read ads in QST and you've learned how to count money...so that you could pay for "your own station" to use with the callsign you "own" (but really don't). Give you credit for that, Dr. Pasteur, but you haven't learned to pasteurize any human milk-of-kindness yet...it keeps turning sour.

> Shame, shame, shame......

Now, now, now...shaking your finger at your own monitor?

Tsk, tsk, tsk.

2765. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 02:12:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030223211230.05573.00001137@mb-mh.aol.com>
Source record: 61796

In article <20030221105631.16405.00000043@mb-cs.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Sgt Attilla Putz) writes:

>>> And what can you do with it RIGHT NOW, other than be compensated for
>>>your time, that I can't do with my Amateur Extra?
>>
>> Be a professional...be a human being...?
>
> I'd need to get a sample of your blood to test the "human" part. If you
>told me the sky was blue and the grass was green, I'd have to look and be
>sure.

We all know how "expert" you medical folks are about blood typing.

That was just one case. How many more are there not yet reported?

>> I have some suggestions on what you can do with yours
>
> I am sure you would, but I'd STILL be able to get on the band of my
>choice, in the mode of my choice, when I want.

Poor baby, has only a limited number of bands and modes as an amateur...but he remains defiant on "choice." :-)

> Oh yes...And with my OWN 1 x 2 callsign.

Oh, my, yes, a walking radio station with his very own callsign!

Isn't that Sgt Putz' objective to enter amateur radio...be someone that few other humans are?

Better get one of those shiny radio-kop badges with that "own callsign" to impress everyone when away from that raddio.

Oh...and don't look now, but you don't really "own" that whoopie-do callsign...you've only got permission to use it from the government. It's a grant from them, not your property. FCC can take it away from you if they see fit to do so, ex-marine or not.

2766. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 02:12:31 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030223211231.05573.00001138@mb-mh.aol.com>
Source record: 61782

In article <f45722ac.0302231245.f5e9cb0@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
>news:<d22b54c3.0302221911.70355fdc@posting.google.com>...
>
>> Includes the complete irrelevance attached to posting experience in
>> baby-sitting Army RTTY repeaters over a half century ago as some kinda
>> "credentials". Except more so.
>>
>> w3rv
>
>Sounds like "-real- military experience" to me. Got any?

Sigh...I sense another snow job catapulting in like the last
"navy intelligence photo mission." We must bear up...

2767. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 02:12:31 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030223211231.05573.00001139@mb-mh.aol.com>
Source record: 61789

In article <d22b54c3.0302221911.70355fdc@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>Includes the complete irrelevance attached to posting experience in
>baby-sitting Army RTTY repeaters over a half century ago as some kinda
>"credentials". Except more so.

Poor baby, still suffering catapult over-pressure?

I never "baby-sat" any Army TTYs. That was in tape relay at Chuo Kogyo. Poor guy never has seen any torn-tape TTY relay in operation, has he? Too bad, no US military branch has them anymore...doesn't need them.

Kellie doesn't understand that real, high-power (up to 40 KW) HF transmitters at a station are NOT "repeaters." They were not such a half century ago, still not so.

2768. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 02:12:32 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030223211232.05573.00001140@mb-mh.aol.com>
Source record: 61793

In article <f45722ac.0302221623.21c78fdd@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20030222140633.12173.00000653@mb-mr.aol.com>...
>
>> I prefer to think they are simply "not serious". Just like ol' Cecil, who
swore
>> he'd never get an Extra...
>
>First you'se guys incessantly "encourage" lower class hams to upgrade,
>then complain when they do.

Jimmie must think he is "giving talks to industry" again when
he mentions all that class distinction.

Jimmie also wants folks never, ever to change their minds about
anything once they said something in the past. It's almost like
one can't take the guy seriously...

2769. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 02:21:13 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E5981A6.3080507@adelphia.net>
Source record: 62052

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> In article <3E57B711.7060702@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
> writes:
>
>
>> <more snippage>
>>
>> Okay Larry.
>>
>> If you were sincere, allow me to note what I think.
>>
>> Aside from my physical problems that interfered somewhat with my Morse
>>code takeup, the tests weren't that hard. Unless the earlier tests were
>>many orders of magnitude harder, I'm still not impressed with how hard
>>they were.
>>
>> They were and always have been entry level tests, and to guage
>>superiority by comparing one to the other is amusing. The tests are
>>first grade stuff. If you want to fell superior to others based on what
>>you did in first grade, well then go ahead.
>>
>> I'll judge hams on what they did afterwards.
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>
> Mike:
>
> In a way, you helped me make my point. The Pre-Restructuring license
> tests WERE "first-grade" stuff compared to what an experienced radio
> amateur should know after even a few years of operating time.The problem
> that I'm addressing is the fact that a lot of prospective Entry-Level hams
> have been whining about the licensing requirements, particularly code
> testing, in spite of the fact that compared to the knowledge required
> of professional electronic communicators, they ARE quite basic. Anyone
> with a rudimentary understanding of electronics could most likely get
> a passing score on the "theory" simply by applying common sense.
>
> I'm not really one tiny bit concerned about my "superiority" over any other
> ham at any level. However, I and many others in this newsgroup have
> had to endure over a decade of whining and complaining by people who
> want full amateur privileges but are totally disinterested in learning and
> developing simple, practical communications skills. Therefore, the

> Extra Lites have to prove themselves to ME.

Not that I have to prove anything, but I'm on the BOD of my local club, I am a major participant in field day in the area, controlling the GOTA station and working the late shift. (we were second in our class in FD last year)I run the club website and am involved with the PAQSO party. I help at all the public service events for the club, and make every piece of equipment that I can for my shack. I help at the local ARRL kid's day efforts, and other recruiting efforts we do.

What do you do for the ARS?

- Mike KB3EIA -

2770. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 02:39:57 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3E5985FD.C8F86FEC@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 62053

N2EY wrote:

>
> In case I forgot to mention it at the time: Congrats on your upgrade! Hope you
> are enjoying the new privileges.
>

Thanks. HF is a lot of fun. Most of my hamming is on HF nowadays.

73s

2771. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 02:42:41 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3E5986A1.4B351D62@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 62054

N2EY wrote:

> . There was even a proposal sent to the FCC to grandfather all hams
> who held General, Conditional or Advanced back then to Extra. Good heavens...

How about those that held CB licenses back then? :-) :-) :-)

2772. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 03:02:52 UTC
From: KB9TMP <kb9tmp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <v5j2rg137b05a1@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 62055

"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:2FDC07BD4F914DDA.A5065375F3EEEABC.218DE52BA0D82195@lp.airnews.net...
> "Jackie" <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> wrote in message
> news:rv66a.230004$be.204752@rwcrnsc53...
> > > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > >
> > > Therefore, the
> > > Extra Lites have to prove themselves to ME.
> > >
> > Hahah! You really need to take a bottle of Get Over Yourself. If you
> don't
> > want to talk to newer Extras or those of lesser license classes, then
turn
> > the knob.
> > >
> > Jackie
> > KC0ODY
> > >
> > >
> >
> Jackie: He's been begging for someone to "prove theirself" to him ever
since
> I found this newsgroup--probably before that.

I did we had a real nice chat on 20 meters the other day.

> I envision Larry as a very
> lonely person because of it. But, he's too arrogant to get it...

I didn't find him that way at all.

> He also
> is under the delusion that those whom he attacks are truly offended or
upset
> by him.

He use to attack me here also remember? But now
I've shown him I'm not whining trying to get something
for nothing and not a part of the "I want it all now" group

> That's the *real* joke...
>
> Kim W5TIT

The real joke is I have a QSL card on my wall with
the callsign of K3LT and you don't. BTW Kim he's

really rather nice on the air. We even tried a little Hellschriber along with the PSK 31 and RTTY. He only tends to get rabid when you talk about laziness and callsigns naming body parts ;^) OTOH I'm not to fond of lazy people either, be it in the ARS or just life in general.

As for the assigning words to Larrys callsign here's my attempt at it. K3Let's Try

He's the one who suggested we try Hellschriber which up to that point neither of us had ever tried. BTW it works pretty nice also!

--
'73' From KB9TMP
"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
if you can fake that, you've got it made."
-Groucho Marx

2773. Re: Why I operate essentially 100% CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 03:11:45 UTC
From: "Bill, W7TI" <jamspam@upyours.now>
Message-ID: <Xns932BC3453C1Cpookster@216.168.3.50>
Source record: 62056

"garigue" <garigue@attbi.com> wrote in
news:GCc6a.236869$Ec4.242784@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net:

> Agree 110% Bill ....I operated pactor et al for about 14 years until
> my PK232 bit the dust ....I should get another as I really enjoyed the
> digital modes ...have been using the sound card stuff but I guess I am
> used to the 232.
>

Have you tried MMTTY for RTTY? It's free and does a better decoding job
than almost any TNC. Uses your soundcard and is highly configurable.

--
Bill, W7TI

2774. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 03:44:18 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030223224418.09808.00001224@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 62058

In article <rv66a.230004$be.204752@rwcrnsc53>, "Jackie"
<buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> writes:

>> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> > Therefore, the
> > Extra Lites have to prove themselves to ME.
>
>Hahah! You really need to take a bottle of Get Over Yourself. If you don't
>want to talk to newer Extras or those of lesser license classes, then turn
>the knob.
>
>Jackie
>KC0ODY

Jackie:

In spite of any hasty conclusions you may have drawn about me without
really knowing me personally, in over 20 years as a ham the only time
I've questioned another ham's license class on-the-air is when they were
doing something obviously illegal. Those times have been few and far
between.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2775. Re: Why I operate essentially 100% CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 03:44:18 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030223224418.09808.00001223@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 62059

In article <GCc6a.236869$Ec4.242784@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net>, "garigue" <garigue@attbi.com> writes:

>Agree 110% Bill ....I operated pactor et al for about 14 years until my >PK232 bit the dust ....I should get another as I really enjoyed the digital >modes ...have been using the sound card stuff but I guess I am used to the >232.

Since your PK-232 bit the dust, why not try a KAM-Plus next? Mine is 10 years old and showing no signs of "age" whatsoever, except maybe it's EPROM firmware version. It's a heckuva lot smaller than a PK232, does everything the 232 does, and I think it's a lot simpler for somone new to digital modes to master, since it can be controlled directly from the keyboard with a dumb-terminal or terminal emulator program (I use QModem).

73 de Larry, K3LT

2776. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 03:44:19 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030223224419.09808.00001225@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 62057

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.has6be2.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

Phil:

I agree entirely!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2777. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 03:44:19 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030223224419.09808.00001226@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 62060

In article <20030223211216.05573.00001117@mb-mh.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>>> Therefore, the
>>> Extra Lites have to prove themselves to ME.
>>
>>No experienced ham, new ham, or prospective ham has to prove
>>ANYTHING to you, they don't even owe you the time of day.
>
> Well, for the sake of a local paratranit (bus) organization,
> someone ought to tell him at least the time of day. :-)

Lennie:

No need. I hack my watch to WWV regularly, and the AMDT in my bus incorporates a GPS receiver which gives me very accurate time. I never have to call the Dispatcher to axe for a "10-36."

> Without that, all the bus (paratransit) schedules would have to
> be transmitted in morse code... :-)

Considering what our schedulers can do to them, that would indeed be a welcome improvement!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2778. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 03:44:20 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030223224420.09808.00001227@mb-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 62061

In article <3E5981A6.3080507@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

>
>
> Not that I have to prove anything, but I'm on the BOD of my local club,
I
>am a major participant in field day in the area, controlling the GOTA
>station and working the late shift. (we were second in our class in FD
>last year)I run the club website and am involved with the PAQSO party.
>I help at all the public service events for the club, and make every
>piece of equipment that I can for my shack. I help at the local ARRL
>kid's day efforts, and other recruiting efforts we do.
>
> What do you do for the ARS?
>
>- Mike KB3EIA -

Mike:

Very impressive. I personally thank you for your service to the Amateur
Radio community.

I've been licensed for 21 years, and have been an ARRL member for 23 years.
I am currently the Vice-President of my club; having also served terms as
President and Secretary. I am also active in local ARES, SKYWARN, and serve
as alternate Net Control for our Information, Bulletin, and Traffic net. I
have
participated in Field Day each year since I've been licensed, and in my present

club, I am the Digital Mode "Captain" and Logging Manager. I am also the
one who prepares and submits the Cabrillo logs for all contests participated in

by our club and individual members of our club. I serve as a control operator
for our club's repeater system and on the repeater technical committee. I am
also the Founding Vice-President and Trustee of a smaller "break-off" club
which is devoted specifically to contesting. I am currently an ARRL Official
Bulletin Station and maintain a 24/7 packet BBS with the latest ARRL and
local bulletins. I have, throughout my ham career, served in the ARRL Field
Organization as an OO, OBS, and ORS. I operate a "low-profile" station in
my apartment using mainly indoor and balcony antennas, power levels
< 30 W. maximum, and primarily utilize CW and digital modes. In spite of
my modest operating conditions, I have worked all corners of the globe.
I am the 2003 Field Day Co-Chairman for the KCARC, and have served as
Field Day Chairman in 1996 and 1999.

Is this enough, Mike?

73 de Larry, K3LT
Vice President
Kent County Amateur Radio Club (W3HZW)
Vice President and Trustee
Dover Amateur Radio Club (W3DOV)
Dover, Delaware

2779. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 03:45:23 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030223224523.23360.00000515@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 62062

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/23/03 8:12 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030223211229.05573.00001136@mb-mh.aol.com>

> His reflection is in your monitor

No glare, no reflection monitor, Your Lameness.

Try again?

2780. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 03:47:10 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E59959D.2AF97AAF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62063

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E553A2E.859D91C9@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:

Allow me to add some of the parts you've snipped just for the sake of
clarity:

LHA: "Geez, will you Three Morseketeers make up your collective
mind? :-)"

> >We don't have a collective mind.
>
> Do you have hives?

So your response to my statement is just more of your nonsense.

> >No, I simply called attention to your playing fast and loose with the
> >truth.
>
> "Fast and loose?" Heavens no...everything is Strict and Proper,
> in formation, dressed right and covered down. Hut-too-tree-foah!

So that's your response to a statement which accuses you of outright
fabrication?

Me: "When I tell you, 'It's raining',
that is not a command, it is a statement based in fact."

LHA: "Of course. You will also say 'the sky is blue, the grass is
green' and other colorful statements of fact while red in
the face. Go for it."

> >Those aren't commands either.
>
> Oh, that's right! You issue Commandments!

Wrong again. I made statements.

Me: "Don't blame someone else that you allowed several decades of
"interest"
in amateur radio to pass without acting on that 'interest'."

LHA: "I have interest in my bank, too, but don't want to become a
banker. There, two facts, absolute truth. :-)"

> >Only dodges from you, Leonard?

> No, I only drive Chevrolets...

Yet more nonsense from you in lieu of an actual response.

LHA: "Would I expect the Three Morseketeers (and Dartisgone)
to "change?!?!?" Oh, my, no...not in a millennia....nobody
can tell them anything! :-)"

> >Somebody can. You can't. I have no obligation to accept your input on
> >amateur radio matters. As far as I'm concerned, you aren't anything to
> >amateur radio.
>
> Ah, "there you have it!" Dismissal. The Commandment issuer
> now dismisses the "inferiors." :-)

You aren't knowledgeable about amateur radio. You aren't a participant
in amateur radio. Why would anyone be swayed toward your view of how
amateur radio should be regulated?

Me: "You aren't interested in becoming a ham, Len."

LHA: "Ham is the butchered meat of swine. I don't want to be that.
:-)"

> >Ham: An amateur radio operator.
> >You don't want to be that either.

> Does Porky the Pig have a license?

Not to my knowledge. That'd be something you and Porky have in common.

LHA: "But, I've never been interested in jumping through hoops on
command of a bunch of control freaks who demand
dedication and committment to be shown to those freaks."

> >Yeah, those damned control freaks at the FCC. They'll only have you in
> >amateur radio on their terms unless you can convince them that the regs
> >should be changed for your personal benefit.

> You want ARRL or Department of State to grant ham licenses?

That isn't what I wrote.

> Gee, I thought the FDA licensed hams?

That isn't what I wrote.

LHA: Poor baby. Get both of your balloons popped?

> >No, but I have a birthday at the end of the month.
>
> Will you be four years old then? Or just three? If three you can
> get a nice news factoid on ARRL Letter, maybe even a hug from
> a kindly, grandfatherly-looking VE. :-)
>
> >That shouldn't surprise you. You're subject to the law in every other
> >aspect of your life. You have only two small obstacles to overcome in
> >your quest for an amateur radio license which permits HF access: 1) the

> >law and 2) intertia.

> <Gomer Pyle voice-over>
>
> "Surprize...sur-priaze!"
>
> <segue to theme from "The Untouchables">

Just more nonsense from you.

LHA: Oh? I'm just talking about regulations...and unstuffing some
shirts, popping balloons.

> >Then you just aren't doing a very good job of it.
>
> I'm retired from regular hours, not on a contract assignment now.
> How can I be doing any sort of job? :-)

Your material isn't as cute when the stuff you snipped is reinserted.

Me: Until you pass an exam for an amateur radio
license, you are simply a spectator.

LHA: "Okay. I'll look out the window for rain."

> >It makes about as much sense as anything else you've done toward
> >obtaining a license.
>
> I got a First Phone in 1956...got an Illinois driver's license in 1950.
>
> Wanna see a scan of my Poetic License? :-)

We weren't discussing commercial radio licenses. We weren't discussing
driving licenses. We surely weren't discussing poetic license.

> Tsk, tsk, tsk, still no rain outside the window...

Still no amateur radio license either. Maybe if you make a wish...

Dave K8MN

2781. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 03:50:51 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E59967B.3B38934E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62064

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <c2356669.0302201432.3a32d44b@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> (N2EY) writes:
>
> >Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >news:<3E54629A.D484A704@earthlink.net>...
> >> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >> >
> >> > In article <c2356669.0302180920.6d0ef744@posting.google.com>,
> >N2EY@AOL.COM
> >> > (N2EY) writes:
> >> >
> >> > >"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> >> > >news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hah4ji9.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> >> > >> On 17 Feb 2003 17:53:32 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> > >Anybody can comment, propose rule changes, etc., not just hams.
> >> > >However, it is a mystery why an individual who has never held an
> >> > >amateur license and obviously has little interest in getting one is so
> >> > >interested in changing the rules.
> >> >
> >> > Tsk, tsk, tsk, it's a mystery to me why someone who is an
> >> > amateur will hide his profession. :-)
> >
> >Who does that? Can't be me. My profession has been reported here
> >several times. Here it is again:
> >
> >I'm an electrical engineer. I've been employed full time in design
> >(and a few other EE-related activities) since graduation from college.
>
> In what field of electricity or electronics? Table lamp design?
> Spaceship control systems? Miniature R/C cars? Power
> transmission? Industrial control electric things? $3.50 AC
> outlet strips with built-in surge protectors?
>
> No company mentioned (for various fearfull reasons), no field
> within electricity or electronics mentioned, yet Mr. N2EY
> gave talks to industry according to himself and his bosom
> buddy Kellie. Excuse me, Mr. Kellie. Talks about what?

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio

amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr. Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

I'd have to say that you are predicatable, Leonard.

Dave K8MN

2782. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 03:53:55 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030223225355.23360.00000516@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 62065

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/23/03 8:12 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030223211228.05573.00001134@mb-mh.aol.com>

>How much would you still "own" after you lost a civil court case
> of libel and had to pay damages?

You mean AFTER I presented all of the stuff YOU have posted?

You mean AFTER my representitive gets done presenting lie after lie,
accusation after accusation that YOU haev presentd here?

You mean AFTER my representitive shows your "invitation" to present your
GROL in an e mail and what was ACTUALLY delivered? And forget the lame
"mistake" twist, Lennie...He'll also present the tons of post you've made
laying claim to being an "engineering professional". Professional engineers
don't make those kind of stupid mistakes.

>AOL took that libelous HOME PAGE down, not your "post."

Wasn't anything libelous about it, Your Lyingness. You are a liar. It's
documented in your own posts. You make unsubstantiated accusations against
organizations and individuals alike without the least bit of intent of
validating your claims. You claim to be a professional engineer, yet you can't
even send e mail without making an error.

Whew.

>You have a LOT of problems with property ownership.

Nope. But you may.

>Tsk, tsk, tsk.

For once I agree with you. Tsk, tsk, tsk. What a shame for an old man
like you to be so blatantly self-abusive in public with your own misdeeds of
truth, and then alledge others to be "libellous".

Whew.

2783. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 03:57:57 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030223225757.23360.00000517@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 62066

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/23/03 8:12 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030223211225.05573.00001128@mb-mh.aol.com>

>My wife is observant and reasoning, ...(SNIP)

But obviously not very good at it if she let's you behave the way you do.

>...had a license to practice counseling in Washington,...(SNIP)

Well, that answer's a lot of questions about what's wrong in Washington.

>and was stuck
> with all those disturbed military people there (Bremerton, Lewis,
> etc.). YOU fit the label you try to pin on others.

I doubt it, Putzy One.

> QED

QED yourself. Too bad you can't appreciate how silly you look.

> No. You haven't "tried." You and the Oberst are only trying.

We are not "only" anything.

>Very trying.

Mission accomplished, I'd say.

2784. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 04:05:55 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E599A64.56B618BA@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62067

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3E56C140.56F3591B@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >It matters! If you don't have yours, I have two. I'll send you one.
>
> Thanks, but lemme see if I can find mine first.

Okay.

> >> > My gear was store bought and used. Both the receiver and transmitter
> >> > came from Allied's used equipment list. My deal with my dad was that
> >> > I'd save the money for the receiver from my paper route and he and Mom
> >> > would get me that transmitter for Christmas. I bought a Knight R-100
> >> > general coverage receiver and Pop ordered me a Knight T-60 transmitter a
> >> > couple of weeks later.
> >>
> >> If I'd had parnets like that I'd have been licensed years earlier. How
> >> old were ya when the Novice license arrived? For me it was October 14,
> >> 1967.
> >
> >Fourteen. The license was dated November 22, 1963.
>
> Famous date.

Really impossible to forget.

> >I turned fifteen
> >three months later. That was the beginning of my sophomore year of high
> >school.
>
> Shoot, you wuz old! I turned 13 in April of '67 and it took three months to go
> through the exam process (pass the code, wait 6-8 weeks for the written to show
> up at the volunteer examiner's house, pass the written, wait 6-8 weeks for the
> license to show up). And ya didn't know if ya failed the written until the FCC
> letter arrived.

Well, I wasn't exactly shaving yet

> >Selling my dad wasn't easy. I was told that both ham radio and playing
> >the guitar were "kicks" and that all that stuff would be cluttering up a
> >closet after I'd lost interest.
>
> Different era. Today a lot of parents would be glad for something that would
> keep a kid interested for a while.

See--our parents only thought we had short attention spans 'cuz they
didn't know how the subsequent generation would turn out.

> >I ask him periodically if he thinks
> >I'll ever get tired of either one. He's now 78 and I'm pushing 54
> >really hard.
>
> HAW! Sweet, really sweet.

He gets a silly grin on his face whenever I mention it. I like to
remind him of the numerous times he said the Beatles music would never
last.

>
> Some of those old Novice rigs were not well designed, while others were
> amazingly good. Cost was not always a good indicator, either.

No, but it could be. I've always thought the little Drake 2-NT was just
about a perfect Novice transmitter.

> One thing those kits did was eliminate the financial advantages of homebrewing
> with new parts. Unless you could get some of the expensive components from
> sources other than Allied, Newark, or the local radio emporium, it was cheaper
> to buy a kit. Lookit the DX-20: $36 as a new kit. You'd spend that much for the
> power supply parts and chassis/cabint/hardware from Allied.

...but if one had access to two or three transformer-powered TV sets of
that era, money could be saved.

> >I wish I'd known enough to get a ham bands only
> >receiver. That would come later in the form of a Mosley CM-1, xtal
> >controlled front end, no RF stage (antenna to first mixer) and only five
> >tubes, all of them 6AW8A's.
>
> Neat little rx, no selectivity but otherwise not bad. With a QF-1, almost a
> poor man's 2-B.

Yep. A Q-multiplier really helped it and the thing was stable and had a
uniform tuning rate.

> Best simple rx lashup for the effort and $$ from those days: BC-453 Command set
> preceded by homebrew xtal controlled converter. Discovered that idea about
> 1970, sold my SX-99 soon after. Surplus xtals permit covering 80 and 40, '453
> has excellent stability, tuning rate and dial. My first converter was built on
> the chassis from an old AA5 BC rx - 12BA6 RF amp, 12BE6 mixer, 12AV6 xtal osc
> in the Pierce circuit. Tuned circuits were BC caps and coils wound on plastic
> pill bottles. No dipper - got really good at calculating coil dimensions and
> turns by pencil and paper. Only thing I had to buy were the '453 itself and the
> xtals.
>
> Still have one of those lashups.

The converter route was a neat way to go. I held onto the R-100 because
a pal was selling a little Lafayette HE-73 Preconverter which worked as

either a preselector or converter.

> >I had a DX-20 later while living in Miami. I still remember that iron
> >vane meter clunking against the peg.
>
> Adventurer was the same way.

I still have one which I fire up from time to time. It is paired with
the Johnson 122 VFO.

I just came into some treasure yesterday. I was visiting K8IP on the
Ohio side of the river. He gave me a clean BC-348Q and a National
RCP--a variant of the NC-100 with the catcomb coil casting which
operates with a rack and pinion gear. The plate has a CAA contract date
of 1945 with crystal control option and squelch added by a company
called "Schutting" in Washington, D.C.

Both are about to undergo a recap operation.

> >> > > But some folks would have denied us our licenses based on age alone.
> >> > > Odd, really odd.
> >> >
> >> > It makes perfect sense if you're a fellow with half a century of
> >> > PROFESSIONAL experience and you're embarrassed to be shown up by a bunch
> >> > of telegraph key wielding CHILDREN!
> >>
> >> HAW!!!
> >>
> >> But it's been possible to get a ham license in the USA for over a
> >> dozen years now with no code test at all.
> >
> >That just doesn't cut it if you have your heart set on HF ham radio and
> >you are faced with the enormous wall which a five word per minute morse
> >exam presents.
>
> Maybe, to folks like that, ham radio really IS all about working...you know the
> rest.
>
> Just remember:
>
> "His hobby is wasting time. Your time"

Agreed.

Dave K8MN

2785. Re: New Field Day Entry Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 04:08:41 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030223230841.23360.00000519@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 62068

>Subject: Re: New Field Day Entry Class
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/23/03 8:12 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030223211225.05573.00001127@mb-mh.aol.com>

> Not "dissed."

Yes..."dissed". As in "disrespected".

You lie.

You make up stories.

You antagonize.

You don't keep your promises.

>What "needs?" I have no need to fight personalities.

Obviously you do.

> I see some
> beings in here who are obsessive-compulsive about fighting
> others who do not share their opinions.

Whew! Could you have dropped that nut any closer to your OWN tree,
Lennie..?!?!

> They sometimes get back what they attempt to throw at others,
> then they get oh, so angry at shooting back.

Again, the nut falls close to home. Witness your years of antagonizing
and lying here.

That's YOUR leagacy, Lennie.

No one will remember your dubiously original articals in "Ham Radio" or
how you managed to pawn yourself off from one job to the next until you had
enough acorns in the nest that you could aford to quit jumping around.

What few Amateurs who DO remember you will remember you for lies and
profanity. They will remember you for deception and antagonism.

They will remember your deceitful attempts to embellish your weak military
"career" by invoking the memory of KIA's that you had NO association with other
than to serve in the same unit years after they perished.

Nice job, YA PUTZ!

Steve

2786. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 04:09:26 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E599B49.56F5378E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62069

Brian wrote:
>
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030222140633.12173.00000653@mb-mr.aol.com>...
>
> >
> > I prefer to think they are simply "not serious". Just like ol' Cecil, who swore
> > he'd never get an Extra...
>
> First you'se guys incessantly "encourage" lower class hams to upgrade,
> then complain when they do.

I've not encountered many radio amateurs who swear that they'd never
upgrade.
Likewise, I've not encountered many non-radio amateurs who claim they
are going for an "Extra right out of the box" and who haven't done zip
several years down the road.

Dave K8MN

2787. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 04:14:53 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030223231453.23360.00000520@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 62070

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/23/03 8:12 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030223211227.05573.00001132@mb-mh.aol.com>

>For disputes with US Army awards and honors of the past, go
> to the US Army Historical Center. For disputes with awards
> to units in the past, go to the US Army Adjutant General.

Sorry I stepped on your...uh...rant, Lennie. I ahve no "dispute" with
them.

Sorry that YOU are too sorry to admit you got your rant jammed between a
rock and the truth.

Oh well...Another day's work well done. Lennie's been caught with
half-century old "facts"...

Sheesh.

Steve, K4YZ

2788. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 04:18:57 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030223231857.23360.00000521@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 62071

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/23/03 8:12 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030223211229.05573.00001135@mb-mh.aol.com>

>A life-saver...complete with a void in the center...but the sour
> flavor version.

That's "lifesaver", Lennie. I have the documentation to prove it.

No "MD" was needed.

>Three decades a ham with your "own callsign" and you haven't
> learned anything about electronics-radio theory?

Who told you that...?!?!

You're slipping, Your Creepiness.

2789. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 04:22:07 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E599E32.E4F3BC9C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62072

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E57EB7C.A0596401@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E565A51.B1C29552@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > > > Yet its Jim's radio. You're the one who cannot keep things straight.
> > > > > Don't sit up all night tuning the 160M band endlessly trying to snag a
> > > > > new one, then try to be coherent in replies. Doesn't work.
> > > >
> > > > I understand that ",Brian" gave you a problem.
> > >
> > > Brian only gives you problems.
> >
> > Zat so? When did your stupidity or your playing dumb become my problem?
> > You alone have to take the responsibility for what you write.
>
> Dave, I can only respond to what you write. If its too inane, or too
> smug, you get what you get.

So that we're sure I have this straight. I write something which you
consider to be smug. You respond with an imcomplete idea. That makes
me somehow responsible for your reply. Is that about it?

> >
> > > > > I was not home when replying. Jump, jump, jump.
> > > >
> > > > Oh. Correct my statement to read: "We're not all gathered whereever it
> > > > is that you are". You can explain your second sentence, the incomplete
> > > > one, later if you have any interest in anyone being able to understand
> > > > it.
> > >
> > > You're supposed to be a bright boy.
> >
> > It is tough to fill in the blanks on a supposed sentence which contains
> > only the same three words. Those three repeated words of yours have
> > about the same meaning as "Tree, tree, tree" or "Lift, lift, lift". If
> > you can't complete an idea, don't expect others to do it for you.
>
> Dave, try using context. Like when I said "Jump, jump, jump" (to
> conclusions).

You didn't write "Jump, jump, jump (to conclusions". You wrote "Jump,
jump, jump" Nothing about conclusions was written by you or me.

> > > > > Why would I turn on Jim's radio? You're still confused, aren't you?
> > > > >
> > > > > Phil may be on to something. Stupid seems to be your default mode. Ed
> > > > > Hare lost interest in the group when you ran extended versions of your
> > > > > nonsense replies.
> > > >
> > > > That's really too bad. Law of unintended consequences. I liked Ed.
> > >
> > > It wasn't apparent.
> >
> > Perhaps not to you, Mr Obtuse.

I don't believe it was apparent to Ed.

> > > On the other hand, how many other people have been run off this group?
> > > I don't see any litttle violins playing for them.
> > >
> > > I don't know of anyone who has been "run off this group". Ed left of
> > > his own volition. His tolerance for crap had been exceeded.
> >
> > As did mine.

Did you mean "as was mine"? Were you run off this group? I only
recalling you driving off in a Huff or leaving in a snit.

Dave K8MN

2790. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 04:26:26 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030223232626.23360.00000522@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 62073

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/23/03 8:12 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030223211230.05573.00001137@mb-mh.aol.com>

>> I am sure you would, but I'd STILL be able to get on the band of my
>>choice, in the mode of my choice, when I want.
>
> Poor baby, has only a limited number of bands and modes as
> an amateur...but he remains defiant on "choice.

Please remind me how many bands YOU can get on right now, Your Sleaziness?

(Remember...the back of your GROL says you can NOT "operate" without an FCC
authorized station license...)

>> Oh yes...And with my OWN 1 x 2 callsign.
>
> Oh, my, yes, a walking radio station with his very own callsign!

Walking...hang gliding, roller skating...yep...that and more.

Please tell us about YOUR operating experiences, Lennie!

>Isn't that Sgt Putz' objective to enter amateur radio...be someone
> that few other humans are?

Nope...I wanted to learn about radios. Got that and lot's more.

>Oh...and don't look now, but you don't really "own" that whoopie-
> do callsign...you've only got permission to use it from the
> government. It's a grant from them, not your property. FCC can
> take it away from you if they see fit to do so, ex-marine or not.

Whelp, Lennie, for the meantime it's mine.

No one else's. Only one in the world.

Please remind us about yours?

2791. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 04:31:50 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E59A079.29D6C91F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62075

Floyd Davidson wrote:

> I've been reading this thread, and frankly it is not amusing at
> all. I've been licensed as KL7GPS for awhile and thought
> amateur radio might be something to take up as a hobby now that
> I'm retired (from a professional career in communications, which
> included both commercial radiotelegraph and radiotelephone
> licenses).
>
> I haven't gotten around to putting together a rig to get on the
> air, and this type of exchange is cause to question whether it
> would be worth the bother.
>
> It's a hobby folks. Those tests are *all* meaningless to anyone
> who has worked in the field.

I worked in "the field" and found doing so pretty meaningless in amateur
radio.
I did it mostly for the money.

> Someone mentioned getting an Extra
> Class at age 16 and that it was tougher than a 1st Phone. I had
> a 1st Phone at age 16, but by age 20 I'd met at least a dozen
> people who'd been to a 6 week school that taught that test, and
> even though they didn't understand a bit of electronics, they
> were just as legal (and frankly at least a useful to the boss)
> for standing a transmitter watch as I was! I can't see either
> the Extra test or the 1st Phone as significant... compared to
> something like working in a modern telecommunications center.

So you'd agree that someone can hold a commercial ticket and not know
anything about electronics?

I didn't find that working in a modern telecommunications center as
interesting as spending an evening on 1.8 megs chasing African stations.

> As for code, the military could teach the average GI to read
> code at 35 wpm, so I can't see much significance to that either,
> except that it required time and dedication that nobody except a
> GI just out of boot camp is likely to have once they reach age
> 18 or so.

We've had a certain non-radio amateur who is a frequent poster here
report that only a very small percentage of GI's had any real morse
aptitude. You're saying that the average GI could become morse
proficient? I always thought so too.

> I personally like that idea of an Elmer. It's a hobby, it is
> *supposed* to be fun. And it is when people at various levels
> get together and exchange ideas, help each other, and generally
> do whatever part of it they are capable of enjoying.

I don't see anything wrong with lending a helping hand to a newcomer--as long as he or she doesn't refer to me as an "Elmer".

> I'd suggest the Larry and Dick dump the chip on the shoulder
> routine.

Try reading a while longer, Floyd. Go ahead and put the rig together.

Dave K8MN

2792. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 04:33:04 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E59A07C.FE831152@att.net>
Source record: 62074

N2EY wrote:

> Hmmm.. I passed the Extra in 1970 at the age of 16. Tougher than the First
> Phone......
>
> Next time somebody starts waving their First Phone around...

You might as well have taken the First Phone test, you wouldn'thave been the first 16 year old to get one. Obviously you could have done it. Wasn't any huge deal. But I get a little tired of hearing repeatedly that all the ham radio tests have always been "entry level" and trivial. Not so.

Dick

2793. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 04:33:19 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030223233319.23360.00000523@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 62076

>Subject: Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/23/03 8:12 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030223211221.05573.00001124@mb-mh.aol.com>

>Without any evidence of employment or no one receiving
> professional services, we can consider you unemployed.

OOOOOOOH LENNIE!

The "royal" we...?!?!

Shame, shame! Falling prey to your own rants!

YOU can consider him anything you want. The rest of us know the truth.

>Being unemployed is not a crime. Feel free to admit it.

Neither is being stupid or arrogant. Take your own advice.

2794. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 04:50:51 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E59A4ED.56C5F8CC@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62078

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20030223132157.25154.00000483@mb-cb.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (Mr.
> N2EY the Extra Pedant) writes:
>
> >In article <8765rbw0j1.fld@barrow.com>, Floyd Davidson <floyd@ptialaska.net>
> >writes:
> >
> >>I've been reading this thread, and frankly it is not amusing at
> >>all. I've been licensed as KL7GPS for awhile and thought
> >>amateur radio might be something to take up as a hobby now that
> >>I'm retired (from a professional career in communications, which
> >>included both commercial radiotelegraph and radiotelephone
> >>licenses).
> >>
> >>I haven't gotten around to putting together a rig to get on the
> >>air, and this type of exchange is cause to question whether it
> >>would be worth the bother.
> >
> >Don't let take this NG as a representative sample of what you'll encounter on
> >the air. It's not.
>
> Unfortunately, that isn't that true. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

How would you know what someone is likely to encounter on the air,
Leonard?
Tsk, tsk, tsk.

> >>It's a hobby folks. Those tests are *all* meaningless to anyone
> >>who has worked in the field. Someone mentioned getting an Extra
> >>Class at age 16 and that it was tougher than a 1st Phone.
> >
> >That was me who got the Extra at 16. FCC office, 20 wpm send and receive, 2
> >years as an Advanced, secret tests, yada yada yada. Big deal, that was just
> >one
> >accomplishment. Which was not unusual at all back then anyway, there were 12
> >year old Extras in those days.
>
> No four-year-olds aided, I mean, proctored by kindly grandfatherly
> VEs?
>
> >The "tougher than the First Phone" thing was a quote from an FCC examiner.
>
> Surrrre it was, long-timer.

How would you know, Leonard?

> >>I had
> >>a 1st Phone at age 16, but by age 20 I'd met at least a dozen
> >>people who'd been to a 6 week school that taught that test, and
> >>even though they didn't understand a bit of electronics, they
> >>were just as legal (and frankly at least a useful to the boss)
> >>for standing a transmitter watch as I was! I can't see either
> >>the Extra test or the 1st Phone as significant... compared to
> >>something like working in a modern telecommunications center.
> >
> >I went on to EE school at age 18, and discovered that amateur radio background
> >was a big help in EE. But it was only a beginning - there was a lot more to
> >learn, of course. Radio is but a small part of electrical engineering.
>
> So...do we assume you've never worked professionally in radio?
>
> All we've heard is Jimmie's profession...never where he has
> worked. Nothing. Zip. Nada.

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

> >>As for code, the military could teach the average GI to read
> >>code at 35 wpm, so I can't see much significance to that either,
> >>except that it required time and dedication that nobody except a
> >>GI just out of boot camp is likely to have once they reach age
> >>18 or so.
> >
> >The "toughest" code test ever required for a US ham license was 20 wpm plain
> >language, needing one minute solid copy out of five minutes. By professional
> >or serious amateur standards, that's not very much skill at all, compared to
> >what is expected in the real world. Such tests are all gone, anyway.
>
> The US military never took "average" recruits for morse code
> telegraphy. Since WW2 days they gave them an aptitude
> test. Those showing no or little aptitude got sent to other
> military schools.

What was the percentage of those taking the aptitude tests which showed
little or no aptitude for learning morse again, Leonard?

> There is NO "boot camp" in the US Army or USAF. Such is
> Basic Training.

That's funny. Air Force DI's at Amarillo routinely referred to Basic
Training as "boot camp" in October and November 1968. I still heard the
term used at Lackland in 1971 and '72 after I returned from Vietnam.

You weren't in the Air Force either were you, Len?

> Civilian intercept operators for the
> US government are trained at Fort Huachuca as well.

Don't believe everything you read on a web page, Leonard.

> >>I personally like that idea of an Elmer. It's a hobby, it is
> >>*supposed* to be fun. And it is when people at various levels
> >>get together and exchange ideas, help each other, and generally
> >>do whatever part of it they are capable of enjoying.
> >
> >Which goes on all over the place. Try reading the Elecraft or Glowbug
> >reflectors - all sorts of folks helping each other out with information,
> >experience, parts sources, etc.
>
> Try doing actual designing instead of just mods or bragging
> or kit-building...

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

Dave K8MN

2795. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 04:52:16 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E59A4FB.70B6668F@att.net>
Source record: 62077

Floyd Davidson wrote:

> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:
> >Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote:
> >> > > I'll judge hams on what they did afterwards.
> >>
> >> For some strange reason that refrain was NEVER heard before the late
> >> restructuring. Another point in favor of Larry's point of view.
> >>
> >> Then we have geniuses like Slim Burke to offer up as genuine, current evidence.
> > >
> >Dick, you're supposed to be the biggest, baddest Extra with a
> >professional career in electronics, plus lots and lots of emergency
> >comms experience. Yet you can't seem to be able to get a radio to
> >work away from the power mains.
>
> I've been reading this thread, and frankly it is not amusing at
> all. I've been licensed as KL7GPS for awhile and thought
> amateur radio might be something to take up as a hobby now that
> I'm retired (from a professional career in communications, which
> included both commercial radiotelegraph and radiotelephone
> licenses).
>
> I haven't gotten around to putting together a rig to get on the
> air, and this type of exchange is cause to question whether it
> would be worth the bother.
>
> It's a hobby folks. Those tests are *all* meaningless to anyone
> who has worked in the field. Someone mentioned getting an Extra
> Class at age 16 and that it was tougher than a 1st Phone. I had
> a 1st Phone at age 16, but by age 20 I'd met at least a dozen
> people who'd been to a 6 week school that taught that test, and
> even though they didn't understand a bit of electronics, they
> were just as legal (and frankly at least a useful to the boss)
> for standing a transmitter watch as I was! I can't see either
> the Extra test or the 1st Phone as significant... compared to
> something like working in a modern telecommunications center.
>
> As for code, the military could teach the average GI to read
> code at 35 wpm, so I can't see much significance to that either,
> except that it required time and dedication that nobody except a
> GI just out of boot camp is likely to have once they reach age
> 18 or so.
>

> I personally like that idea of an Elmer. It's a hobby, it is
> *supposed* to be fun. And it is when people at various levels
> get together and exchange ideas, help each other, and generally
> do whatever part of it they are capable of enjoying.
>
> I'd suggest the Larry and Dick dump the chip on the shoulder
> routine.

And I'd suggest that if you predicate your opinion of ham radio and hams, and anyone posting here, only on reading of this this thread you're in for a real shock. Assuming you can handle Google go back a few years and work your way up to the present then get back to us. To say your knowledge of things is incomplete is just too much understatement to even present a small piece of a case. You've got the chips on the wrong shoulders.

Dick

2796. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 04:57:51 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E59A691.95829A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62079

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E57E82F.2EE444A5@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <3E553338.C2DE600C@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> writes:
>
> >> Poor baby. Way back in time he got his snow job melted...all
> >> about using CW as an order-wire for an RTTY circuit in some
> >> small embassy (?) in the middle of Africa in the 1980s.
> >>
> >You mean the order wire circuit which you claimed on numerous occasions
> >that I had originated--the one I corrected about repeatedly? That claim
> >of yours was pasted by a repost from the Google archives. Watch out for
> >those six-year-olds waving the straight keys around. You could get
> >hurt.
>
> If an RTTY radio circuit has such bad performance that you
> need manual telegraphy through OOK CW to communicate
> schedules and orders, then it will not be a good RTTY circuit
> for regular traffic.

You really haven't been paying attention, have you. Go back and check
those Google archives and enlighten yourself.

It should become an OOK CW circuit
> instead.

That wasn't for you to decide.

> If an RTTY radio circuit is passing TTY messages fine in
> regular traffic, then it doesn't need any OOK CW for
> schedules and orders in order-wire use.

Again, you haven't been paying attention.

> That's logical. One or the other.

It wasn't for you to decide.

> Even in the 1980s other HF radio users didn't do such illogical
> procedures. Only, has the Oberst explained, the "State
> Department."

The Department of State was not obligated to do everything some other HF radio users did, Spock.

> >
> >> I'll rank his radio expertise with those "seven hostile action"
> >> heroes.
> >
> >What do you know about my radio expertise?
>
> No one is impressed...except by getting away with a cushy
> job with the government and sent to exotic locales such as
> Guinea-Bisseau.

You mean that you aren't impressed? You don't know anything about my radio expertise. How is my having a government job "getting away with" anything, Leonid?

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr. Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

Dave K8MN

2797. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 05:07:13 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E59A8C3.5A081B84@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62080

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20030222140633.12173.00000652@mb-mr.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (Mr.
> N2EY the Pedant) writes:
>
> >>>> > Tsk, tsk, tsk, it's a mystery to me why someone who is an
> >>>> > amateur will hide his profession. :-)
> >>>
> >>>Who does that? Can't be me. My profession has been reported here
> >>>several times. Here it is again:
> >>>
> >>>I'm an electrical engineer. I've been employed full time in design
> >>>(and a few other EE-related activities) since graduation from college.
> >>
> >> In what field of electricity or electronics? Table lamp design?
> >> Spaceship control systems? Miniature R/C cars? Power
> >> transmission? Industrial control electric things? $3.50 AC
> >> outlet strips with built-in surge protectors?
> >
> >You don't need to know, Len. Electrical engineering is my profession, and
> >it's not hidden, so you could not have been talking about me anyway.
>
> To have a profession implies being professional, of having an
> income derived from someone or some entity receiving those
> professional services.
>
> Without any evidence of employment or no one receiving
> professional services, we can consider you unemployed.
>

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

> >> No company mentioned (for various fearfull reasons),
> >
> >"Fearfull"? Of what? Certainly not you, Len. I don;t even take you seriously,
> >let alone fear you or any thing you could do.
>
> Yes you are. I manage to sully that careful image of the
> pedantic radio guru-wannabe that you try to cultivate.

>
> Being unemployed is not a crime. Feel free to admit it.

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

> >
> >You don't need to know, Len.
>
> Military stealth technology? How can one "give talks to
> industry" when they are not employed by any industry?
>
> Is this one of those secret navy intelligence things involving
> photography of over-flying USSR military bombers?

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

> >> Poor baby.
> >
> >Hmmm... I get called 'baby', 'boy', and 'old fart'......Ageist,
> >racist.....
>
> "Poor baby" is a mild sarcasm that can be used against a
> pedant with some anal-retentivity. It is common in American
> English use.

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

> >Both of which are now defunct, are they not? If not, where can I buy the
> >March, 2003 issue of Ham Radio fanzine?
>
> All 22 years of Ham Radio articles are available on 3 CDs from
> CQ and resold by ARRL for $150. Shipping charges EXTRA with
> ARRL direct orders.
>
> Ham Radio magazine quit publication in 1990 on the sale of

> the parent company (Communications Technology, Inc.) to CQ.
> CQ reorganized the assets of Communications Technology into
> the Ham Radio Bookstore (still existing) and the formation of
> Communications Quarterly magazine.
>
> While Ham Radio is no longer being published monthly, it did
> not disappear, vanish, or become absent in any way. The
> three CDs prove that. Good information does not become
> "defunct" like burned-out vacuum tubes.

The magazine is defunct. I have a whole shelf full of Radio Craft magazine. It is defunct as well. There are no new issues of Radio Craft yet, lo and behold, the old copies still reside on the shelf.

Dave K8MN

2798. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 05:18:05 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E59AB4F.6316C763@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62081

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E5652A1.65D2C4DB@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >> In article <G545a.187100$HN5.815085@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net>, "Jackie"
> >> <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> writes:
> >>
> >> >"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> >> >news:20030220021035.29944.00000027@mb-fi.aol.com...
> >> >
> >> >> "It's the LAW!" Right. Laws in force now cannot ever
> >> >> be changed, cannot be talked about (absolutely never
> >> >> by those without official authorized licenses!). Yup.
> >> >
> >> >Who sez?
> >>
> >> Heh...that phrase "It's the LAW!" turns up from time to
> >> time in here, written by several. It's the "turf" mentality
> >> of the old-timers.
> >
> >The turf in question is amateur radio, in which we are participants and
> >in which you are not a participant.
>
> ...and I suppose you think you "own" your own callsign, too?

My callsign is mine as long as I breathe and continue to renew it. No
one else is authorized to use my callsign. It isn't a vanity call. I
pay no fee for it. I am the only holder of K8MN. You are less a
participant in the issue of my callsign than you are in amateur radio.

> >
> >> You, specifically, haven't written that, but others have. I'd
> >> mention DejaNews but that is "defunct." :-) Google
> >> bought out DejaNews. Google has most of the past
> >> messages in newsgroups. Some of the regulars in here
> >> virtually live there, virtual ego bruisings very painful,
> >> demanding some sort of retribution or at least a chance
> >> at more virtual combat. :-)
> >
> >Recent quotes posted here from the Google site reveal the ego which has
> >been bruised to be yours.
>
> Incorrect. Oberst Heil cannot take corrections or advice on
> professional (non-amateur) radio procedure and tries to

> misdirect the subject into one of "belonging to participants."

"Incorrect" just doesn't cut it, Leonid. You made a number of false statements which Google archives disproved. You didn't have any "corrections or advice" to offer. You were as much involved in Department of State communications operations aa you are amateur radio operations, i.e. not at all.

> >> Some even go so far as to virtually claim ownership of an
> >> activity, including the alleged authority to rule on who is
> >> allowed to express opinions. They have no authority but
> >> demand obeyance or they will meet the dissenters after
> >> school is over and beat them up. :-)
> >
> >To state that I am a participant in amateur radio while you are not is
> >just the iteration of a fact and has not been construed by any others as
> >a statement of ownership of amateur radio.
>
> The above is an example of "turf" claims.

No, the statement I made is irrefutable fact.

> >I don't demand anything of you.
>
> Nonsense. Oberst Heil DEMANDS all the time, refuses to
> acknowledge correction of professional (non-amateur) radio
> procedures and techniques, then tries to misdirect the
> subject to something else.

Ummmm...again, you weren't remotely involved with any Department of State communications operations ever. You have made a couple of false statements.
Those have come back to bite you in the ass.

> >You've been free to post your rants for quite a number of years.
> >I've been laughing at them for years.
>
> No. Oberst Heil, like a good prussian, has very little sense
> of humor outside his inner circle of "participators."

You have no more way of knowing that than you do of State Department communications operations. You are true to form:

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr. Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

>
> >> All that about a hobby. :-)

> >
> >(...in which you have no stake.)
>
> But the Oberst has a very large stake, one that is on fire for
> burning heretics to "cleanse their spirit of evil."

I have a stake in that I am a participant in amateur radio.

> There shall be NO dissent in the ranks.

You aren't in the ranks.

> All shall obey the
> correctness of the Oberst in all radio things, not just the
> amateur ones.

I don't determine whether you participate in amateur radio, Len. You'll
have to pass the exam if you want to do that.

Dave K8MN

2799. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 05:20:48 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E59AC03.14A19AEF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62082

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <f45722ac.0302210503.716575a8@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >> >> > Anything else you would like me to pass on to Len?
> >> >>
> >> >> No, you'd likely get it screwed up too.
> >> >
> >> >Just like you to jump to conclusions.
> >>
> >> Pssst...mention the cashews... :-)
> >
> >Dave, I've got a message for you from Len: "Cashews."
>
> I don't think it does any good. The Oberst only listens to
> what he wants to hear. He is not good about taking advice.
> He is above such things.

Let's see if you are good at taking advice, Lynnard. To become a participant in HF amateur radio, 1) become "proficient" in morse code at the rate of 5 wpm and 2) pass the appropriate written exams. Maybe you're above such things.

Dave K8MN

2800. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 05:27:07 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E59AD6D.E7EFEB52@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62083

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E5657B7.CA553FE5@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >I had to wait for my laughter to subside before I could even comment on
> >this one. Nice that you gave Steve a spelling lesson. Has it dawned on
> >you that, while the word does have two "T"s, it only has one "L"?
> >Attila, Foghorn.
>
> Find a reputable Hun English teacher and prove it, Oberst.
>
> What is the alphabet of the Hun language? Were you in the
> "foreign service" in Hun land?

More humor from Leonid! Why no, I own several dictionaries but I didn't really need them for this one. In all of them "Attila" is spelled with one "L" as is the word "suxiliary". You've misspelled both of them more than once. Why not simply admit that your little spelling lesson for Steve backfired? Your gaffe was entertaining though.

Dave K8MN

2801. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 05:28:57 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E59ADED.FDB0AD51@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62084

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E56566B.8DCCFB5B@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >That you have lied a number of times has been demonstrated through a
> >number of Google reposts and through offering the offering of urls and
> >quotes from web pages which all disprove various claims made on a
> >repeated basis by you. I would not be inclined to accept as truth, the
> >statements of someone who has repeatedly told lies in the past.
>
> Poor baby...you will NEVER ever accept any correction on
> government radio procedure or trying to pull a snow job on
> the rest of the readers in here, will you? :-)

When was it that you were involved in any manner in U.S. Department of
State communications operations, poor baby?

> Well, it's a good thing the US government no longer has you on
> some embassy or counsulate staff. Good for the USA, that is...

You are ever true to form.

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

Dave K8MN

2802. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 05:33:05 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E59AED4.8CBC5059@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62085

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E56536D.1DE84A8D@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >You never did tell us, Len. To which ethnic minority do you belong?
>
> It's a majority, Herr Oberst...the rest of the human race not
> afflicted with this sense of ethnic cleansing to keep US amateur
> radio sacred, held to the thoughts of those already licensed
> in it.

Please explain how those not licensed as radio amateurs make up an
ethnic group? Please explain how the "rest of the human race" gives a
hoot about amateur radio at all.

> You must have the same problems with property as Attilla.
> Poor guy...thinks he "owns" judgemental edicts in a
> newsgroup.

...and you still can't spell the word "Attila".

Dave K8MN

2803. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 05:35:41 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E59AF81.1EC7C031@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62086

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20030221105631.16405.00000043@mb-cs.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Sgt
> Attilla Putz) writes:
>
> >>> And what can you do with it RIGHT NOW, other than be compensated for
> >>>your time, that I can't do with my Amateur Extra?
> >>
> >> Be a professional...be a human being...?
> >
> > I'd need to get a sample of your blood to test the "human" part. If you
> >told me the sky was blue and the grass was green, I'd have to look and be
> >sure.
>
> We all know how "expert" you medical folks are about blood
> typing.
>
> That was just one case. How many more are there not yet
> reported?

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

Dave K8MN

2804. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 05:44:15 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E59B183.57ABA677@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62087

Dave Heil wrote:

>"suxiliary".

Just a Freudian typo, Leonard. I'll correct it myself: "auxiliary".

Dave K8MN

2805. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 05:58:42 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E59B4A0.5090204@adelphia.net>
Source record: 62088

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> Is this enough, Mike?

Sounds very nice, Larry. tks fr info!

- Mike KB3EIA -

2806. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 06:15:21 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@ptialaska.net>
Message-ID: <87y946tdae.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 62091

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote:
>N2EY wrote:
>
>> Hmmm.. I passed the Extra in 1970 at the age of 16. Tougher than the First
>> Phone......
>>
>> Next time somebody starts waving their First Phone around...
>
> You might as well have taken the First Phone test, you wouldn'thave been the first
>16 year old to get one. Obviously you could have done it. Wasn't any huge deal. But
>I get a little tired of hearing repeatedly that all the ham radio tests have always
>been "entry level" and trivial. Not so.

As I mentioned earlier, I did in fact take the 1st phone as a teenager. At the time an Extra Class offered no privileges and I saw no reason to bother with it. I needed to eat, so I tested for both commercial telephone and commercial telegraph licenses. I never used the telegraph ticket and let it lapse. I was working in the broadcast industry when I was in the 11th grade in high school. (It paid for my education... but telecommunications is *lots* more fun!)

I knew *many* disk jockies that went to school for six weeks and earned 1st Class Radiotelephone tickets. None of them had *any* perception of what it all meant on a larger scale. What they understood was that by memorizing a test they had a better chance of being employed. Smart people, but not technicians.

I don't recall anyone who was familiar with the tests in the 1960's that did not think the Amateur Extra was a "harder" test than the First Class Radiotelephone. Big deal. As to being a reflection on knowledge of electronics, they are indeed *both* entry level in nature. I have no doubt that a 6 weeks course could also teach that Extra Class exam too. I have no doubt that, at a _minimum_, several months of a top notch tech school and then 2 to 5 years of hands on experience working with a variety of radio equipment is required to reach a level of professional stature. Five years of engineering courses and 2-3 years of work experience are even better. (Incidentally, I've also known several top notch radio technicians who simply did not do well at tests, and never did pass either a 1st or 2nd Class Phone exam. I just don't see the tests as an indicator of ability as a technician.)

But the point is Ham Radio is *not* a professional service. It is a *hobby*. There is no reason to deride someone who has just barely learned enough to tune up a rig and start a QSO. If *that* is fun, then *that* is what the person needs to learn. They don't *need* to know what people learn in tech schools and in the first several years on the job. They *never* need to learn that. Unless of course it just happens to be something that is fun for them to learn, in which case it is fine if the do. It *doesn't* make them any more special in the Ham world than an accountant who can just barely tune a rig, but does a local Ham club the favor of keeping their books for them.

Technical expertise in radio is *not* the measure of a Ham. And none of those tests are the measure of technical expertise anyway, so claiming a test is a measure the a Ham's value is just absurd.

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://www.ptialaska.net/~floyd>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

2807. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 06:18:25 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@ptialaska.net>
Message-ID: <87vfzatd5a.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 62092

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote:
>Floyd Davidson wrote:
>>
>> I'd suggest the Larry and Dick dump the chip on the shoulder
>> routine.
>
> And I'd suggest that if you predicate your opinion of ham radio and hams, and anyone
>posting here, only on reading of this this thread you're in for a real shock.

Nothing I said suggested that to be true! So perhaps _you_
could be in for a shock concerning exactly what I do predicate
my opinion of hams and ham radio on. :-)

> Assuming you can handle Google go back a few years and work your way up to the present
>then get back to us. To say your knowledge of things is incomplete is just too much
>understatement to even present a small piece of a case. You've got the chips on the
>wrong shoulders.

I *know* better than that.

In what I think is the much *more* typical style of Hams in
general, the responses to it have been (except for yours) very
agreeable. And even yours isn't filled with the silly bullying
and insults that were in the posts by Larry (and which you
voiced support for) that I referenced.

(A couple of the responses to my original article were downright
nearly as pleasant as I've seen anyone be on Usenet, including
one email which was just an absolutely wonderful message.)

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://www.ptialaska.net/~floyd>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

2808. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 06:26:31 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hasjnd6.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 62089

On Mon, 24 Feb 2003 04:31:50 GMT, Dave Heil wrote:

>I don't see anything wrong with lending a helping hand to a newcomer--as
>long as he or she doesn't refer to me as an "Elmer".

Mr too. For a xouple of years I worked for a guy named Elmer
whom I didn't respect as a "mentor".

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

2809. Re: Why I operate essentially 100% CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 06:26:32 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hasmes7.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 62090

On 24 Feb 2003 03:44:18 GMT, Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>>Agree 110% Bill ....I operated pactor et al for about 14 years until my
>>PK232 bit the dust ....I should get another as I really enjoyed the digital
>>modes ...have been using the sound card stuff but I guess I am used to the
>>232.

Send it to Timewave = they revive and upgrade 232s very nicely.
Mine was done about three years ago, when they added DSP detection
and replaced the DCD sensitivity control (at no cost) which they
said was damaged when I shipped it to them.

>Since your PK-232 bit the dust, why not try a KAM-Plus next? Mine is
>10 years old and showing no signs of "age" whatsoever, except maybe
>it's EPROM firmware version. It's a heckuva lot smaller than a PK232,
>does everything the 232 does,

Does it do NAVTEX and TDM ? Does it have a Signal Analysis
mode to determine data type, polarity, and baud rate ?

>and I think it's a lot simpler for somone new to digital modes to master,
>since it can be controlled directly from >the keyboard with a dumb-terminal
>or terminal emulator program (I use >QModem).

I rum my 232 from a terminal emulator and control it directly from
the keyboard. I use it mainly for (non-ham) MF/HF monitoring. Were
I on HF (I am licensed for all ARS bands and modes but I haven't had
a HF rig for over 25 years) I would run PACTOR.

The fancy (and expensive) packet program runs a PK-88 on 2-m.

I recently acquired a KAM-3 (not the plus) which I may set up
on a second packet channel (our ARES/RACES operations here are
heavily into packet) or use it for APRS - I haven't decided
which. The antenna connected to that transceiver went sour
(20+ dB down compared to an identical antenna on the other
mast) and the safety officer that I've been married to all
these years has declared that I have to wait until it's drier
and warmer to climb up on the roof (I agree).

It's taken me a while to shift gears to the Kantronics command set
after using the AEA for over 10 years. It is smaller than the PK-88
and the PK-232 but I do miss the tuning indicator and DCD sensitivity
control that the 232 has.

But learning new stuff is part of the fun of ham radio.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

2810. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 06:49:13 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b3d6gp02pvq@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 62004

Ahhh, C'mon, be nice..... he is more like the Frank Burns of amateur radio instead..... (reference M*A*S*H*)

Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

> Len ... welcome to ham radio from "Larry the (bigoted) Lecturer" ...
> ham radio's "ambassador of goodwill and the true ham spirit" (NOT!)
>
> Seriously ... don't let his "dumbed down Extra Lite" crap get to you.
> I'm an RF engineer w/over 32 years experience and have been a
> ham for over 25 years and Larry insults me, too ...
>
> As my friend from the UK would say, "Tell him to piss off."
>
> And, despite jerks like Larry, welcome to ham radio.
>
> 73,
> --
> Carl R. Stevenson - wk3c (ex - wa6vse)
> Grid Square FN20fm
> <mailto:wk3c@wk3c.com> (general personal e-mail and NCI e-mail)
> <mailto:wk3cqth@wk3c.com> (QSO, QSL, skeds, only, please)
> --
> NCI-1052
> Executive Director, No Code International
> Fellow, The Radio Club of America
> Senior Member, IEEE
> Member, QCWA (31424)
> Member, ARRL
> Member, TAPR
> Member, The SETI League
> --
> Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
> Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
> <http://www.nocode.org>
>
> [remainder of Larry the (bigoted) Lecturers AH comments deleted]
>

2811. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 07:07:28 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hasn7f8.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 62093

On 24 Feb 2003 04:33:19 GMT, Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:

>>Being unemployed is not a crime. Feel free to admit it.
>
>Neither is being stupid or arrogant. Take your own advice.

My judge friend often says that it's a shame that stupidity is not
a jailable offense in California - if it were the jails would be full.

Ignorance is curable. Stupidity isn't.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2812. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 07:07:29 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hasnp39.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 62094

On 24 Feb 2003 03:44:19 GMT, Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>In article <cuvyxnansvbet.has6be2.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
><Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:
>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>
>Phil:
>
>I agree entirely!

I said about all that I wanted to say about that..... <ggg>

Actually what I said (and the reply message text got wiped from the
bit-bucket) was that yes, FCC engineers served as examiners when the
regular license examiner was on vacation, out sick, or on a lunch
break. We trained our clerical staff to cover the written exam and
applications processing tasks, but the engineers (and later we got
technicians) were the ones who gave the code tests.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2813. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 07:07:29 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hasnyja.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 62095

On Mon, 24 Feb 2003 05:33:05 GMT, Dave Heil wrote:

>....and you still can't spell the word "Attila".

My friend with that name spells it exazctly the way you do. It's a
common Yugoslavian first name mowadays.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2814. Re: Petition for retail point-of-sales record keeping - transmitters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 10:50:01 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BA7F6308.100F2%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 62096

"Bill Sohl" wrote:
>
> (snip) Dale Reich, K8AD, of Seville Ohio, has
> petitioned the FCC to require sellers of
> two-way voice or data equipment to keep on
> file a buyer's name, address, telephone number
> and any future information. This, when selling
> a radio that required licensing under the
> current FCC rules.

Before we give another group authority to collect even more information on us, I'd rather see a few baby steps first. Such as serious steps to better enforce the laws already on the books and perhaps requiring a license be shown when purchasing equipment that requires a license to use.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2815. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 12:49:04 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302240449.12728333@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62097

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hasn7f8.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> On 24 Feb 2003 04:33:19 GMT, Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
> >>Being unemployed is not a crime. Feel free to admit it.
> >
> >Neither is being stupid or arrogant. Take your own advice.
>
> My judge friend often says that it's a shame that stupidity is not
> a jailable offense in California - if it were the jails would be full.
>
> Ignorance is curable. Stupidity isn't.
>
> ---
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

The jails are full.

2816. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 12:51:30 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302240451.6d6e186@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62098

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.haqdpk0.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> On 22 Feb 2003 16:21:19 -0800, Brian wrote:
>
> >> I found out that you don't know what an EA is (it's NOT a
> >> Spanish radio amateur in this context). Ask your CPA to define
> >> it for you.
> >
> >You're "smiley challenged."
>
> There are smileys and there are smileys. The trick is to know when
> to NOT use one.
>
> ---
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

A bigger trick is to recognize one when you see it.

:) - ordinary smiley
;) - winkey smiley
;)) - big grin with a wink

That should help.

2817. Re: Why I operate essentially 100% CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 12:55:14 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302240455.3dadfd43@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62099

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hasmes7.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
>
> But learning new stuff is part of the fun of ham radio.
>
> ---
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
> From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
> Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

Ding ding.

2818. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 13:09:23 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302240509.d06f4dc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62100

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E599E32.E4F3BC9C@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E57EB7C.A0596401@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E565A51.B1C29552@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
>
> > > > > > Yet its Jim's radio. You're the one who cannot keep things straight.
> > > > > > Don't sit up all night tuning the 160M band endlessly trying to snag a
> > > > > > new one, then try to be coherent in replies. Doesn't work.
> > > > >
> > > > > I understand that ",Brian" gave you a problem.
> > > >
> > > > Brian only gives you problems.
> > >
> > > Zat so? When did your stupidity or your playing dumb become my problem?
> > > You alone have to take the responsibility for what you write.
> >
> > Dave, I can only respond to what you write. If its too inane, or too
> > smug, you get what you get.
>
> So that we're sure I have this straight. I write something which you
> consider to be smug. You respond with an imcomplete idea. That makes
> me somehow responsible for your reply. Is that about it?

No. You forgot inane.

> > > > > > I was not home when replying. Jump, jump, jump.
> > > > >
> > > > > Oh. Correct my statement to read: "We're not all gathered whereever it
> > > > > is that you are". You can explain your second sentence, the incomplete
> > > > > one, later if you have any interest in anyone being able to understand
> > > > > it.
> > > >
> > > > You're supposed to be a bright boy.
> > >
> > > It is tough to fill in the blanks on a supposed sentence which contains
> > > only the same three words. Those three repeated words of yours have
> > > about the same meaning as "Tree, tree, tree" or "Lift, lift, lift". If
> > > you can't complete an idea, don't expect others to do it for you.
> >

> > Dave, try using context. Like when I said "Jump, jump, jump" (to
> > conclusions).
>
> You didn't write "Jump, jump, jump (to conclusions". You wrote "Jump,
> jump, jump" Nothing about conclusions was written by you or me.

I filled in the "(to conclusions)" so you'd finally get it. Poor
Dave.

> > > > > > Why would I turn on Jim's radio? You're still confused, aren't you?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Phil may be on to something. Stupid seems to be your default mode. Ed
> > > > > > Hare lost interest in the group when you ran extended versions of your
> > > > > > nonsense replies.
> > > > >
> > > > > That's really too bad. Law of unintended consequences. I liked Ed.
> > > >
> > > It wasn't apparent.
> > >
> > Perhaps not to you, Mr Obtuse.
>
> I don't believe it was apparent to Ed.

Ed was a decent enough guy before he hooked up with you. He just got
caught up running with the wrong crowd.

We all have our limits. I thought I met had mine, and announced I was
leaving the group. Then I decided not to let you guys run me off.

So next you start the "Kim and Alec Baldwin" routine on me. Didn't
work, didit?

> > > > On the other hand, how many other people have been run off this group?
> > > > I don't see any litttle violins playing for them.
> > >
> > > I don't know of anyone who has been "run off this group". Ed left of
> > > his own volition. His tolerance for crap had been exceeded.
> >
> > As did mine.
>
> Did you mean "as was mine"?

As in, "As was mine tolerance?" No. You'll have to be more specific.

> Were you run off this group? I only
> recalling you driving off in a Huff or leaving in a snit.

Which was it; a Huff or a snit?

How has my leaving worked out?

2819. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 13:25:54 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302240525.18aa306f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62001

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E599B49.56F5378E@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030222140633.12173.00000653@mb-mr.aol.com>...
> >
> > >
> > > I prefer to think they are simply "not serious". Just like ol' Cecil, who swore
> > > he'd never get an Extra...
> >
> > First you'se guys incessantly "encourage" lower class hams to upgrade,
> > then complain when they do.
>
> I've not encountered many radio amateurs who swear that they'd never
> upgrade.

I've encountered Extras that wanted to downgrade to Advanced so they could prove to the world that they were "old-time" hams who knew the Morse Code. I can only wonder why they don't prove to the world that they know the code by simply using the code.

> Likewise, I've not encountered many non-radio amateurs who claim they
> are going for an "Extra right out of the box" and who haven't done zip
> several years down the road.
>
> Dave K8MN

Dave, I'm sorry you have such limited experiences with people. Thats what happens when you spend the majority of your life in a comm shack handing out Q's at a 4 per minute rate.

Let me help you out. People often don't do what they say. There are rare exceptions, such as yourself, whom always do what they say, and don't do what they say they won't do. But not everyone is like you. Trust me.

For example, many people find trying to learn the Morse code confusing and frustrating. Some just can't do it, whether they have a learning or hearing disability, or just can't get past the frustration part. In another time and place, those people became Cooks and MP's. Your only experience has been inside the comm shack, where you see a bunch of ditty-boppers. You assume anyone can be a ditty-bopper.

Do you suppose that there might be a person out there who has no interest in VHF+ amateur communications, but having had a career in HF communications, would like to get an HF license? But then finds that

they cannot learn the code? Perhaps even reflects back on his or her experiences on HF, and ask why the Code is so necessary to amateur communications in the year 2003?

I hope I've helped you out on this subject.

Best of Luck, Brian

2820. Re: New Field Day Entry Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 13:28:22 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302240528.1fda6062@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62002

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030223230841.23360.00000519@mb-da.aol.com>...

>
> That's YOUR leagacy, Lennie.
>

Steve, spend a few moments reflecting on your career on rrap.

Post your legacy as you see it.

2821. Re: County Issuing Radio Licenses

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 13:32:33 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302240532.6a6961d0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62003
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.shortwave

Jim, obviously you weren't on a military frequency. Does the FCC dole
out frequencies to the DoD? Brian

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:<v5ilm4elhin13c@corp.supernews.com>...
> Brian, when I worked in circuit control on Guam Island, there was a **very**
> nasty blast from the Chief of Naval Operations concerning putting military
> transmissions on 75 meters. Seems it is an international ham band. Someone
> complained to the FCC. Hmmmm ... there **are** international treaties.
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim
>
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0302221658.49d90b39@posting.google.com...
> > "Stan" <k6rmr@dslextreme.com> wrote in message
> news:<v5droe6ns6el5f@corp.supernews.com>...
> > > In 1934 The Congress of the United States gave
> > > sole Authority to control and license all radio Transmissions
> > > in the Country to the FCC.
> > > Stan
> > >
> > Cept military.
>
>
> ---
> Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
> Version: 6.0.456 / Virus Database: 256 - Release Date: 2/18/03

2822. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 14:05:05 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <519A34C8E4709EEF.AC7F390307B99120.575E74F4FFC2D370@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 62011

"KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com> wrote in message
news:v5j2rg137b05a1@corp.supernews.com...
>
> "W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
> news:2FDC07BD4F914DDA.A5065375F3EEEABC.218DE52BA0D82195@lp.airnews.net...
> > "Jackie" <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> wrote in message
> > news:rv66a.230004$be.204752@rwcrnsc53...
> > > > > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > Therefore, the
> > > > > Extra Lites have to prove themselves to ME.
> > > >
> > > > Hahah! You really need to take a bottle of Get Over Yourself. If you
> > don't
> > > > want to talk to newer Extras or those of lesser license classes, then
> turn
> > > > the knob.
> > > >
> > > > Jackie
> > > > KC0ODY
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > Jackie: He's been begging for someone to "prove theirself" to him ever
> since
> > I found this newsgroup--probably before that.
>
> I did we had a real nice chat on 20 meters the other day.
>
> > I envision Larry as a very
> > lonely person because of it. But, he's too arrogant to get it...
>
> I didn't find him that way at all.
>
> > He also
> > is under the delusion that those whom he attacks are truly offended or
> upset
> > by him.
>
> He use to attack me here also remember? But now
> I've shown him I'm not whining trying to get something
> for nothing and not a part of the "I want it all now" group
>
> > That's the *real* joke...

> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> The real joke is I have a QSL card on my wall with
> the callsign of K3LT and you don't. BTW Kim he's
> really rather nice on the air. We even tried a little
> Hellschriber along with the PSK 31 and RTTY. He
> only tends to get rabid when you talk about laziness
> and callsigns naming body parts ;^) OTOH I'm not
> to fond of lazy people either, be it in the ARS or
> just life in general.
>
> As for the assigning words to Larrys callsign here's
> my attempt at it. K3Let's Try
>
> He's the one who suggested we try Hellschriber which
> up to that point neither of us had ever tried. BTW it
> works pretty nice also!
>
> --
> '73' From KB9TMP
> "The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
> if you can fake that, you've got it made."
> -Groucho Marx
>
>
>

Maybe if Larry would display the same kind of characteristics on this newsgroup as you apparently were afforded on HF, there are those of us who would not have the opinions we do. I do not find Larry nice at all... Nor do I care to investigate any further...

Kim W5TIT

2823. Re: Petition for retail point-of-sales record keeping -transmitters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 14:07:24 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <wGp6a.4761$8f7.746@nwrdny02.gnilink.net>
Source record: 62005

"Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
news:BA7F6308.100F2%stewart@say.net...
> Before we give another group authority to collect even more information
on
> us, I'd rather see a few baby steps first. Such as serious steps to better
> enforce the laws already on the books and perhaps requiring a license be
> shown when purchasing equipment that requires a license to use.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

Amen!

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

2824. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 14:12:00 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3E5A2830.2080006@psu.edu>
Source record: 62006

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Mike Coslo wrote....

>> The tests are
>>
>>>first grade stuff
>>
>
> I don't see any way that anyone could have ever made such a statement concerning
> the Extra class written I took in '69. There was a whole lot of quite advanced and
> involved radio theory that demanded considerable comprehensive learning of complex
> material. Definitely way beyond entry level. That you say it today seems to me
> to validate what Larry has to say on the subject- the tests truly ARE reduced
> severely in content and quality.

Don't get me wrong. I had to spend some serious time studying for my Extra. But that desn't mean it was "hard" for me. It meant studying and working on the material. And although my weakest knowledge are is in RF, (one of the reasons I forst started looking at the ARS in the first place) I am savvy enough to know that there isn't as much difference as you say. Maybe we have different definitions of hard.

In my limited experience, I would have to say that if there were one area that needed improvement in a retro fashion, it would be that the prospective extra would be required to wait for a while before being able to teast for and get the license. I know a few Extras who passed the test and have nil HF experience. It IS a shame when an extra doesn't know how to operate an HF rig.

> Seems worth saying one more time- If the Extra class is not going to mean
> anything, it's no more than a farce. What else could it be when everyone today
> wants to say the test for it means no more than the Novice test?

Who says it doesn't mean anything? It means something to me.

>>> I'll judge hams on what they did afterwards.
>>
>
> For some strange reason that refrain was NEVER heard before the late
> restructuring. Another point in favor of Larry's point of view.

I'll judge ALL hams on what they do afterwards. This includes pre "easy test" hams, CW wizards, Pre-restructuring hams, Pre-incentive licensing hams, shack on a belters, those of us who took the easy tests, and the whole gamut.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2825. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 14:21:38 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3E5A2A72.8020109@psu.edu>
Source record: 62007

Floyd Davidson wrote:
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:
>
>>Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote:
>>
>>>>> I'll judge hams on what they did afterwards.
>>>>
>>> For some strange reason that refrain was NEVER heard before the late
>>>restructuring. Another point in favor of Larry's point of view.
>>>
>>> Then we have geniuses like Slim Burke to offer up as genuine, current evidence.
>>
>>Dick, you're supposed to be the biggest, baddest Extra with a
>>professional career in electronics, plus lots and lots of emergency
>>comms experience. Yet you can't seem to be able to get a radio to
>>work away from the power mains.
>
>
> I've been reading this thread, and frankly it is not amusing at
> all. I've been licensed as KL7GPS for awhile and thought
> amateur radio might be something to take up as a hobby now that
> I'm retired (from a professional career in communications, which
> included both commercial radiotelegraph and radiotelephone
> licenses).

And great fun it is! There are enough different modes and activities to keep a person gainfully occuppied and having fun at the same time.

> I haven't gotten around to putting together a rig to get on the
> air, and this type of exchange is cause to question whether it
> would be worth the bother.

Don't let the actions of a few deter you. Now get on the air! My biggest regret is that I didn't start in Ham radio sooner. Even to the extent of taking the so-called hard tests.

> I personally like that idea of an Elmer. It's a hobby, it is
> *supposed* to be fun. And it is when people at various levels
> get together and exchange ideas, help each other, and generally
> do whatever part of it they are capable of enjoying.

Sure is fun. Not many things I can Elmer on, being a relatively new ham and all, but I help where I can.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2826. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 14:22:51 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3E5A2ABB.4060707@psu.edu>
Source record: 62010

Jackie wrote:
>>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
>
> > Therefore, the
> > Extra Lites have to prove themselves to ME.
>
> Hahah! You really need to take a bottle of Get Over Yourself.

<snip>

Is that stuff made by GOYa? ;^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

2827. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 14:25:02 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <2Xp6a.5836$hj.1655097@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 62008

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0302231242.203ee0a9@posting.google.com...
>
> Many of the Extras on here, whom most of work in the field as
> electronics engineers, want the rest of us to learn everything to
> their level of professional detail, without getting paid a handsome
> salary for the effort.

That is blatantly false ... I, for one, have REPEATEDLY stated
that, while technical proficiency could/should be improved in our
ranks, that there should NOT be anything even remotely approaching
an EE level of knowledge requirement.

> They really do want something for nothing.

Also blatantly false ... all we want is to eliminate an outdated,
unnecessary
requirement that only serves as a barrier to entry by qualified people (the
Morse proficiency requirement).

Carl - wk3c

2828. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 14:25:47 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3E5A2B6B.6050806@psu.edu>
Source record: 62009

Len Budney wrote:

> Here's a thought: If the FCC won't make tougher tests mandatory, maybe
> the ARRL should offer voluntary "certifications". They give out
> wallpaper to people who work all states, etc.; why can't they give out
> some wallpaper to people who voluntarily sit for an examination on
> theory, deeper theory, and super-duper tough theory?

In fact, they do offer courses.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2829. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 14:30:19 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <%%p6a.5838$hj.1657309@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 62012

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3E5981A6.3080507@adelphia.net...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
[his usual sort of stuff]
>
> Not that I have to prove anything, but I'm on the BOD of my local club, I
> am a major participant in field day in the area, controlling the GOTA
> station and working the late shift. (we were second in our class in FD
> last year)I run the club website and am involved with the PAQSO party.
> I help at all the public service events for the club, and make every
> piece of equipment that I can for my shack. I help at the local ARRL
> kid's day efforts, and other recruiting efforts we do.
>
> What do you do for the ARS?

Larry helps keep the bands from becoming "overcrowded" by constantly
insulting and putting down newbies on usenet. That appears to be his
sole function in life, other than driving his bus.

Carl - wk3c

2830. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 14:31:29 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3E5A2CC1.9060804@psu.edu>
Source record: 62013

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> In article <rv66a.230004$be.204752@rwcrnsc53>, "Jackie"
> <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> writes:
>
>
>>>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>>
>>>Therefore, the
>>>Extra Lites have to prove themselves to ME.
>>
>>Hahah! You really need to take a bottle of Get Over Yourself. If you don't
>>want to talk to newer Extras or those of lesser license classes, then turn
>>the knob.
>>
>>Jackie
>>KC0ODY
>
>
> Jackie:
>
> In spite of any hasty conclusions you may have drawn about me without
> really knowing me personally, <snippage>

But that is what she has to judge you with, Larry; your postings.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2831. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 14:48:31 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3E5A30BF.90604@psu.edu>
Source record: 62014

Floyd Davidson wrote:
> Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote:
>
>>Floyd Davidson wrote:
>>
>>>I'd suggest the Larry and Dick dump the chip on the shoulder
>>>routine.
>>
>>And I'd suggest that if you predicate your opinion of ham radio and hams, and anyone
>>posting here, only on reading of this this thread you're in for a real shock.
>
>
> Nothing I said suggested that to be true! So perhaps _you_
> could be in for a shock concerning exactly what I do predicate
> my opinion of hams and ham radio on. :-)
>
>
>>Assuming you can handle Google go back a few years and work your way up to the present
>>then get back to us. To say your knowledge of things is incomplete is just too much
>>understatement to even present a small piece of a case. You've got the chips on the
>>wrong shoulders.
>
>
> I *know* better than that.
>
> In what I think is the much *more* typical style of Hams in
> general, the responses to it have been (except for yours) very
> agreeable. And even yours isn't filled with the silly bullying
> and insults that were in the posts by Larry (and which you
> voiced support for) that I referenced.
>
> (A couple of the responses to my original article were downright
> nearly as pleasant as I've seen anyone be on Usenet, including
> one email which was just an absolutely wonderful message.)

Agreed, Floyd!

If a person is truly trying to sway others, they are much better served by being pleasant in their approach. Like it or not, abrasiveness works best on sandpaper.

Since we are on the google thing here, I suggest anyone interested do a search on Fritz Zwicky. A brilliant but eccentric astronomer who was so difficult that colleagues purposefully discounted some of his theories until after his passing. (dark matter)

His abrasiveness and intractability actually impeded science's progress.

I wonder if he would have changed his approach if he considered that he was actually doing harm to his profession?

- Mike KB3EIA -

2832. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 15:31:47 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0302240731.6efb6537@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62015

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030223211231.05573.00001139@mb-mh.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0302221911.70355fdc@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >Includes the complete irrelevance attached to posting experience in
> >baby-sitting Army RTTY repeaters over a half century ago as some kinda
> >"credentials". Except more so.
>
> Poor baby, still suffering catapult over-pressure?
>
> I never "baby-sat" any Army TTYs. That was in tape relay at
> Chuo Kogyo. Poor guy never has seen any torn-tape TTY
> relay in operation, has he? Too bad, no US military branch
> has them anymore...doesn't need them.
>
> Kellie doesn't understand that real, high-power (up to 40 KW)
> HF transmitters at a station are NOT "repeaters." They were
> not such a half century ago, still not so.

"Includes the complete irrelevance attached to posting experience in
baby-sitting Army RTTY repeaters over a half century ago as some kinda
"credentials". Except more so."

2833. Re: Why I operate essentially 100% CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 16:16:46 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <Ozr6a.245319$vm2.190141@rwcrnsc54>
Source record: 62016

Ok Phil and Larry tnx for the info ... my 232 suffers from what I have heard
is a terminal IE DOA condition....I have tried x2 to replace the LM-317
regulator which apparently is the problem with the 232 series in that a lot
of heat is generated. I am no design engineer but that is what I have heard
throughout the years. The information I received from Timewave was that
the unit is probably gone for good. Pactor is definitely the mode I enjoyed
the most. I have tried the sound card stuff through a home brew interface
but I think my optoisolator or there abouts is shot as there is a T-R
problem. Again this is one of those things that I have to get around to
doing.

That lists keeps getting longer and longer....

73 Guys and Girls God Bless Tom KI3R Port Vue nr Pittsburgh
"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hasmes7.pminews@netnews.attbi.com...
> On 24 Feb 2003 03:44:18 GMT, Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> >>Agree 110% Bill ....I operated pactor et al for about 14 years until my
> >>PK232 bit the dust ....I should get another as I really enjoyed the
digital
> >>modes ...have been using the sound card stuff but I guess I am used to
the
> >>232.
>
> Send it to Timewave = they revive and upgrade 232s very nicely.
> Mine was done about three years ago, when they added DSP detection
> and replaced the DCD sensitivity control (at no cost) which they
> said was damaged when I shipped it to them.
>
> >Since your PK-232 bit the dust, why not try a KAM-Plus next? Mine is
> >10 years old and showing no signs of "age" whatsoever, except maybe
> >it's EPROM firmware version. It's a heckuva lot smaller than a PK232,
> >does everything the 232 does,
>
> Does it do NAVTEX and TDM ? Does it have a Signal Analysis
> mode to determine data type, polarity, and baud rate ?
>
> >and I think it's a lot simpler for somone new to digital modes to master,
> >since it can be controlled directly from >the keyboard with a
dumb-terminal
> >or terminal emulator program (I use >QModem).
>
> I rum my 232 from a terminal emulator and control it directly from
> the keyboard. I use it mainly for (non-ham) MF/HF monitoring. Were

> I on HF (I am licensed for all ARS bands and modes but I haven't had
> a HF rig for over 25 years) I would run PACTOR.
>
> The fancy (and expensive) packet program runs a PK-88 on 2-m.
>
> I recently acquired a KAM-3 (not the plus) which I may set up
> on a second packet channel (our ARES/RACES operations here are
> heavily into packet) or use it for APRS - I haven't decided
> which. The antenna connected to that transceiver went sour
> (20+ dB down compared to an identical antenna on the other
> mast) and the safety officer that I've been married to all
> these years has declared that I have to wait until it's drier
> and warmer to climb up on the roof (I agree).
>
> It's taken me a while to shift gears to the Kantronics command set
> after using the AEA for over 10 years. It is smaller than the PK-88
> and the PK-232 but I do miss the tuning indicator and DCD sensitivity
> control that the 232 has.
>
> But learning new stuff is part of the fun of ham radio.
>
> ---
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
> From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
> Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon
>
>

2834. Re: Petition for retail point-of-sales record keeping -transmitters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 16:16:47 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <Pzr6a.245321$vm2.189863@rwcrnsc54>
Source record: 62017

The only baby steps that I would like to see is a return to the enforcement that was present back in the 60s ...and that would return these days only with a yearly license fee. I am sure that would go over big with the "somfin fer nutin" crowd.

73 God Bless Tom KI3R Port Vue Pa.
"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message news:wGp6a.4761$8f7.746@nwrdny02.gnilink.net...
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
> news:BA7F6308.100F2%stewart@say.net...
> > Before we give another group authority to collect even more information
> on
> > us, I'd rather see a few baby steps first. Such as serious steps to better
> > enforce the laws already on the books and perhaps requiring a license be
> > shown when purchasing equipment that requires a license to use.
> >
> >
> > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> >
> > http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
> Amen!
>
> --
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI
>
>

2835. Re: Petition for retail point-of-sales record keeping - transmitters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 16:26:08 UTC
From: Lloyd <Lloyd@NoMoreBureaucrats.net>
Message-ID: <b3dh1u$gs8$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 62018

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message

> Since when has investigation of purchase and possession of radio
> ewuipment which has not been stolen been a function of local law
> enforcement? It's bad enough that the Feingold Bill (now law) gave
> them permission to investigate unlicensed "CB" -operation-.
>
> Needed by -whom- ? Certainly not local law enforcement which has a
> full plate and not enough funds to do it right at present.
> ---
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>

ANYTHING which results in a less intrusive federal government,
less tax burden on overtaxed and overegulated Americans IS
ALWAYS good news! As well as anything that results in a
shrinking of the bloated federal bureaucracy and too many federal
bureaucrats is always good news as well for the American tax payer.

Lloyd

"Contrary to premature reports from power hungry federal
bureaucrats, the Second Amendment to the U.S. Constitution
is NOT dead and IS an individual right guaranteed by the
United States Constitution."

2836. Re: County Issuing Radio Licenses

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 16:41:19 UTC
From: Wayne <W77wayne@youdontsayno.com>
Message-ID: <b3dhue$i6g$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 62019
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.shortwave

Reminds me of a practical lesson in "frequency assignment"
which I witnessed being taught to the FCC a few years
ago. Two gents approached the U.S. Navy ship on which
I was a civilian tech rep a few years ago. One guy was fairly
obese and the other looked like Elmer Fudd. They approached
the gangway, waving tiny gold badges and screaming something
about a radio signal coming from this ship and that they were from
the "FCC." They demanded to see the C.O. of the ship but
instead, the OOD had the Marine guard deposit them on the
nearest civilian property, with instructions not to set foot on
military property in the near future, less they get to sample food
served in the Navy brig. Funniest dam thing I saw in years!

WayneO

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0302240532.6a6961d0@posting.google.com...
> Jim, obviously you weren't on a military frequency. Does the FCC dole
> out frequencies to the DoD? Brian
>
> "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:<v5ilm4elhin13c@corp.supernews.com>...
> > Brian, when I worked in circuit control on Guam Island, there was a
very
> > nasty blast from the Chief of Naval Operations concerning putting
military
> > transmissions on 75 meters. Seems it is an international ham band.
Someone
> > complained to the FCC. Hmmmm ... there **are** international treaties.
> >
> > 73 from Rochester, NY
> > Jim
> >
> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > news:f45722ac.0302221658.49d90b39@posting.google.com...
> > > "Stan" <k6rmr@dslextreme.com> wrote in message
> > news:<v5droe6ns6el5f@corp.supernews.com>...
> > > > In 1934 The Congress of the United States gave
> > > > sole Authority to control and license all radio Transmissions
> > > > in the Country to the FCC.
> > > > Stan
> > >
> > > Cept military.
> >

> >
> > ---
> > Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> > Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
> > Version: 6.0.456 / Virus Database: 256 - Release Date: 2/18/03

2837. Re: N8WWM BUSTED SAYS RAIN REPORT

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 16:58:55 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <1cik5v81phn558psqm606h7qcsma2e3otp@4ax.com>
Source record: 62021
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On 23 Feb 2003 17:27:34 GMT, Lloyd@no.spammmmm (Lloyd) wrote:

>No. You made the original assertion that it is almost impossible to
>lose a defamation suit for making just a few posts. It is up to you
>to support your difficult position (Your position is difficult to
>defend, because it takes just one example of a successful suit to
>prove you wrong).

My opinion is based on experience. I was co-sysop of a BBS that was online from 1989 to 1996. It handled Fidonet, and later, Usenet message groups. Users posted with handles to remain (semi)anonymous, just like today. Two groups of users got into on the board, and threatened to sue. Now, how do you think a *reputable* lawyer is going react when a client asks about suing someone only known as "Malignant Boner" and all you have is an IP address?

>Google is full of examples for anyone who chooses to look, and they
>date back to the late 1990's. Wired Magazine even lamented at that
>time that the existence of Usenet was threatened. When the courts in
>Virginia decided that they could apply Virginia law to any AOL
>subscriber no matter where they reside in the U.S. (the "long arm"
>provision), things got even scarier for AOLers who defame other Usenet
>posters.

...and what was the outcome of these suits? Settled out of Court? Dropped? Dismissed by the Judge?

Like I said, either post the link or shut up. I'm not doing your damn homework.

2838. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 17:05:22 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0302240905.4e1b6771@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62020

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:<Z2b6a.3284$8f7.2103@nwrdny02.gnilink.net>...

> Actually, that was the kicker. (no pun intended.) We went from a range of
> only a couple of blocks to being able to reach one or two towns over. More
> recently, my niece and I were able to copy each other over approx. 15 mi.,
> albeit w/greatly elevated antennas. (Using the Morse feature only, no
> voice.)

Neat!

> You kidding, I can read radio stuff for hour on end.

Well, you asked for it....

> All too kewl, thanks for sharing. :-)

Maybe I should tell the story about Daisy and the dynamotor.....

73 de Jim, N2EY

2839. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 17:21:37 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0302240921.23049fdf@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62022

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030223211221.05573.00001124@mb-mh.aol.com>...
> In article <20030222140633.12173.00000652@mb-mr.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com writes:
>
> >>>> > Tsk, tsk, tsk, it's a mystery to me why someone who is an
> >>>> > amateur will hide his profession. :-)
> >>>
> >>>Who does that? Can't be me. My profession has been reported here
> >>>several times. Here it is again:
> >>>
> >>>I'm an electrical engineer. I've been employed full time in design
> >>>(and a few other EE-related activities) since graduation from college.
> >>
> >> In what field of electricity or electronics? Table lamp design?
> >> Spaceship control systems? Miniature R/C cars? Power
> >> transmission? Industrial control electric things? $3.50 AC
> >> outlet strips with built-in surge protectors?
> >
> >You don't need to know, Len. Electrical engineering is my profession, and
> >it's not hidden, so you could not have been talking about me anyway.
>
> To have a profession implies being professional, of having an
> income derived from someone or some entity receiving those
> professional services.

Did you not understand: "I've been employed full time in design(and a
few other EE-related activities) since graduation from college.", Len?
What do you think it means? ;-)

> Without any evidence of employment or no one receiving
> professional services, we can consider you unemployed.

You would be mistaken, then. Who is "we"? :-)

> >> No company mentioned (for various fearfull reasons),
> >
> >"Fearfull"? Of what? Certainly not you, Len. I don;t even take you seriously,
> >let alone fear you or any thing you could do.
>
> Yes you are.

No, I'm not. It's quite clear that you are really ticked off that I
won;t tell you where I work. Too bad, learn to live with it. ;-)

> >>>> > Must be some schizoid fantasy thing going around... :-)
> >>>

> >>>lessee...who needs multiple screen names?
> >>
> >> Why does AOL make them available? :-)
> >
> >So that different family members can use the same account yet retain
> >different
> >email accounts and online identities. For some reason, you need multiple
> >identities to deal with ham radio. Could the reason be that you are afraid of
> >something? Sure seems like it.
>
> Oh, my, got a post-graduate degree in psychology too? :-)

Naw, just common sense. ;-)

> >> My full USPS mailing address was in every byline
> >> in Ham Radio magazine. Same in BYTE.
> >
> >Both of which are now defunct, are they not? If not, where can I buy the
> >March, 2003 issue of Ham Radio fanzine?
>
> All 22 years of Ham Radio articles are available on 3 CDs from
> CQ and resold by ARRL for $150. Shipping charges EXTRA with
> ARRL direct orders.

No NEW issues in more than 12 years. Just digital reprints. IOW,
defunct. X-P
>
> Ham Radio magazine quit publication in 1990 on the sale of
> the parent company (Communications Technology, Inc.) to CQ.

No new issues in more than 12 years = defunct. R.I.P.

> CQ reorganized the assets of Communications Technology into
> the Ham Radio Bookstore (still existing) and the formation of
> Communications Quarterly magazine.

No more new issues of "Ham Radio" magazine. That means "defunct". Like
the allegedly shagged-out Norwegian Blue in the Monty Python "Dead
Parrot" sketch. 8-(

>
> While Ham Radio is no longer being published monthly, it did
> not disappear, vanish, or become absent in any way.

Really? No new issues in 12+ years but it has not become absent in any
way? HAW!

> The
> three CDs prove that.

All the CDs do is make old information available without the need to
make paper copies.

> Good information does not become
> "defunct" like burned-out vacuum tubes.

Lots of vacuum tube information in those old issues of "Ham Radio",
too. :-)))

> >My full name and address in every US Callbook and CD-ROM since 1968, and are
> >on the FCC database. Did you have trouble accessing the database to find my
> >name?
>
> No, but the information does not reveal your field of industry or
> profession, either. :-)

So? Sounds like you have an obsessive-compulsive need for that
information. Too bad. Learn to live without it. ;-)
>
> >His hobby is wasting time....
>
> Lots of offended beings waste their time replying, don't they? :-)

You reply to almost every post I make here, whether addressed to you
or not. You are afraid of the truth. And that's no joke.

Jim, N2EY

2840. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 17:28:27 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hat7vjg.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 62023

On 23 Feb 2003 21:15:21 -0900, Floyd Davidson wrote:

>Technical expertise in radio is *not* the measure of a Ham.

I hope that you can agree with me that technical expertise is but
-one- measure of a ham and there are other factors as well. It is
not the -sole- factor.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2841. Re: County Issuing Radio Licenses

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 17:28:27 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hat7mgf.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 62024

On 24 Feb 2003 05:32:33 -0800, Brian wrote:

>Jim, obviously you weren't on a military frequency. Does the FCC dole
>out frequencies to the DoD?

An FCC representative sits on the Interagency Radio Advisory
Committee (IRAC) that does. Until NTIA got into the act, the
FCC did the paperwork and provided the leadership for IRAC.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2842. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 17:37:22 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E5A5835.925A13E2@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62025

Phil Kane wrote:
>
> On Mon, 24 Feb 2003 04:31:50 GMT, Dave Heil wrote:
>
> >I don't see anything wrong with lending a helping hand to a newcomer--as
> >long as he or she doesn't refer to me as an "Elmer".
>
> Mr too. For a xouple of years I worked for a guy named Elmer
> whom I didn't respect as a "mentor".

I worked as an outside salesman for an industrial electronics distributor. We had a middle-aged counterman with two missing front teeth. The guy couldn't add two single digit numbers without a calculator. Want to guess as to his given name?

Dave K8MN

2843. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 17:40:46 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E5A5911.9FAB8484@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62026

Phil Kane wrote:
>
> On Mon, 24 Feb 2003 05:33:05 GMT, Dave Heil wrote:
>
> >....and you still can't spell the word "Attila".
>
> My friend with that name spells it exazctly the way you do. It's a
> common Yugoslavian first name mowadays.

Len's now off in search of a "Hun language" dictionary online.

Dave K8MN

2844. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 17:48:34 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hati9yh.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 62027

On Mon, 24 Feb 2003 17:37:22 GMT, Dave Heil wrote:

>I worked as an outside salesman for an industrial electronics
>distributor. We had a middle-aged counterman with two missing front
>teeth. The guy couldn't add two single digit numbers without a
>calculator. Want to guess as to his given name?

Yet, Zack Electronics, the "parts house" in San Francisco for many
decades, had a counterman named Elmer (Grassi) who was a top-notch ham
and assisted many a ham and broadcast professional in getting the
right parts either from stock or on special order.

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2845. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 17:49:33 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E5A5B76.3071A89@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62028

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E599E32.E4F3BC9C@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E57EB7C.A0596401@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E565A51.B1C29552@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > > > > > > Yet its Jim's radio. You're the one who cannot keep things straight.
> > > > > > > > Don't sit up all night tuning the 160M band endlessly trying to snag a
> > > > > > > > new one, then try to be coherent in replies. Doesn't work.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > I understand that ",Brian" gave you a problem.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Brian only gives you problems.
> > > > >
> > > > Zat so? When did your stupidity or your playing dumb become my problem?
> > > > You alone have to take the responsibility for what you write.
> > >
> > > Dave, I can only respond to what you write. If its too inane, or too
> > > smug, you get what you get.
> >
> > So that we're sure I have this straight. I write something which you
> > consider to be smug. You respond with an imcomplete idea. That makes
> > me somehow responsible for your reply. Is that about it?
>
> No. You forgot inane.

I'll correct that portion. "You respond with an incomplete and inance
idea".

> > > > > > > > I was not home when replying. Jump, jump, jump.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Oh. Correct my statement to read: "We're not all gathered whereever it
> > > > > > > is that you are". You can explain your second sentence, the incomplete
> > > > > > > one, later if you have any interest in anyone being able to understand
> > > > > > > it.
> > > > > >
> > > > > You're supposed to be a bright boy.

> > > >
> > > > It is tough to fill in the blanks on a supposed sentence which contains
> > > > only the same three words. Those three repeated words of yours have
> > > > about the same meaning as "Tree, tree, tree" or "Lift, lift, lift". If
> > > > you can't complete an idea, don't expect others to do it for you.
> > > >
> > > Dave, try using context. Like when I said "Jump, jump, jump" (to
> > > conclusions).
> >
> > You didn't write "Jump, jump, jump (to conclusions". You wrote "Jump,
> > jump, jump" Nothing about conclusions was written by you or me.
>
> I filled in the "(to conclusions)" so you'd finally get it. Poor
> Dave.

You also wrote some blather about context. Your three word non-sentence
had no context.

> > > > > > > Why would I turn on Jim's radio? You're still confused, aren't you?
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Phil may be on to something. Stupid seems to be your default mode. Ed
> > > > > > > Hare lost interest in the group when you ran extended versions of your
> > > > > > > nonsense replies.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > That's really too bad. Law of unintended consequences. I liked Ed.
> > > > >
> > > > > It wasn't apparent.
> > > >
> > > > Perhaps not to you, Mr Obtuse.
> >
> > I don't believe it was apparent to Ed.
>
> Ed was a decent enough guy before he hooked up with you. He just got
> caught up running with the wrong crowd.

I'm sure your comment will send him scurrying back here.

> We all have our limits. I thought I met had mine, and announced I was
> leaving the group. Then I decided not to let you guys run me off.

You were wrong about your limits. You were wrong to announce anything
if there was the possibility that you would nearly instantly change your
mind. Alec Baldwin found himself having to eat HIS words too after
announcing that he'd be leaving the country if George Bush was elected.

You ran yourself off for a very brief time.

> So next you start the "Kim and Alec Baldwin" routine on me. Didn't
> work, didit?

You, Kim and Alec have some traits in common.

> > > > > On the other hand, how many other people have been run off this group?
> > > > > I don't see any litttle violins playing for them.
> > > > >
> > > > > I don't know of anyone who has been "run off this group". Ed left of
> > > > > his own volition. His tolerance for crap had been exceeded.
> > > >
> > > > As did mine.
> > >
> > > Did you mean "as was mine"?
> >
> As in, "As was mine tolerance?" No. You'll have to be more specific.

Read what you wrote. Read what I wrote. See if you can find any
glaring grammatical goofs on your part. Let me know what you find.
>
> > Were you run off this group? I only
> > recalling you driving off in a Huff or leaving in a snit.
> >
> Which was it; a Huff or a snit?

It matters not.

> How has my leaving worked out?

For you? Not very well. You don't seem to have much will power.

Dave K8MN

2846. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 18:03:25 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E5A5EB3.617021E1@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62029

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E599B49.56F5378E@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030222140633.12173.00000653@mb-mr.aol.com>...
> > >
> > > >
> > > > I prefer to think they are simply "not serious". Just like ol' Cecil, who swore
> > > > he'd never get an Extra...
> > >
> > > First you'se guys incessantly "encourage" lower class hams to upgrade,
> > > then complain when they do.
> >
> > I've not encountered many radio amateurs who swear that they'd never
> > upgrade.
>
> I've encountered Extras that wanted to downgrade to Advanced so they
> could prove to the world that they were "old-time" hams who knew the
> Morse Code. I can only wonder why they don't prove to the world that
> they know the code by simply using the code.

A downgrade would seem to be an impossibility.

> > Likewise, I've not encountered many non-radio amateurs who claim they
> > are going for an "Extra right out of the box" and who haven't done zip
> > several years down the road.

> Dave, I'm sorry you have such limited experiences with people. Thats
> what happens when you spend the majority of your life in a comm shack
> handing out Q's at a 4 per minute rate.

I've never handed out "Q's" from a "comm shack".

> Let me help you out. People often don't do what they say.

I was aware of that. We have only to look at Cecil, you, Kim and Len in
this very group to confirm that.

> There are
> rare exceptions, such as yourself, whom always do what they say, and
> don't do what they say they won't do. But not everyone is like you.

I was aware of that as well.

> Trust me.

I'm going to have problems with this one. You told us that you were leaving the group but your absence was very brief. How can I trust you?

> For example, many people find trying to learn the Morse code confusing
> and frustrating. Some just can't do it, whether they have a learning
> or hearing disability, or just can't get past the frustration part.
> In another time and place, those people became Cooks and MP's. Your
> only experience has been inside the comm shack, where you see a bunch
> of ditty-boppers. You assume anyone can be a ditty-bopper.

I never worked with a bunch of ditty-boppers anywhere. My last year in the military was spent doing news releases for the Lackland AFB Office of Information. I never encountered ditty-boppers in any of the several rock and blues bands of which I was a member. While a couple of the electronics distributors I worked for had hams as employees (I even had a radio amateur, W8PBX as a sales manager at one place), none were real CW aficionados.

I believe that just about anyone can learn morse code at a rate of five words per minute in very short order.

> Do you suppose that there might be a person out there who has no
> interest in VHF+ amateur communications, but having had a career in HF
> communications, would like to get an HF license? But then finds that
> they cannot learn the code? Perhaps even reflects back on his or her
> experiences on HF, and ask why the Code is so necessary to amateur
> communications in the year 2003?

We've been through all this before. I don't believe there are many people who can't learn morse code at five words per minute. I don't believe there will be any morse test at all within a short period. I believe that even Len Anderson can learn morse at five words per minute. After all, he has told us that he already knows morse code. How much of a stretch can it be for him to become "proficient" with it at five words per minute? I believe that morse is used as much in 2003 as it was in 1998 in amateur radio.

> I hope I've helped you out on this subject.

Not really.

Dave K8MN

2847. Re: N8WWM BUSTED SAYS RAIN REPORT

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 18:05:04 UTC
From: Dave Hall <nojunk_n3cvj@worldlynx.net>
Message-ID: <3E5A5ED0.1421@worldlynx.net>
Source record: 62030
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Krell wrote:
>
> On 23 Feb 2003 17:27:34 GMT, Lloyd@no.spammmmm (Lloyd) wrote:
>
> >No. You made the original assertion that it is almost impossible to
> >lose a defamation suit for making just a few posts. It is up to you
> >to support your difficult position (Your position is difficult to
> >defend, because it takes just one example of a successful suit to
> >prove you wrong).
>
> My opinion is based on experience. I was co-sysop of a BBS that was
> online from 1989 to 1996. It handled Fidonet, and later, Usenet
> message groups. Users posted with handles to remain (semi)anonymous,
> just like today. Two groups of users got into on the board, and
> threatened to sue. Now, how do you think a *reputable* lawyer is going
> react when a client asks about suing someone only known as "Malignant
> Boner" and all you have is an IP address?

I was also sysop of both a land-line and ham radio packet BBSes back between 1990 and 1995, and I had to deal with similar issues. One of the most famous issues had to deal with a ham in my area (WA3QNS) sending a message that denounced the gulf war (Actually it was a poll), and included a 1-900 number to call. Someone got the bright idea that this post facilitated business use of ham radio, and the FCC got involved. To make a long story short, the rules were subsequently changed so that BBS operators were not held responsible for the content of messages posted by their members. To view otherwise would've placed a great deal of pressure on sysops, to constantly monitor traffic. A daunting task, to say the least.

>
> >Google is full of examples for anyone who chooses to look, and they
> >date back to the late 1990's. Wired Magazine even lamented at that
> >time that the existence of Usenet was threatened. When the courts in
> >Virginia decided that they could apply Virginia law to any AOL
> >subscriber no matter where they reside in the U.S. (the "long arm"
> >provision), things got even scarier for AOLers who defame other Usenet
> >posters.
>
> ...and what was the outcome of these suits? Settled out of Court?
> Dropped? Dismissed by the Judge?

There have been some successful suits. The vast majority never make it to court though, as there are just too many obsticles in the way, and

it's generally not worth the effort. Plaintiffs, in libel cases, still have the burden of proof to show damages, and that is often not quantifiable. It's also hard to draw the line between statement of fact and the expression of an opinion, the latter being protected under the 1st amendment.

> Like I said, either post the link or shut up. I'm not doing your damn
> homework.

It's just hot air. Like the frivilous lawsuits where a criminal breaks into a house and injures himself in the process, and sues the homeowner. No one with any sense would even consider such a case.....

Dave
"Sandbagger"

2848. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 19:48:19 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E5A771A.293FB0C1@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62031

Phil Kane wrote:
>
> On Mon, 24 Feb 2003 17:37:22 GMT, Dave Heil wrote:
>
> >I worked as an outside salesman for an industrial electronics
> >distributor. We had a middle-aged counterman with two missing front
> >teeth. The guy couldn't add two single digit numbers without a
> >calculator. Want to guess as to his given name?
>
> Yet, Zack Electronics, the "parts house" in San Francisco for many
> decades, had a counterman named Elmer (Grassi) who was a top-notch ham
> and assisted many a ham and broadcast professional in getting the
> right parts either from stock or on special order.

Maybe that's where they got the nickname! OUR (Cincinnati) Elmer was not a ham and used to say about hams, "Those hams will take up ten dollars worth of time for ten cents worth of parts". In those days, Elmer would have had to wait on one ham for three hours to hit the ten buck mark. He came to us from Lapriow Brothers Surplus in Northside where he was the grinch behind the counter for years. If you wanted pleasantry or were looking for some technical advice, you had to deal with one of the two owners.

Dave K8MN

2849. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 20:37:20 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@ptialaska.net>
Message-ID: <87smuds9dr.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 62039

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote:
>On 23 Feb 2003 21:15:21 -0900, Floyd Davidson wrote:
>
>>Technical expertise in radio is *not* the measure of a Ham.
>
> I hope that you can agree with me that technical expertise is but
> -one- measure of a ham and there are other factors as well. It is
> not the -sole- factor.

It is a *hobby*, and technical expertise is *not* the measure of
a Ham. It isn't even a part of that measure!

Think about it! Some of the *least* technically inclined Ham
operators are the *best*.

It is just wonderful if any given Ham wishes to develop a level
of technical expertise approaching or equal to a professional, but
that doesn't equate to a measure of that person as a Ham.

Instead, what they *do* with that expertise is an important part
of such a measure. For example, if they use it to help others,
either by teaching those who want to also develop the same
expertise or if they give technical assistance to those who do
not, *that* is the material of a good Ham. If they use their
expertise to disparage others or to insult whole groups of people
(i.e., Novices or new Extra Class licensees) then that expertise
is a net negative.

It is not technical expertise which counts. It's what a person
does with whatever talents they bring to the table (large or
small), that is the measure.

Hence we have some here demonstrating very effectively that
technical expertise can be a negative.

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://www.ptialaska.net/~floyd>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

2850. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 21:20:02 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3E5A8C82.670C7E36@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 62032

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>
> Actually, it stands for "Lotsa Talent."
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

"Lima Tango"?

2851. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 21:27:39 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302241327.474d19a5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62033

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<2Xp6a.5836$hj.1655097@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0302231242.203ee0a9@posting.google.com...
> >
> > Many of the Extras on here, whom most of work in the field as
> > electronics engineers, want the rest of us to learn everything to
> > their level of professional detail, without getting paid a handsome
> > salary for the effort.
>
> That is blatantly false ... I, for one, have REPEATEDLY stated
> that, while technical proficiency could/should be improved in our
> ranks, that there should NOT be anything even remotely approaching
> an EE level of knowledge requirement.

Now Carl, is that false for every Extra on here, or just for you?

> > They really do want something for nothing.
>
> Also blatantly false ... all we want is to eliminate an outdated,
> unnecessary
> requirement that only serves as a barrier to entry by qualified people (the
> Morse proficiency requirement).

I think you completely misread my comment.

And I agree with eliminating outdated, unnecessary and superfluous
requirements.

But please reflect on what some of the PCTA Extras have stated
regarding current theory exams. As far as the code exam goes, does
Extra Dick want the elimination of outdated requirements? Does Extra
Jim want outdated requirements removed? Does Extra Kelly want
outdated requirements removed? Does Extra Phil want outdated
requirements removed? Does Extra Larry (non-electronics career) want
outdated requirements removed?

Nope. That's more than two (aka "a couple").

I stand by my statement of "many."

Brian

2852. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 21:31:46 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302241331.42241d8c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62034

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E59A4FB.70B6668F@att.net>...

>
> And I'd suggest that if you predicate your opinion of ham radio and hams, and anyone
> posting here, only on reading of this this thread you're in for a real shock.
> Assuming you can handle Google go back a few years and work your way up to the present
> then get back to us. To say your knowledge of things is incomplete is just too much
> understatement to even present a small piece of a case. You've got the chips on the
> wrong shoulders.
>
> Dick

Ahem, Dick. He's pegged you. Suck it up and move on. Tomorrow is
another day. Maybe you could Elmer someone for pennance.

Brian

2853. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 21:33:45 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3E5A8FB9.1CA0D9B8@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 62035

Dick Carroll wrote:

>
> You might as well have taken the First Phone test, you wouldn'thave been the first
> 16 year old to get one. Obviously you could have done it. Wasn't any huge deal. But
> I get a little tired of hearing repeatedly that all the ham radio tests have always
> been "entry level" and trivial. Not so.
>

Depends on what background you had when you took the tests. Sure, the
extra writtens are not a big deal for a person with a BSEE to handle.
But for someone in a non technical field it would take some effort.

2854. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 21:37:43 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3E5A90A6.C5ABC413@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 62036

Floyd Davidson wrote:

>
> I knew *many* disk jockies that went to school for six weeks and
> earned 1st Class Radiotelephone tickets. None of them had *any*
> perception of what it all meant on a larger scale. What they
> understood was that by memorizing a test they had a better
> chance of being employed. Smart people, but not technicians.

I have heard urban legends suggesting that such schools taught
little more than "Question 38's answer is 'C'". As if the FCC
only had one test and it was an open secret that the answer
key was known outside of the FCC offices....

2855. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 21:48:39 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3E5A9337.70A4FEC1@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 62037

Dave Heil wrote:

>
> Maybe that's where they got the nickname! OUR (Cincinnati) Elmer was
> not a ham and used to say about hams, "Those hams will take up ten
> dollars worth of time for ten cents worth of parts".

I have found that most of the time is spent trying to get the salesperson to understand what I want. Not trying to learn technical info. Sometimes they don't even have what I need. Nowadays I spend most of my searching for parts on the 'net.

2856. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 21:52:11 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3E5A940B.C8BE9E0C@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 62038

Mike Coslo wrote:

>
> Since we are on the google thing here, I suggest anyone interested do a
> search on Fritz Zwicky. A brilliant but eccentric astronomer who was so
> difficult that colleagues purposefully discounted some of his theories
> until after his passing. (dark matter)
>
> His abrasiveness and intractability actually impeded science's progress.
>
> I wonder if he would have changed his approach if he considered that he
> was actually doing harm to his profession?
>

Had read in an old issue of _Sky and telescope_ an article on the naming of
the planet Pluto. Someone suggested a name like "Chronus" but the suggester
was so detested that people who otherwise liked the name blew it off....
Can't remember if it was Fritz or someone else.

2857. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 22:24:07 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@ptialaska.net>
Message-ID: <87isv9s4fs.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 62043

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote:
>Floyd Davidson wrote:
>
>>
>> I knew *many* disk jockies that went to school for six weeks and
>> earned 1st Class Radiotelephone tickets. None of them had *any*
>> perception of what it all meant on a larger scale. What they
>> understood was that by memorizing a test they had a better
>> chance of being employed. Smart people, but not technicians.
>
>I have heard urban legends suggesting that such schools taught
>little more than "Question 38's answer is 'C'". As if the FCC
>only had one test and it was an open secret that the answer
>key was known outside of the FCC offices....

I don't think they had the answer keys, but they certainly did
have the exact wording of each and every question that would
ever show up on a test. So the "school" taught pattern matching
between 300 (or whatever it was) questions and answers.

That's actually easier than "Question 38's answer is C", because
on some tests it was question 43 or 12 instead. :-)

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://www.ptialaska.net/~floyd>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

2858. Re: New Field Day Entry Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 23:26:25 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030224182625.05845.00000081@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 62040

>Subject: Re: New Field Day Entry Class
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 2/24/03 7:28 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0302240528.1fda6062@posting.google.com>

>Steve, spend a few moments reflecting on your career on rrap.
>
>Post your legacy as you see it.

The difference here, Brain, is that I don't have an agenda to keep or a self-proclaimed mission other than poking holes in Lennie's lying.

YOU are a added "bennie". Vippy is a joke. The three of you make up the Three Blind Mice of RRAP.

Furthermore, I have no concern about how I am perceived in here. My "legacy", as I have told you before, exists outside this forum. My "legacy" exists in REAL deeds...Not what is spewed about in here.

My Amateur Radio "personna" is exhibited ON Amateur Radio...Not a flamefest infected newsgroup.

Next?

Steve, K4YZ

2859. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 23:37:32 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030224183732.23546.00000140@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 62041

From N2EY:
>>>You were the one who started waving degrees around.

I never was "waiving" my degree, just stated my interests. I mentioned my degree to show why I would be interested in the electronics aspects of amateur radio.

From K4YZ:
> But as demonstrated before (with references to established secondary
>education facilities within spitting distance of Lennie's hole) the Amateur
>License MAY confer college credit as an elective

Did you just read what you wrote? I seriously doubt any accredited college would offer college credit, even 1 credit, for getting an amateur radio license. Using a question pool format, most people can pass the test within a week. Giving college credit for that would be wrong. Which college does this?

The subject material for the test is very good - if one truly mastered those areas. One way to make use of this would be to offer ARRL certification courses. Its not the same as the amateur radio license. Certifications mean you went into more detail in a specific area.

2860. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 23:38:54 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <i2y6a.5897$hj.1723735@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 62042

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0302241327.474d19a5@posting.google.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<2Xp6a.5836$hj.1655097@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > news:f45722ac.0302231242.203ee0a9@posting.google.com...
> > >
> > > Many of the Extras on here, whom most of work in the field as
> > > electronics engineers, want the rest of us to learn everything to
> > > their level of professional detail, without getting paid a handsome
> > > salary for the effort.
> >
> > That is blatantly false ... I, for one, have REPEATEDLY stated
> > that, while technical proficiency could/should be improved in our
> > ranks, that there should NOT be anything even remotely approaching
> > an EE level of knowledge requirement.
>
> Now Carl, is that false for every Extra on here, or just for you?

I don't recall ever seeing ANYONE (other than PCTAs floating
red herrings) advocate EE knowledge for any class of ham license.

> > > They really do want something for nothing.
> >
> > Also blatantly false ... all we want is to eliminate an outdated,
> > unnecessary
> > requirement that only serves as a barrier to entry by qualified people
(the
> > Morse proficiency requirement).
>
> I think you completely misread my comment.

I think you misread my comment ... I was responding to the "want
something for nothing" comment ... nothing more, in my last paragraph
above ...

73,
Carl - wk3c

2861. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 23:47:43 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <zay6a.5898$hj.1728404@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 62044

"Floyd Davidson" <floyd@ptialaska.net> wrote in message
news:87smuds9dr.fld@barrow.com...
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote:
> >On 23 Feb 2003 21:15:21 -0900, Floyd Davidson wrote:
> >
> >>Technical expertise in radio is *not* the measure of a Ham.
> >
> > I hope that you can agree with me that technical expertise is but
> > -one- measure of a ham and there are other factors as well. It is
> > not the -sole- factor.
>
> It is a *hobby*, and technical expertise is *not* the measure of
> a Ham. It isn't even a part of that measure!

First, it's a service, that some people choose to pursue as a hobby.

Check out 97.1 ... to quote:
ï¿½97.1 Basis and purpose.
The rules and regulations in this Part are designed to provide an amateur
radio service having a fundamental purpose as expressed in the following
principles:

(a) Recognition and enhancement of the value of the amateur service to the
public as a voluntary noncommercial communication service, particularly with
respect to providing emergency communications.

(b) Continuation and extension of the amateur's proven ability to contribute
to the advancement of the radio art.

(c) Encouragement and improvement of the amateur service through rules which
provide for advancing skills in both the communications and technical phases
of the art.

(d) Expansion of the existing reservoir within the amateur radio service of
trained operators, technicians, and electronics experts.

(e) Continuation and extension of the amateur's unique ability to enhance
international goodwill.

b, c, and d all point to the value of technical proficiency amongst hams
as justifying rationales for our continued access to our spectrum
allocations.

NOWHERE in Part 97 does it refer to ham radio as a hobby ... it's a service.

> Think about it! Some of the *least* technically inclined Ham
> operators are the *best*.

While I will admit that someone can be a polite, courteous,
"good" *operator* with little technical knowledge, that does
not mean that we should encourage folks to believe that
technical knowledge has no merit or value and they should
all become techno-ignorant appliance operators.

73,
--
Carl R. Stevenson - wk3c
Grid Square FN20fm
<mailto:wk3c@wk3c.com> (general personal e-mail and NCI e-mail)
<mailto:wk3cqth@wk3c.com> (QSO, QSL, skeds, only, please)

NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, QCWA (31424)
Member, ARRL
Member, TAPR
Member, The SETI League

Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

2862. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 23:52:56 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <sfy6a.5899$hj.1728951@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 62046

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3E5A8FB9.1CA0D9B8@ix.netcom.com...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> >
> > You might as well have taken the First Phone test, you wouldn'thave
been the first
> > 16 year old to get one. Obviously you could have done it. Wasn't any
huge deal. But
> > I get a little tired of hearing repeatedly that all the ham radio tests
have always
> > been "entry level" and trivial. Not so.
> >
>
> Depends on what background you had when you took the tests. Sure, the
> extra writtens are not a big deal for a person with a BSEE to handle.
> But for someone in a non technical field it would take some effort.
>

What's the point??? Remember, we're talking about basic qualifications
here, not some "work ethic, make 'em jump through hoops" crap ...

Dick apparently thought the test he had to take was "hard" ... he doesn't
believe that todays' tests are "hard enough" ... and he begrudges anyone
who already has the technical knowledge to pass them easily because
he believes that "everyone should have to work hard to demonstrate their
dedication" in order to "earn" their license ...

Carl - wk3c

2863. Re: Petition for retail point-of-sales record keeping -transmitters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-24 23:55:48 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <8iy6a.5901$hj.1729292@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 62045

"garigue" <garigue@attbi.com> wrote in message
news:Pzr6a.245321$vm2.189863@rwcrnsc54...
> The only baby steps that I would like to see is a return to the
enforcement
> that was present back in the 60s ...and that would return these days only
> with a yearly license fee. I am sure that would go over big with the
> "somfin fer nutin" crowd.

If Congress would permit the FCC to keep the money and use it for
increased enforcement in the ham bands, I'd gladly pay an annual fee
of, say $10.00, for my ham license (or $100.00 for a 10 year license,
plus the maintenance fee for my callsign)

Carl - wk3c

2864. Re: Petition for retail point-of-sales record keeping -transmitters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 00:27:32 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b3ed90kqq1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 62047

What maintenance fee is that? It seems to me that once a 'special and/or vanity call' is issued it is then in the data base..right? Why the additional charges for a vanity call upon renewal?

Can anyone say ripe-off ?

Dan/W4NTI

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message news:8iy6a.5901$hj.1729292@nnrp1.ptd.net...
>
> "garigue" <garigue@attbi.com> wrote in message
> news:Pzr6a.245321$vm2.189863@rwcrnsc54...
> > The only baby steps that I would like to see is a return to the
> enforcement
> > that was present back in the 60s ...and that would return these days
only
> > with a yearly license fee. I am sure that would go over big with the
> > "somfin fer nutin" crowd.
>
> If Congress would permit the FCC to keep the money and use it for
> increased enforcement in the ham bands, I'd gladly pay an annual fee
> of, say $10.00, for my ham license (or $100.00 for a 10 year license,
> plus the maintenance fee for my callsign)
>
> Carl - wk3c
>

2865. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 00:54:29 UTC
From: Jackie <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com>
Message-ID: <99z6a.247115$HN5.1052450@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 62048

> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message

> > Len:
> >
> > You've just been given bad advice. You ARE a "dumbed down Extra Lite"

Pay no mind to Larry. He trolls this newsgroup like it's a lake full of walleye.

Jackie KC0ODY

2866. Re: Petition for retail point-of-sales record keeping - transmitters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 01:02:38 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.52.0302250058430.163@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 62049

On Sun, 23 Feb 2003, Bill Sohl wrote:
>The correct RM # is RM-10641
>
>Someone else previously posted:
>RADIO LAW: HAM PETITIONS TO KEEP EQUIPMENT AND
>SALES DATE ON FILE
>
>Dale Reich, K8AD, of Seville Ohio, has petitioned the FCC to require
>sellers of two-way voice or data equipment to keep on file a buyer's
>name, address, telephone number and any future information.
>This, when selling a radio that
>required licensing under the current FCC rules.
>
>Accordiong to an ARRL bulletin, the information collected
>would remain private, available only to the FCC or law enforcement.
>Reich said in his petition that any retail vendor would be able to ask
>local police for an investigation if the retailer suspected the radios
>were not going to be used in compliance with the law.
>
>Included in the petition is a requirement for "ownership and license
>tagging" for gear operating under Parts 5, 15, 18, 74, 80, 90,
>95 and 97. In his petition, Reich said such tagging used to be
>an FCC requirement and that his
>proposed change was a needed tool for local law enforcement.
>
>The full text of Reich's petitions is available on the FCC Web site. Search
>for petition number RM-1064. (Coorection - It's RM-10641)
>
>Comments are due no later than February 28th.
>(K8AD, ARRL Letter)

So, someone wants the government to keep track of cordless phones, video senders, non-IR TV/satellite remotes, etc.... (well, part 15 was included).

If that's what we really want, that will force the FCC to become as large as the IRS, 100,000 employees strong nationwide, just to MANAGE THE PAPERWORK. What a bonehead idea.

Now, there may be some merit in "REAL" two-way gear tracking, but then don't we already have that - it's called LICENSING? :-)

2867. Re: Petition for retail point-of-sales record keeping - transmitters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 01:07:41 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.52.0302250106250.163@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 62050

On Mon, 24 Feb 2003, Dwight Stewart wrote:
>"Bill Sohl" wrote:
>> (snip) Dale Reich, K8AD, of Seville Ohio, has
>> petitioned the FCC to require sellers of
>> two-way voice or data equipment to keep on
>> file a buyer's name, address, telephone number
>> and any future information. This, when selling
>> a radio that required licensing under the
>> current FCC rules.
>
> Before we give another group authority to collect even more information on
>us, I'd rather see a few baby steps first. Such as serious steps to better
>enforce the laws already on the books and perhaps requiring a license be
>shown when purchasing equipment that requires a license to use.

Just don't expect any gifts of radio equipment then.....

2868. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 01:12:24 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.52.0302250111190.163@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 61901

On Mon, 24 Feb 2003, Dave Heil wrote:
>A downgrade would seem to be an impossibility.

...Don't be so certain. Call Riley and ask for a re-test, then intentionally pass the lower elements but fail element 4. You will swiftly be handed your downgrade. :-)

2869. Re: Petition for retail point-of-sales record keeping -transmitters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 01:14:57 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.52.0302250114340.163@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 61902

On Mon, 24 Feb 2003, Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>What maintenance fee is that? It seems to me that once a 'special and/or
>vanity call' is issued it is then in the data base..right? Why the
>additional charges for a vanity call upon renewal?
>
>Can anyone say ripe-off ?

What's "ripe" about that?

>"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
>news:8iy6a.5901$hj.1729292@nnrp1.ptd.net...
>>
>> "garigue" <garigue@attbi.com> wrote in message
>> news:Pzr6a.245321$vm2.189863@rwcrnsc54...
>> > The only baby steps that I would like to see is a return to the
>> enforcement
>> > that was present back in the 60s ...and that would return these days
>only
>> > with a yearly license fee. I am sure that would go over big with the
>> > "somfin fer nutin" crowd.
>>
>> If Congress would permit the FCC to keep the money and use it for
>> increased enforcement in the ham bands, I'd gladly pay an annual fee
>> of, say $10.00, for my ham license (or $100.00 for a 10 year license,
>> plus the maintenance fee for my callsign)
>>
>> Carl - wk3c
>>
>
>
>

2870. Re: Petition for retail point-of-sales record keeping - transmitters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 01:31:22 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <v5lhtfj537kk16@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 61903

Ouch! Now wireless digital cameras are out too! I knew there was a reason
I didn't want a wireless LAN ;)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.52.0302250058430.163@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...

>
> So, someone wants the government to keep track of cordless phones, video
> senders, non-IR TV/satellite remotes, etc.... (well, part 15 was
included).
>
> If that's what we really want, that will force the FCC to become as large
as the
> IRS, 100,000 employees strong nationwide, just to MANAGE THE PAPERWORK.
What a
> bonehead idea.
>
> Now, there may be some merit in "REAL" two-way gear tracking, but then
don't we
> already have that - it's called LICENSING? :-)

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.456 / Virus Database: 256 - Release Date: 2/18/03

2871. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 02:02:19 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030224210219.22973.00001461@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 61922

In article <3E59A4ED.56C5F8CC@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>How would you know what someone is likely to encounter on the air,
>Leonard?

1. Get an HF receiver.
2. Connect receiver to an antenna.
3. Turn receiver on.
4. Listen.

No problem.

>> >The "tougher than the First Phone" thing was a quote from an FCC examiner.
>>
>> Surrrre it was, long-timer.
>
>How would you know, Leonard?

Tsk, tsk, tsk. I was agreeing with the unemployed person. :-)

Oh, and I took such a First Phone test in 1956. Must have
changed since then, though, what with COLEMs and all.

>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

Big Lie repeated. [always willing to oblige... :-)]

>What was the percentage of those taking the aptitude tests which showed
>little or no aptitude for learning morse again, Leonard?

You tell us, mighty macho morseman from the wilds of
the African experience. :-)

>That's funny. Air Force DI's at Amarillo routinely referred to Basic
>Training as "boot camp" in October and November 1968. I still heard the
>term used at Lackland in 1971 and '72 after I returned from Vietnam.
>You weren't in the Air Force either were you, Len?

No. As a civilian engineer I've only been to Wright-Patterson,
Chanute, Edwards AFB as far as USAF-only installations.

Why is it so important to you, mighty macho morseman?
Is US amateur radio some kind of military auxilliary?

>> Civilian intercept operators for the
>> US government are trained at Fort Huachuca as well.
>
>Don't believe everything you read on a web page, Leonard.

Been to "Fort Sneeze," too, fat stuff. Several times.

Missed the UAV section there (wasn't fully in on last trip),
would have been interesting.

>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

Big Lie thing repeated.

No problem on repetition. Takes very little effort to do. Always
glad to help mighty macho morsemen in their quest for Truth,
Justice, and the Amateur Way. :-)

2872. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 02:02:20 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030224210220.22973.00001462@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 61911

In article <3E59A07C.FE831152@att.net>, Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> Hmmm.. I passed the Extra in 1970 at the age of 16. Tougher than the First
>> Phone......
>>
>> Next time somebody starts waving their First Phone around...
>
> You might as well have taken the First Phone test, you wouldn'thave been the
>first
>16 year old to get one. Obviously you could have done it. Wasn't any huge
>deal. But
>I get a little tired of hearing repeatedly that all the ham radio tests have
>always
>been "entry level" and trivial. Not so.
>

Tsk, tsk, tsk, you didn't and the unemployed one didn't go
all the way to First Class. Was it too tough for you? :-)

Gosh, when the FCC came all the way down to Fort Monmouth
to give you the test, I would have thought you could meet them
all the way...tsk, tsk, tsk.

2873. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 02:02:21 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030224210221.22973.00001463@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 61904

In article <20030223224420.09808.00001227@mb-fk.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>Is this enough, Mike?

Earned your WAS yet? Need help? :-)

2874. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 02:02:22 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030224210222.22973.00001464@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 61923

In article <3E59A691.95829A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <3E57E82F.2EE444A5@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >>
>> >> In article <3E553338.C2DE600C@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
>> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> >> writes:
>>
>> >> Poor baby. Way back in time he got his snow job melted...all
>> >> about using CW as an order-wire for an RTTY circuit in some
>> >> small embassy (?) in the middle of Africa in the 1980s.
>> >
>> >You mean the order wire circuit which you claimed on numerous occasions
>> >that I had originated--the one I corrected about repeatedly? That claim
>> >of yours was pasted by a repost from the Google archives. Watch out for
>> >those six-year-olds waving the straight keys around. You could get
>> >hurt.
>>
>> If an RTTY radio circuit has such bad performance that you
>> need manual telegraphy through OOK CW to communicate
>> schedules and orders, then it will not be a good RTTY circuit
>> for regular traffic.
>
>You really haven't been paying attention, have you. Go back and check
>those Google archives and enlighten yourself.

I know what was good doctrine and procedure on HF radio
as used by US government and military communicators.

The subject originally was using CW telegraphy as an
"order-wire" on an RTTY circuit. Illogical procedure.
Not used by other agencies.

> It should become an OOK CW circuit
>> instead.
>
>That wasn't for you to decide.

True, but that didn't make it "good" or "logical," did it?

>> If an RTTY radio circuit is passing TTY messages fine in
>> regular traffic, then it doesn't need any OOK CW for
>> schedules and orders in order-wire use.
>
>Again, you haven't been paying attention.

I pay attention to practical procedure that makes sense in
radio, especially that which was worked out years before.

>> That's logical. One or the other.
>
>It wasn't for you to decide.

Yes it was five years ago. Heil tried to pull off a snow job
on pro techniques, got bit on the ass then, hasn't stopped
hurting since.

>> Even in the 1980s other HF radio users didn't do such illogical
>> procedures. Only, has the Oberst explained, the "State
>> Department."
>
>The Department of State was not obligated to do everything some other HF
>radio users did, Spock.

Yes, Nurse Chapel, there's no Bones about it. If anyone
Chekovs old messages they won't find any actual reference
to State's procedure, will they? Uhura along and find that the
only "authority" on State is the one shoveling the snow job
about CW telegraphy order-wires on an RTTY circuit. Even
Scotty wouldn't do that all the way to Sulu land. Don't have
a Roddenberry, Kirk.

>You mean that you aren't impressed? You don't know anything about my
>radio expertise. How is my having a government job "getting away with"
>anything, Leonid?

Poor baby. All that time in a diplomatic service and never
learned any lessons of diplomacy. :-)

>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

Big Lie statement repeated. :-)

2875. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 02:02:23 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030224210223.22973.00001465@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 61917

In article <c2356669.0302240921.23049fdf@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>Did you not understand: "I've been employed full time in design(and a
>few other EE-related activities) since graduation from college.", Len?
>What do you think it means? ;-)

Looks like an unsubstantiated statement of employment to me. No details of anything, just generalities.

What are those "EE-related activities," mighty worker?

Do you have any idea of the different fields/disciplines in electricity and electronics? Over two dozen different large groupings in the IEEE Transactions alone.

>> Without any evidence of employment or no one receiving
>> professional services, we can consider you unemployed.
>
>You would be mistaken, then. Who is "we"? :-)

Any reader who has had the endurance to read these statements. That's about four of us in the "we" category.

>No, I'm not. It's quite clear that you are really ticked off that I
>won;t tell you where I work. Too bad, learn to live with it. ;-)

Poor baby. Must not be taking this "seriously!"

>No more new issues of "Ham Radio" magazine. That means "defunct". Like
>the allegedly shagged-out Norwegian Blue in the Monty Python "Dead
>Parrot" sketch. 8-(

I'm not familiar with the references to aviary creatures mentioned. Are those carried in QST?

>Lots of vacuum tube information in those old issues of "Ham Radio",
>too. :-)))

Then, in the illogic of pedantic guilt by association, vacuum tubes are DEFUNCT.

You can't have it both ways...

>So? Sounds like you have an obsessive-compulsive need for that
>information. Too bad. Learn to live without it. ;-)

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Getting testy about being unemployed?

>> >His hobby is wasting time....
>>
>> Lots of offended beings waste their time replying, don't they? :-)
>
>You reply to almost every post I make here, whether addressed to you
>or not. You are afraid of the truth. And that's no joke.

I'm not a marine named Colonel Jessup. [motion picture
"A Few Good Men" available on DVD (a form of CD)]

I have the time. :-)

2876. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 02:02:24 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030224210224.22973.00001466@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 61913

In article <f45722ac.0302240451.6d6e186@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
>news:<cuvyxnansvbet.haqdpk0.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
>> On 22 Feb 2003 16:21:19 -0800, Brian wrote:
>>
>> >> I found out that you don't know what an EA is (it's NOT a
>> >> Spanish radio amateur in this context). Ask your CPA to define
>> >> it for you.
>> >
>> >You're "smiley challenged."
>>
>> There are smileys and there are smileys. The trick is to know when
>> to NOT use one.
>>
>> ---
>> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>A bigger trick is to recognize one when you see it.
>
>:) - ordinary smiley
>;) - winkey smiley
>;)) - big grin with a wink
>
>That should help.

Careful, Brian, he has a friend who is a judge...

Oddly enough, "smileys" or emoticons are claimed to be the
innovations of a Tektronix engineer, first seen on BBS networks
years ago. Tektronix, a world leader in oscilloscopes, is head-
quartered in Oregon, near Phil's residence. :-)

2877. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 02:02:25 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030224210225.22973.00001468@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 61914

In article <3E59967B.3B38934E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

Another macro repeat of a Big Lie item, really the opinion of
another. As stated in another message, I will repeat such
to aid a propagandist wanna-be. :-)

>I'd have to say that you are predicatable, Leonard.

More confusion and misspelling.

I'm not "predicate-able" in that I don't like to diagram sentences.
I just write them. Sometimes I get money for writing.

I'm not "predictable" in that I follow someone's rules on how
to take chastisement like a good little "inferior." :-)

The word might be "predicament" misspelled...but it's not my
predicament but rather Heil's original snow job that he buried
hisself in 5 years ago.

2878. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 02:02:25 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030224210225.22973.00001467@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 61919

In article <3E59A8C3.5A081B84@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

Big Lie statement repeated.

>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

Big Lie statement repeated.

>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

Big Lie statement repeated.

>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

Big Lie statement repeated.

>The magazine is defunct. I have a whole shelf full of Radio Craft
>magazine. It is defunct as well. There are no new issues of Radio
>Craft yet, lo and behold, the old copies still reside on the shelf.

"Radio Craft" was a Gernsback publication which changed its name to "Radio Electronics" and later used the familiar "RE" colloquialism of its readers in reference to itself within the magazine. As far as I've bothered to look on Fry's Electronics big newsstand, it was still in publication last year. I sold a two-part article to RE back in 1968. :-)

2879. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 02:02:26 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030224210226.22973.00001469@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 61915

In article <3E59AC03.14A19AEF@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <f45722ac.0302210503.716575a8@posting.google.com>,
>> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>>
>> >> >> > Anything else you would like me to pass on to Len?
>> >> >>
>> >> >> No, you'd likely get it screwed up too.
>> >> >
>> >> >Just like you to jump to conclusions.
>> >>
>> >> Pssst...mention the cashews... :-)
>> >
>> >Dave, I've got a message for you from Len: "Cashews."
>>
>> I don't think it does any good. The Oberst only listens to
>> what he wants to hear. He is not good about taking advice.
>> He is above such things.
>
>Let's see if you are good at taking advice, Lynnard. To become a
>participant in HF amateur radio, 1) become "proficient" in morse code at
>the rate of 5 wpm and 2) pass the appropriate written exams. Maybe
>you're above such things.

Misdirection. Herr Robust is confused and angry, not
understanding that his legs were pulled or perhaps enraged
that someone had the temerity to tweak his royal nose. :-)

"Cashews" refers to the principal export of Guinea-Bisseau,
a rather small former colony in the middle of Africa...the
location of the US embassy where radio officer Heil used
manual CW as the "order-wire" of an RTTY circuit.

Poor feller must be nuts, can't focus on anything but
himself.

2880. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 02:02:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030224210228.22973.00001470@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 61925

In article <3E59AB4F.6316C763@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <3E5652A1.65D2C4DB@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >> In article <G545a.187100$HN5.815085@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net>, "Jackie"
>> >> <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> writes:
>> >>
>> >> >"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>> >> >news:20030220021035.29944.00000027@mb-fi.aol.com...
>> >> >
>> >> >> "It's the LAW!" Right. Laws in force now cannot ever
>> >> >> be changed, cannot be talked about (absolutely never
>> >> >> by those without official authorized licenses!). Yup.
>> >> >
>> >> >Who sez?
>> >>
>> >> Heh...that phrase "It's the LAW!" turns up from time to
>> >> time in here, written by several. It's the "turf" mentality
>> >> of the old-timers.
>> >
>> >The turf in question is amateur radio, in which we are participants and
>> >in which you are not a participant.
>>
>> ...and I suppose you think you "own" your own callsign, too?
>
>My callsign is mine as long as I breathe and continue to renew it.

That "callsign" is NOT real property, is not personal property.
It is the registry of your permission to operate according to
US amateur radio regulations, the registry maintained by the
FCC. The FCC has the perfect right to take away that
callsign if it sees fit to do so.

>No one else is authorized to use my callsign.

Quite true. The same thing applies to driver's license numbers,
hunting and fishing license registry numbers, and many other
licenses having registry alphanumerics.

>You are less a
>participant in the issue of my callsign than you are in amateur radio.

The FCC may take away your license (and the callsign) any
time they see fit. No staff or commissioner in the FCC is
required to have any amateur radio license.

>No, the statement I made is irrefutable fact.

Incorrect.

>Ummmm...again, you weren't remotely involved with any Department of
>State communications operations ever. You have made a couple of false
>statements.

Not. While details of US Department of State activities are
not fully public, indeed some are quite classified, much of it
IS quite public. DSN listings of embassy and consulate staffs
are an example. If you wish to embellish staff listings as
"key lists," that is your own title hunger growling. "Key lists"
is the familiar name of master cryptographic keys, not staff
listings.

State Department radio communications facilities' capabilities
on HF isn't publicized in amateur radio magazines, yet their
size and nature are known to other radio professionals involved
in HF communications for the various military and government
agencies and groups. Within the USA international networks of
radio, State has always been one of the smaller ones. Their
procedures on HF are generally that of all other HF radio
communications involving both message traffic and as common
carriers for messages of several agencies using a network.

A term such as "order-wire" is not well-known to radio
amateurs. It is the command circuit, full-time or part-time,
used to maintain a radio circuit or circuits to a receiving
location. It is familiar to those few of us who have been in
government, military, or common-carrier communications.

What was done in here was to mention "order-wire" casually
on an opinion of the superiority of using manual telegraphy
on a radio teleprinter circuit, claiming that conditions in the
middle of Africa made it too difficult to "synchronize" schedules
and other circuit commands. On the face of it, that is highly
illogical. If a radio circuit cannot handle RTTY as an "order-
wire" function, then it cannot handle normal message traffic
using TTY. It should be a full-time CW telegraphy circuit. On
the other hand, if normal TTY message traffic works, then there
is no reason whatsoever not to use TTY for the scheduling and
command instructions. The switchover to CW telegraphy just
for "order-wire" information exchange makes no sense.

That snow job might have passed unnoticed among a group of
average radio amateurs, hobbyists who have probably not had
any experience with full-time HF messaging. Unfortunately, it
did not and the snow cover-up has been going on for 5 years.

>Those have come back to bite you in the ass.

Not mine. :-)

>You have no more way of knowing that than you do of State Department
>communications operations.

Snow jobs are snow jobs. Some fancy description of government
activity can't cover up lots of snow.

>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

No problem with me. If Herr Robust wants to perpetuate a
Big Lie technique in propaganda, I am willing to help him
out by repeating it every time he uses that macro. :-)

>I have a stake in that I am a participant in amateur radio.

That isn't the principal cause of all this snow job coverup.
You have a "stake" only because of ego and pride not
allowing you to give in to any correction. You will insist
and obfuscate and misdirect any correction of an obvious
original flaw until you are no more.

>> There shall be NO dissent in the ranks.
>
>You aren't in the ranks.

True. My military Honorable Discharge was received in 1960.

>I don't determine whether you participate in amateur radio, Len.

Misdirection again. One does not have to be a participant in
amateur radio to understand that the alleged CW "order-wire"
on an RTTY circuit was illogical. Those of us who had been
in HF messaging for the military and government knew it wasn't
good procedure.

>You'll have to pass the exam if you want to do that.

Continual misdirection. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

2881. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 02:02:31 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030224210231.22973.00001471@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 61924

In article <3E59959D.2AF97AAF@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <3E553A2E.859D91C9@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>
>Allow me to add some of the parts you've snipped just for the sake of
>clarity:
>
>LHA: "Geez, will you Three Morseketeers make up your collective
> mind? :-)"
>
>> >We don't have a collective mind.
>>
>> Do you have hives?
>
>So your response to my statement is just more of your nonsense.

...still no answer. :-)

>> >No, I simply called attention to your playing fast and loose with the
>> >truth.
>>
>> "Fast and loose?" Heavens no...everything is Strict and Proper,
>> in formation, dressed right and covered down. Hut-too-tree-foah!
>
>So that's your response to a statement which accuses you of outright
>fabrication?

That's as good as your worth... :-)

>Me: "When I tell you, 'It's raining',
> that is not a command, it is a statement based in fact."
>
>LHA: "Of course. You will also say 'the sky is blue, the grass is
> green' and other colorful statements of fact while red in
> the face. Go for it."
>
>> >Those aren't commands either.
>>
>> Oh, that's right! You issue Commandments!
>
>Wrong again. I made statements.

Jawhol, Herr Robust! :-)

>Me: "Don't blame someone else that you allowed several decades of
>"interest"
> in amateur radio to pass without acting on that 'interest'."
>
>LHA: "I have interest in my bank, too, but don't want to become a
> banker. There, two facts, absolute truth. :-)"
>
>> >Only dodges from you, Leonard?
>
>> No, I only drive Chevrolets...
>
>Yet more nonsense from you in lieu of an actual response.

I've written it before and continue to write it. My original
purpose was to argue against the morse code test for an
amateur radio license, any class, in the USA. That is
still my objective.

Personally taking and passing an amateur radio test was
not my personal objective, personally speaking.

Unfortunately, a small group of anal-retentive macho
morsemen cannot see arguing anything except from a
point of view equivalent to their own personal ideals.

>You aren't knowledgeable about amateur radio.

Wrong. US amateur radio is one of the most-publicized
hobby activities involving radio in the United States. The US
regulations on amateur radio forbid transmission with the
intent to obscure communications. There is nothing secret
about US amateur radio.

>You aren't a participant in amateur radio.

True. That's also true of every single unlicensed person who
might, someday, want to get a license.

The FCC does not require any staffer or commissioner to have
amateur radio licenses, yet they MAKE the regulations regarding
US amateur radio.

>Why would anyone be swayed toward your view of how
>amateur radio should be regulated?

It is not possible to change the very set-in-old-mental-concrete
minds of superior beings who have a need to control what is
"best for amateur radio." I do not attempt to change their
minds. They are unmoveable in any event. They, as self-
styled "superior beings" become quite unglued when confronted
by others having opposite viewpoints about a radio activity.

>That isn't what I wrote.

>That isn't what I wrote.

Your exact words are not inviolate. You cannot take any criticsm
of your "superior" viewpoints so you go on tirades of rebuke and
false charges, fantasies of conspiracy that others aren't saying
what they are writing. No problem. You are an "untouchable"
who feels he must always be obeyed just because you exist.

Now you are angry at a light tone in response, demanding some
kind of penance for false sins. Pfui. Ptui.

>Just more nonsense from you.

>Your material isn't as cute when the stuff you snipped is reinserted.

Awwwww.....

>We weren't discussing commercial radio licenses. We weren't discussing
>driving licenses. We surely weren't discussing poetic license.

We surely weren't discussing US Department of State, either,
yet you are using that as one of your "superior" attributes. :-)

Shirley, you lack a sense of humor.

>Still no amateur radio license either. Maybe if you make a wish...

False argument. Only you were demanding that all have a
federal merit badge for amateurism to achieve your concept
of amateurism.

2882. Re: New Field Day Entry Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 02:02:32 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030224210232.22973.00001472@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 61906

In article <f45722ac.0302240528.1fda6062@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
>news:<20030223230841.23360.00000519@mb-da.aol.com>...
>
>>
>> That's YOUR leagacy, Lennie.
>>
>
>Steve, spend a few moments reflecting on your career on rrap.
>
>Post your legacy as you see it.

"Seven hostile actions." :-)

2883. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 02:02:34 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030224210234.22973.00001474@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 61905

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hasnyja.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On Mon, 24 Feb 2003 05:33:05 GMT, Dave Heil wrote:
>
>>....and you still can't spell the word "Attila".
>
> My friend with that name spells it exazctly the way you do. It's a
> common Yugoslavian first name mowadays.

"Mowadays?" :-)

Your friend is a gardener? :-)

2884. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 02:02:34 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030224210234.22973.00001475@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 61908

In article <3E59AF81.1EC7C031@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

Keep on repeating that over and over and over and over again.

It is very important (in your personal viewpoint) to emphasize
those words. It justifies your existance? Of course it does.
Herr Robust never makes mistakes and his edicts are
practically Papal Encyclicals. :-)

2885. Re: New Field Day Entry Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 02:02:34 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030224210234.22973.00001473@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 61926

In article <20030223230841.23360.00000519@mb-da.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>> Not "dissed."
>
> Yes..."dissed". As in "disrespected".
>
> You lie.

I've told verifiable truth having verifiable information.

> You make up stories.

Not in here. No payment. I am a professional writer outside of this newsgroup.

> You antagonize.

YES! Doesn't that just make you wet your panties? :-)

> You don't keep your promises.

What "promises" were not kept? Atillllla the Ham got a total of five separate private e-mails of attachments (scanned first Radiotelegraph license images).

>>What "needs?" I have no need to fight personalities.
>
> Obviously you do.

A newsgroup is a "fighting arena?" I don't think so. I don't get hurt in here. Do you get hurt in here? Rhetorical question...of course you get hurt in here, poor little oversized ego bruised and virtually bleeding. Poor baby.

>> I see some
>> beings in here who are obsessive-compulsive about fighting
>> others who do not share their opinions.
>
> Whew! Could you have dropped that nut any closer to your OWN tree,
>Lennie..?!?!

"Nut?" Only "nuts" I see in here are those PCTAs demanding, crying, whining, cursing, calling names demanding that all glory in their existance, worship their devine morsemanship, and kiss their respective asses because they are might macho hotdogs of the airwaves. :-)

>> They sometimes get back what they attempt to throw at others,
>> then they get oh, so angry at shooting back.
>
> Again, the nut falls close to home. Witness your years of antagonizing
>and lying here.

Poor baby. You really ARE hurt mentally! Tsk, tsk, tsk.

Maybe newsgroups aren't good for you? You can't take them
with any grace at all, can you? Don't let the door hit you in the
ass on the way out...

> That's YOUR leagacy, Lennie.

Note: L-E-G-A-C-Y. Remember your warning about rage making
your fingers do all those typos...

> No one will remember your dubiously original articals in "Ham Radio" or
>how you managed to pawn yourself off from one job to the next until you had
>enough acorns in the nest that you could aford to quit jumping around.

Oh, the IRS, Franchise Tax Board of California, Kitsap County
Assessor's Office in Washington state will remember every year
at tax time. :-)

Pssst: A-R-T-I-C-L-E, not "articals." :-)

Also: A-F-F-O-R-D, two Fs.

Nests. Plural. As to "pawning around from job to job," you can
ask KD6JG about that...or W6MJN...or N2JTV. It's the nature of
the aerospace business...if one is able to hold a job long enough
to see the next downsizing period. Ask Phil, K2ASP, about that,
seeing as we both worked in the same corporation down here.

> What few Amateurs who DO remember you will remember you for lies and
>profanity. They will remember you for deception and antagonism.

P-U-T-Z and C-R-E-E-P. Guess who used those? :-)

> They will remember your deceitful attempts to embellish your weak
military
>"career" by invoking the memory of KIA's that you had NO association with
other
>than to serve in the same unit years after they perished.

"Weak military career?" What was "weak?" Four years active,
four years reserve, got promotions almost as soon as permitted,
received an Honorable Discharge after 8 years of service. If you
have a dispute with my US Army service, contact the Adjutant
General's Office, United States Army.

I see nothing "dishonorable" about being proud of my signal
battalion, the men who served in it from 1946 on through 1957.
I know that unit's history, what happened in Army reorganization
in central Honshu of Japan later, how the lineage traces to the

present-day 78th Signal Service Battalion, 516th Signal Brigade, Headquarters US Army Pacific and the callsign ADA. My signal battalion was twice awarded a Presidential Unit Citation for exceptional signal services while I was assigned to it. I was a part of that. We "got the messages through" as the present-day Signal Corps motto goes.

> Nice job, YA PUTZ!

Thank you. Is that some sort of marine thing, to salute another military branch's performance using middle-European ethnic-Jewish words for "dickhead?"

temper fry

2886. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 02:02:35 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030224210235.22973.00001476@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 61912

In article <3E59AED4.8CBC5059@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <3E56536D.1DE84A8D@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >You never did tell us, Len. To which ethnic minority do you belong?
>>
>> It's a majority, Herr Oberst...the rest of the human race not
>> afflicted with this sense of ethnic cleansing to keep US amateur
>> radio sacred, held to the thoughts of those already licensed
>> in it.
>
>Please explain how those not licensed as radio amateurs make up an
>ethnic group? Please explain how the "rest of the human race" gives a
>hoot about amateur radio at all.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Does Herr Robust think the rest of the human
race cares anything about amateur radio? They are, after all,
amateurs. :-)

>> You must have the same problems with property as Attilla.
>> Poor guy...thinks he "owns" judgemental edicts in a
>> newsgroup.
>
>...and you still can't spell the word "Attila".

Is that in one of the questions on the US amateur test? :-)

2887. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 02:02:36 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030224210236.22973.00001477@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 61918

In article <3E59ADED.FDB0AD51@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <3E56566B.8DCCFB5B@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >That you have lied a number of times has been demonstrated through a
>> >number of Google reposts and through offering the offering of urls and
>> >quotes from web pages which all disprove various claims made on a
>> >repeated basis by you. I would not be inclined to accept as truth, the
>> >statements of someone who has repeatedly told lies in the past.
>>
>> Poor baby...you will NEVER ever accept any correction on
>> government radio procedure or trying to pull a snow job on
>> the rest of the readers in here, will you? :-)
>
>When was it that you were involved in any manner in U.S. Department of
>State communications operations, poor baby?

Sorry, you are not cleared for that information. :-)

>> Well, it's a good thing the US government no longer has you on
>> some embassy or counsulate staff. Good for the USA, that is...
>
>You are ever true to form.

In praising the US government, yes. :-)

State Department is not known for a history of correct procedure
in communications. A rather infamous story on that in 1943 is
told in David Kahn's "The Codebreakers: A History of
Cryptography." That book was on the NY TIMES bestseller lists
(non-fiction) in the early 1960s.

There's more that came out in the Iran-Contra hearings made
public over television, some more in Bamford's book on NSA,
"Body of Secrets." I don't think Herr Robust wants to hear of
those and the newsgroup isn't for the history of gaffes and
giraffes in the US Department of State. :-)

At least Foggy Bottom has managed to clean itself up. A pity
that some amateurs (who once worked for them) can't. :-)

>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

Tsk, tsk, tsk. A "big lie" technique, Herr Robust. You keep on
repeating that word for word. Maybe someone will believe it if
you keep it up. It worked once for a particular political party in
Yurp in the 1930s and early 1940s. Feel proud. :-)

2888. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 02:02:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030224210237.22973.00001478@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 61910

In article <3E59AD6D.E7EFEB52@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>More humor from Leonid! Why no, I own several dictionaries but I didn't
>really need them for this one.

Of course...you speak Hunnish fluently. Everyone knows that
from reading in here... :-)

>In all of them "Attila" is spelled with
>one "L" as is the word "suxiliary". You've misspelled both of them more
>than once.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. The diplomatic "foreign service" really turned you
into some raving anal-retentive thing, didn't it? :-)

>Why not simply admit that your little spelling lesson for
>Steve backfired?

Steve who? You mean Sgt. S.H.A. Putz of the horse marines?
(initials stand for Seven Hostile Actions)

>Your gaffe was entertaining though.

Poor baby. "Giraffe" is the spelling in this zoo. :-)

2889. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 02:02:38 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030224210238.22973.00001479@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 61920

In article <20030223232626.23360.00000522@mb-da.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Attilllllllla the Ham) writes:

>>> I am sure you would, but I'd STILL be able to get on the band of my
>>>choice, in the mode of my choice, when I want.
>>
>> Poor baby, has only a limited number of bands and modes as
>> an amateur...but he remains defiant on "choice.
>
> Please remind me how many bands YOU can get on right now, Your
>Sleaziness?

Any local union band. Dues all paid up. :-)

> (Remember...the back of your GROL says you can NOT "operate" without an
>FCC authorized station license...)

Really? Two months ago I was on HF from a private boat in
a Ventura marina. Operated a nice little SGC-2020, first time
using that model. Not on any "ham" bands, of course.
Wouldn't think of violating the sacred "ham" bands and have
all those Raddio Kops doing a Keystone imitation. Legal, too!
:-)

>>> Oh yes...And with my OWN 1 x 2 callsign.
>>
>> Oh, my, yes, a walking radio station with his very own callsign!
>
> Walking...hang gliding, roller skating...yep...that and more.

You need a ham license to walk? You need one to roller skate?

That's not in Part 97. :-)

> Please tell us about YOUR operating experiences, Lennie!

Which year after 1956? :-)

Weren't you the one getting all bitchy and whiny about "CVs?"

Tsk, tsk, tsk.

>>Isn't that Sgt Putz' objective to enter amateur radio...be someone
>> that few other humans are?
>
> Nope...I wanted to learn about radios. Got that and lot's more.

So far, what has the Putzman learned? How to "carefully tune
in another station?" :-)

>>Oh...and don't look now, but you don't really "own" that whoopie-
>> do callsign...you've only got permission to use it from the
>> government. It's a grant from them, not your property. FCC can
>> take it away from you if they see fit to do so, ex-marine or not.
>
> Whelp, Lennie, for the meantime it's mine.

It does not belong to you as if it were real property. FCC can
take it away from you any time it wants to. You won't have
much say about that and you may have to pay a rather large
fine in addition to being stripped of permission to operate.

> No one else's. Only one in the world.

You have achieved uniqueness and glory by being assigned
a 1x2 AMATEUR callsign. :-)

> Please remind us about yours?

You mean...the First Class Radiotelephone (Commercial)
Operator License granted after just one test session in March
1956 at a real FCC field office in the Federal Building in Chicago?
Hardly any snow that month in northern Illinois and the 90 mile
train ride was uneventful (kept shoes on the whole time). :-)

You mean about the VHF station license that I co-owned with
some partners a while back? Business band, of course. :-)

You don't really want to be reminded, do you? :-)

2890. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 02:02:39 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030224210239.22973.00001480@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 61907

In article <20030223231857.23360.00000521@mb-da.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>A life-saver...complete with a void in the center...but the sour
>> flavor version.
>
> That's "lifesaver", Lennie. I have the documentation to prove it.

A store receipt for a bag of candy, right? :-)

> No "MD" was needed.

You needed advice to go shopping?!?

>>Three decades a ham with your "own callsign" and you haven't
>> learned anything about electronics-radio theory?
>
> Who told you that...?!?!

You did. :-)

2891. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 02:02:40 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030224210240.22973.00001482@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 61909

In article <20030223224523.23360.00000515@mb-da.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Sgt Putz the Hun) writes:

>> His reflection is in your monitor
>
> No glare, no reflection monitor, Your Lameness.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, blind as well... :-)

2892. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 02:02:40 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030224210240.22973.00001481@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 61921

In article <20030223225355.23360.00000516@mb-da.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
(Atillllla the Ham) writes:

>>How much would you still "own" after you lost a civil court case
>> of libel and had to pay damages?
>
> You mean AFTER I presented all of the stuff YOU have posted?

With or without. :-)

> You mean AFTER my representitive gets done presenting lie after lie,
>accusation after accusation that YOU haev presentd here?

"...haev presentd...?" :-)

Poor baby. Can't take the heat, can't even find the kitchen...

Your "representitive" needs to be a Johnnie Cochrane, F. Lee
Bailey, and Mavis Beacon (for the typing). :-)

> You mean AFTER my representitive shows your "invitation" to present your
>GROL in an e mail and what was ACTUALLY delivered? And forget the lame
>"mistake" twist, Lennie...He'll also present the tons of post you've made
>laying claim to being an "engineering professional". Professional engineers
>don't make those kind of stupid mistakes.

EX purchasing agents don't make mistakes... :-)

I spent my adult life working for money in electronics engineering.
Sometimes mistakes happened. We knew how to correct those
and then corrected it.

Do we need to dwell on the consequences of mistaken blood
typing in certain medical fields?

>>AOL took that libelous HOME PAGE down, not your "post."
>
> Wasn't anything libelous about it, Your Lyingness.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. It was. Had it been "innocent," AOL wouldn't
have removed it.

>You are a liar. It's documented in your own posts.

Poor baby...lost the ability to tell right from wrong. Typical
sociopath's rationalization.

>You make unsubstantiated accusations against
>organizations and individuals alike without the least bit of intent of

>validating your claims.

Like ARRL charging shipping charges on direct orders to
Newington? :-)

Like AOL is a profit-making corporation that doesn't require
extra shipping charges above $25 for reselling ARRL products?
:-)

>You claim to be a professional engineer, yet you can't
>even send e mail without making an error.

Incorrect. I've claimed to be a professional, as in accepting
money for services rendered. I've claimed to be an electronics
design engineer...which I have been in several corporations and
continue to be.

The title "professional engineer" is for a state-licensed engineer
and I've never claimed to be one of those.

>>You have a LOT of problems with property ownership.
>
> Nope. But you may.

Not at all. My wife and I have a lot of real property and it is
dealt with properly and legally. We also have considerable
personal property and it is treated the same way. No debts,
no liens, all free and clear.

> For once I agree with you. Tsk, tsk, tsk. What a shame for an old man
>like you to be so blatantly self-abusive in public with your own misdeeds of
>truth, and then alledge others to be "libellous".

Poor baby. You really lost it. :-(

Get some treatment and come back when you are sane.

2893. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 02:02:41 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030224210241.22973.00001483@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 61916

In article <d22b54c3.0302240731.6efb6537@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20030223211231.05573.00001139@mb-mh.aol.com>...
>> In article <d22b54c3.0302221911.70355fdc@posting.google.com>,
>kelly@dvol.com
>> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>>
>> >Includes the complete irrelevance attached to posting experience in
>> >baby-sitting Army RTTY repeaters over a half century ago as some kinda
>> >"credentials". Except more so.
>>
>> Poor baby, still suffering catapult over-pressure?
>>
>> I never "baby-sat" any Army TTYs. That was in tape relay at
>> Chuo Kogyo. Poor guy never has seen any torn-tape TTY
>> relay in operation, has he? Too bad, no US military branch
>> has them anymore...doesn't need them.
>>
>> Kellie doesn't understand that real, high-power (up to 40 KW)
>> HF transmitters at a station are NOT "repeaters." They were
>> not such a half century ago, still not so.
>
>"Includes the complete irrelevance attached to posting experience in
>baby-sitting Army RTTY repeaters over a half century ago as some kinda
>"credentials". Except more so."

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Is aircraft catapulting and naval intelligence photography of bears somehow involved in RADIO? :-)

Are those famous "26 patents" involved in RADIO? [no, it is only one and that is about a mechanical bearing]

Past experience in RADIO, HF radio at that, is not "credentials" but just experience in HF radio. Those who've had it find that those who never had any are murderously resentful of it. Those of us who were in the Big Leagues of HF communicatons on a 24/7 basis are bitterly resented by those whose only experience was in amateur hobby comm or in the much smaller sphere of other government communications.

2894. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 02:28:00 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@ptialaska.net>
Message-ID: <87d6lhrt5b.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 61927

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote:
>"Floyd Davidson" <floyd@ptialaska.net> wrote:
>
>NOWHERE in Part 97 does it refer to ham radio as a hobby ... it's a service.

The FCC administers a service. People engage in the use that
service as a hobby.

Some of them play word games too, of course. ;-)

>> Think about it! Some of the *least* technically inclined Ham
>> operators are the *best*.
>
>While I will admit that someone can be a polite, courteous,
>"good" *operator* with little technical knowledge, that does
>not mean that we should encourage folks to believe that
>technical knowledge has no merit or value and they should
>all become techno-ignorant appliance operators.

Nobody has suggested any such thing, so what is your point?

My point is that technical expertise is not the measure of a
Ham operator, which is an entirely different matter than what
you speak of.

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://www.ptialaska.net/~floyd>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

2895. Re: Petition for retail point-of-sales record keeping -transmitters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 02:59:22 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <e_A6a.255028$Ec4.259373@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 61928

Carl I agree totally with you. The neighbor girl was caught circa 1964 playing her organ on the CB band. Her dad got hit with a $500 fine .... a 16 yr old having a little fun. He could not get out of it. Now look ... even when guys get caught dollars to dem donuts the fines get reduced. I wonder how many ever pay. And that 500 was in 1964 dollars.

The only way that enforcement can happen on a meaningful basis is with user fees ...like it or not.

73 God Bless Tom KI3R Port Vue Pa nr Pittsburgh

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message news:8iy6a.5901$hj.1729292@nnrp1.ptd.net...
>
> "garigue" <garigue@attbi.com> wrote in message
> news:Pzr6a.245321$vm2.189863@rwcrnsc54...
> > The only baby steps that I would like to see is a return to the
> enforcement
> > that was present back in the 60s ...and that would return these days
only
> > with a yearly license fee. I am sure that would go over big with the
> > "somfin fer nutin" crowd.
>
> If Congress would permit the FCC to keep the money and use it for
> increased enforcement in the ham bands, I'd gladly pay an annual fee
> of, say $10.00, for my ham license (or $100.00 for a 10 year license,
> plus the maintenance fee for my callsign)
>
> Carl - wk3c
>

2896. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 03:18:29 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302241918.220a9f7f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61929

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E5A5EB3.617021E1@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E599B49.56F5378E@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030222140633.12173.00000653@mb-mr.aol.com>...
> > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > I prefer to think they are simply "not serious". Just like ol' Cecil, who swore
> > > > > he'd never get an Extra...
> > > >
> > > > First you'se guys incessantly "encourage" lower class hams to upgrade,
> > > > then complain when they do.
> > >
> > > I've not encountered many radio amateurs who swear that they'd never
> > > upgrade.
> >
> > I've encountered Extras that wanted to downgrade to Advanced so they
> > could prove to the world that they were "old-time" hams who knew the
> > Morse Code. I can only wonder why they don't prove to the world that
> > they know the code by simply using the code.
>
> A downgrade would seem to be an impossibility.

David, I never said all Extras were rational. Far from it.

> > > Likewise, I've not encountered many non-radio amateurs who claim they
> > > are going for an "Extra right out of the box" and who haven't done zip
> > > several years down the road.
>
> > Dave, I'm sorry you have such limited experiences with people. Thats
> > what happens when you spend the majority of your life in a comm shack
> > handing out Q's at a 4 per minute rate.
>
> I've never handed out "Q's" from a "comm shack".

Do you hand them out from a Kool-Aid stand?

You must be the slim you've been searching for.

> > Let me help you out. People often don't do what they say.
>
> I was aware of that. We have only to look at Cecil, you, Kim and Len in

> this very group to confirm that.

We do have human failings. Forgive us. Please allow me to lay
prostrate on a cold damp floor and whip myself with split palm fronds
till my back bleeds, while chanting, "Forgive me Father for I have
Sinned, I've not used CW since 1987."

> > There are
> > rare exceptions, such as yourself, whom always do what they say, and
> > don't do what they say they won't do. But not everyone is like you.
>
> I was aware of that as well.

Except for your recent breakdown where you admitted you were wrong.

> > Trust me.
>
> I'm going to have problems with this one. You told us that you were
> leaving the group but your absence was very brief. How can I trust you?

Dave, my absence never happened. I had an Immediate change of heart.

> > For example, many people find trying to learn the Morse code confusing
> > and frustrating. Some just can't do it, whether they have a learning
> > or hearing disability, or just can't get past the frustration part.
> > In another time and place, those people became Cooks and MP's. Your
> > only experience has been inside the comm shack, where you see a bunch
> > of ditty-boppers. You assume anyone can be a ditty-bopper.
>
> I never worked with a bunch of ditty-boppers anywhere. My last year in
> the military was spent doing news releases for the Lackland AFB Office
> of Information.

Isn't that where they drum people out of the Air Force fo
non-adaptability?

I never encountered ditty-boppers in any of the several
> rock and blues bands of which I was a member.

Say Hi to Robin Trower for me.

While a couple of the
> electronics distributors I worked for had hams as employees (I even had
> a radio amateur, W8PBX as a sales manager at one place), none were real
> CW aficionados.

No doubt in downtown Dar es Salam.

> I believe that just about anyone can learn morse code at a rate of five
> words per minute in very short order.

Lets define "just about," please. Would that be 100%, 97%, 95%, what?

> > Do you suppose that there might be a person out there who has no
> > interest in VHF+ amateur communications, but having had a career in HF

> > communications, would like to get an HF license? But then finds that
> > they cannot learn the code? Perhaps even reflects back on his or her
> > experiences on HF, and ask why the Code is so necessary to amateur
> > communications in the year 2003?
>
> We've been through all this before.

So you've made up your mind.

I don't believe there are many
> people who can't learn morse code at five words per minute.

Define "many." Of all the people who've shown an interest and taken
the 5WPM exam (in whatever abomination; Morse or Farnsworth), what is
the passing rate?

What?

I don't
> believe there will be any morse test at all within a short period.

A short period of what? Dits? Dahs? Time? What?

Would you mind completing a sentence?

Nevermind. I can't even pretend to be thick like you.

But do you think there should be?

I
> believe that even Len Anderson can learn morse at five words per
> minute.

Why do you believe that? Has he shown any real evidence of having
learned the code?

> After all, he has told us that he already knows morse code.

In what capacity? Scouts flashing lights from one tent to another
during a Jamboree? Now you think Len is Cecil?

> How much of a stretch can it be for him to become "proficient" with it
> at five words per minute?

Larry and Dick claim 5wpm cannot be "proficiency." Ditto 13wpm.

> I believe that morse is used as much in 2003
> as it was in 1998 in amateur radio.

Use a relavent date. Try 1962. Hey, try the Novice Enchancement year
of 1987.

> > I hope I've helped you out on this subject.
>
> Not really.

Hey, I tried. You're simply too thick.

2897. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 03:33:36 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302241933.3e13e9ab@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61930

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E5A5B76.3071A89@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E599E32.E4F3BC9C@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E57EB7C.A0596401@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E565A51.B1C29552@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > Brian wrote:
>
> > > > > > > > Yet its Jim's radio. You're the one who cannot keep things straight.
> > > > > > > > Don't sit up all night tuning the 160M band endlessly trying to snag a
> > > > > > > > new one, then try to be coherent in replies. Doesn't work.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > I understand that ",Brian" gave you a problem.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Brian only gives you problems.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Zat so? When did your stupidity or your playing dumb become my problem?
> > > > > > > You alone have to take the responsibility for what you write.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave, I can only respond to what you write. If its too inane, or too
> > > > > > smug, you get what you get.
> > > > >
> > > > > So that we're sure I have this straight. I write something which you
> > > > > consider to be smug. You respond with an imcomplete idea. That makes
> > > > > me somehow responsible for your reply. Is that about it?
> > >
> > > No. You forgot inane.
>
> I'll correct that portion. "You respond with an incomplete and inance
> idea".

Huh? "inance?" Dave, get some sleep. A new one on 160M can't be
this important.

> > > > > > > > I was not home when replying. Jump, jump, jump.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Oh. Correct my statement to read: "We're not all gathered whereever it
> > > > > > > > is that you are". You can explain your second sentence, the incomplete

> > > > > > > one, later if you have any interest in anyone being able to understand
> > > > > > > it.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > You're supposed to be a bright boy.
> > > > > >
> > > > > It is tough to fill in the blanks on a supposed sentence which contains
> > > > > only the same three words. Those three repeated words of yours have
> > > > > about the same meaning as "Tree, tree, tree" or "Lift, lift, lift". If
> > > > > you can't complete an idea, don't expect others to do it for you.
> > > > >
> > > > Dave, try using context. Like when I said "Jump, jump, jump" (to
> > > > conclusions).
> > > >
> > > You didn't write "Jump, jump, jump (to conclusions". You wrote "Jump,
> > > jump, jump" Nothing about conclusions was written by you or me.
> > >
> > I filled in the "(to conclusions)" so you'd finally get it. Poor
> > Dave.
>
> You also wrote some blather about context. Your three word non-sentence
> had no context.

Pull your head out. Do you want more context on that one?

> > > > > > > > Why would I turn on Jim's radio? You're still confused, aren't you?
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Phil may be on to something. Stupid seems to be your default mode. Ed
> > > > > > > > Hare lost interest in the group when you ran extended versions of your
> > > > > > > > nonsense replies.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > That's really too bad. Law of unintended consequences. I liked Ed.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > It wasn't apparent.
> > > > > >
> > > > > Perhaps not to you, Mr Obtuse.
> > > > >
> > > > I don't believe it was apparent to Ed.
> > > >
> > > Ed was a decent enough guy before he hooked up with you. He just got
> > > caught up running with the wrong crowd.
> >
> I'm sure your comment will send him scurrying back here.

Rats scurry.

> > We all have our limits. I thought I met had mine, and announced I was
> > leaving the group. Then I decided not to let you guys run me off.
>
> You were wrong about your limits. You were wrong to announce anything
> if there was the possibility that you would nearly instantly change your
> mind. Alec Baldwin found himself having to eat HIS words too after

> announcing that he'd be leaving the country if George Bush was elected.
>
> You ran yourself off for a very brief time.
>
> > So next you start the "Kim and Alec Baldwin" routine on me. Didn't
> > work, didit?
>
> You, Kim and Alec have some traits in common.

See what I mean. I predicted what you were going to do before you did
it. In writing. Yet you couldn't help but play out your role in my
life.

> > > > > > On the other hand, how many other people have been run off this group?
> > > > > > I don't see any litttle violins playing for them.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I don't know of anyone who has been "run off this group". Ed left of
> > > > > > his own volition. His tolerance for crap had been exceeded.
> > > > >
> > > > > As did mine.
> > >
> > > Did you mean "as was mine"?
> >
> > As in, "As was mine tolerance?" No. You'll have to be more specific.
>
> Read what you wrote. Read what I wrote. See if you can find any
> glaring grammatical goofs on your part. Let me know what you find.

I find you obtuse, still.

> > > Were you run off this group? I only
> > > recalling you driving off in a Huff or leaving in a snit.
> >
> > Which was it; a Huff or a snit?
>
> It matters not.

No? I just don't want it coming up again as some vital statistic in a
future point you're desperately trying to make.

> > How has my leaving worked out?
>
> For you? Not very well. You don't seem to have much will power.

None whatsoever. Now its a matter for the actuarial tables.

2898. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 03:35:40 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302241935.44fb90ec@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61931

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E5A5911.9FAB8484@earthlink.net>...
> Phil Kane wrote:
> >
> > On Mon, 24 Feb 2003 05:33:05 GMT, Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > >....and you still can't spell the word "Attila".
> >
> > My friend with that name spells it exazctly the way you do. It's a
> > common Yugoslavian first name mowadays.
>
> Len's now off in search of a "Hun language" dictionary online.

Someone's got to do your homework for you.

2899. Re: County Issuing Radio Licenses

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 03:40:57 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302241940.4db788c7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61932

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hat7mgf.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> On 24 Feb 2003 05:32:33 -0800, Brian wrote:
>
> >Jim, obviously you weren't on a military frequency. Does the FCC dole
> >out frequencies to the DoD?
>
> An FCC representative sits on the Interagency Radio Advisory
> Committee (IRAC) that does. Until NTIA got into the act, the
> FCC did the paperwork and provided the leadership for IRAC.
>
> ---
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

Phil, thank you for confirming that the FCC is not sole Authority to
control and license all radio Transmissions in the Country.

2900. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 03:46:49 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302241946.4dc80818@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61933

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E564F03.72EB24C0@earthlink.net>...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > In article <20030220061433.23241.00000015@mb-da.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> > writes:
> >
> > >Also gave a good indication of propagation. Back when a 1000 mile contact was
> > >a major accomplishment, this was an important feature.
> >
> > Maybe you could help out K3LT complete his WAS? He seems
> > to have difficulty getting out...
>
> Oh, I think it is all relative, Leonard. Compared, for example, to your
> progress on WAS, his performance is stellar.

Smug Dave offers a left-handed compliment to Novice Larry.

2901. Re: New Field Day Entry Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 03:48:16 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302241948.3e7f0300@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61934

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0302240528.1fda6062@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030223230841.23360.00000519@mb-da.aol.com>...
>
> >
> > That's YOUR leagacy, Lennie.
> >
>
> Steve, spend a few moments reflecting on your career on rrap.
>
> Post your legacy as you see it.

Steve, keep your comments on the group, not my mail box. Thanks, Brian

2902. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 04:32:38 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E5AF1CC.CD427B27@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61935

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E59A4ED.56C5F8CC@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >How would you know what someone is likely to encounter on the air,
> >Leonard?
>
> 1. Get an HF receiver.
> 2. Connect receiver to an antenna.
> 3. Turn receiver on.
> 4. Listen.
>
> No problem.

I'll grant that you could do or could have done those things but I have
no indication that you've actually done so since your statement runs
opposite to anything I've encountered on the bands.

> >> >The "tougher than the First Phone" thing was a quote from an FCC examiner.
> >>
> >> Surrrre it was, long-timer.
> >
> >How would you know, Leonard?
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. I was agreeing with the unemployed person. :-)

No, you weren't.

> Oh, and I took such a First Phone test in 1956. Must have
> changed since then, though, what with COLEMs and all.

What has that to do with anything?

> >N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
> >
> >No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> >government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
> >amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
> >Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
> >slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."
>
> Big Lie repeated. [always willing to oblige... :-)]

Are you suggesting that the Google archives, filled with evidence which
supports Jim's profile of your likely actions, can be manipulated? We

have the evidence in the post to which I responded. You completed the profile there for all to see.

> >What was the percentage of those taking the aptitude tests which showed
> >little or no aptitude for learning morse again, Leonard?
>
> You tell us, mighty macho morseman from the wilds of
> the African experience. :-)

I never provided a percentage, Leonard. You did. Have you lost your notes?

> >That's funny. Air Force DI's at Amarillo routinely referred to Basic
> >Training as "boot camp" in October and November 1968. I still heard the
> >term used at Lackland in 1971 and '72 after I returned from Vietnam.
> >You weren't in the Air Force either were you, Len?
>
> No. As a civilian engineer I've only been to Wright-Patterson,
> Chanute, Edwards AFB as far as USAF-only installations.
>
> Why is it so important to you, mighty macho morseman?
> Is US amateur radio some kind of military auxilliary?

It is important as an example of yet another thing which you "know" but which flies in the face of fact--like your knowledge of amateur radio, your knowledge of Department of State communications operations, your knowledge of Department of State Key Officers lists and the like. If it wasn't important, why did you feel it necessary to make the claim?

Oh yeah--"auxiliary" like "Attila" has but one "L".

> >> Civilian intercept operators for the
> >> US government are trained at Fort Huachuca as well.
> >
> >Don't believe everything you read on a web page, Leonard.
>
> Been to "Fort Sneeze," too, fat stuff. Several times.

I've been to Natural Bridge. Several times.

> Missed the UAV section there (wasn't fully in on last trip),
> would have been interesting.
>
> >N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
> >
> >No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> >government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
> >amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
> >Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
> >slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."
>
> Big Lie thing repeated.
>

> No problem on repetition. Takes very little effort to do. Always
> glad to help mighty macho morsemen in their quest for Truth,
> Justice, and the Amateur Way. :-)

All anyone need do is read the thread, Leonard. Your behavior fits the
N2EY profile precisely.

Dave K8MN

2903. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 04:42:07 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3E5AF42E.6040304@adelphia.net>
Source record: 61936

Robert Casey wrote:

> Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>
>> Since we are on the google thing here, I suggest anyone interested do a
>>search on Fritz Zwicky. A brilliant but eccentric astronomer who was so
>>difficult that colleagues purposefully discounted some of his theories
>>until after his passing. (dark matter)
>>
>> His abrasiveness and intractability actually impeded science's progress.
>>
>> I wonder if he would have changed his approach if he considered that he
>>was actually doing harm to his profession?
>>
>>
>
> Had read in an old issue of _Sky and telescope_ an article on the naming of
> the planet Pluto. Someone suggested a name like "Chronus" but the suggester
> was so detested that people who otherwise liked the name blew it off....
> Can't remember if it was Fritz or someone else.

I think it was Fritz. Too bad they didn't have the Dale Carnegie courses
back then.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2904. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 04:46:33 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E5AF573.E0A01B7B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61937

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E59A691.95829A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <3E57E82F.2EE444A5@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >> >>
> >> >> In article <3E553338.C2DE600C@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> >> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >> Poor baby. Way back in time he got his snow job melted...all
> >> >> about using CW as an order-wire for an RTTY circuit in some
> >> >> small embassy (?) in the middle of Africa in the 1980s.
> >> >
> >> >You mean the order wire circuit which you claimed on numerous occasions
> >> >that I had originated--the one I corrected about repeatedly? That claim
> >> >of yours was pasted by a repost from the Google archives. Watch out for
> >> >those six-year-olds waving the straight keys around. You could get
> >> >hurt.
> >>
> >> If an RTTY radio circuit has such bad performance that you
> >> need manual telegraphy through OOK CW to communicate
> >> schedules and orders, then it will not be a good RTTY circuit
> >> for regular traffic.
> >
> >You really haven't been paying attention, have you. Go back and check
> >those Google archives and enlighten yourself.
>
> I know what was good doctrine and procedure on HF radio
> as used by US government and military communicators.

So you didn't go back and refresh your memory. You only know what
doctrine was for the Army in the early 1950's.

> The subject originally was using CW telegraphy as an
> "order-wire" on an RTTY circuit. Illogical procedure.
> Not used by other agencies.

State is not obligated to use what any other agency uses. State was not obligated to consult with you before implementing the system. State had its reasons for using the system. It worked well.

> > It should become an OOK CW circuit
> >> instead.
> >
> >That wasn't for you to decide.
>
> True, but that didn't make it "good" or "logical," did it?

No, that didn't make it good or logical. That it worked and worked well proved it to be both good and logical. Your advice wasn't needed.

> >> If an RTTY radio circuit is passing TTY messages fine in
> >> regular traffic, then it doesn't need any OOK CW for
> >> schedules and orders in order-wire use.
> >
> >Again, you haven't been paying attention.
>
> I pay attention to practical procedure that makes sense in
> radio, especially that which was worked out years before.

State isn't obligated to use what has been "worked out years before". State needed something more reliable than what was "worked out years before".

> >> That's logical. One or the other.
> >
> >It wasn't for you to decide.
>
> Yes it was five years ago. Heil tried to pull off a snow job
> on pro techniques, got bit on the ass then, hasn't stopped
> hurting since.

Ever ask yourself why it is that you always end up looking like the guy who has his brogans in his yap? Are you learning anything, Windy?

> >> Even in the 1980s other HF radio users didn't do such illogical
> >> procedures. Only, has the Oberst explained, the "State
> >> Department."
> >
> >The Department of State was not obligated to do everything some other HF
> >radio users did, Spock.
>
> Yes, Nurse Chapel, there's no Bones about it. If anyone
> Chekovs old messages they won't find any actual reference
> to State's procedure, will they? Uhura along and find that the
> only "authority" on State is the one shoveling the snow job
> about CW telegraphy order-wires on an RTTY circuit. Even
> Scotty wouldn't do that all the way to Sulu land. Don't have
> a Roddenberry, Kirk.

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

> >You mean that you aren't impressed? You don't know anything about my
> >radio expertise. How is my having a government job "getting away with"
> >anything, Leonid?
>
> Poor baby. All that time in a diplomatic service and never
> learned any lessons of diplomacy. :-)

Sure I did, Leonard. I never said that someone who had a government job
was "getting away with" anything. Poor baby.

> >N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
> >
> >No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> >government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
> >amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
> >Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
> >slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."
>
> Big Lie statement repeated. :-)

It'd only be a lie if you didn't keep living up to it. You really can't
help yourself.

Dave K8MN

2905. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 04:51:08 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E5AF688.58F71B4D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61938

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <c2356669.0302240921.23049fdf@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> (N2EY) writes:
>
> >Did you not understand: "I've been employed full time in design(and a
> >few other EE-related activities) since graduation from college.", Len?
> >What do you think it means? ;-)
>
> Looks like an unsubstantiated statement of employment to
> me. No details of anything, just generalities.
>
> What are those "EE-related activities," mighty worker?
>
> Do you have any idea of the different fields/disciplines in
> electricity and electronics? Over two dozen different large
> groupings in the IEEE Transactions alone.

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

It's almost like a self-fulfilling prophecy isn't it, Len?
You just can't stop yourself.

Dave K8MN

2906. Re: County Issuing Radio Licenses

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 04:52:41 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <v5ltn1sqi33f88@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 61939
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.shortwave

True, the FCC doesn't control the DOD, and certainly the FCC isn't going to go in waving a badge. That said, someone said something to somebody and by the time it got to Guam, it was an order from the CNO. The reality of it is that we all have to co-exist and the US has a pretty small percentage of the world population. I'm sure in wartime, the military will do whatever it must - no questions asked.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.458 / Virus Database: 257 - Release Date: 2/24/03

2907. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 05:00:19 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E5AF8AE.399D8469@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61940

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E59967B.3B38934E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
> >
> >No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> >government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
> >amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
> >Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
> >slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."
>
> Another macro repeat of a Big Lie item, really the opinion of
> another. As stated in another message, I will repeat such
> to aid a propagandist wanna-be. :-)

Yes, it was opinion. I happen to think it was extremely well crafted
and accurate. For it to be a lie, there'd have to be evidence that you
are never guilty of the things written. As anyone can see, I've used
the quote below comments made by you which exemplify actions in the
profile Jim put together. There's no legwork involved in tying the
evidence to the profile.

> >I'd have to say that you are predicatable, Leonard.
>
> More confusion and misspelling.
>
> I'm not "predicate-able" in that I don't like to diagram sentences.
> I just write them. Sometimes I get money for writing.
>
> I'm not "predictable" in that I follow someone's rules on how
> to take chastisement like a good little "inferior." :-)
>
> The word might be "predicament" misspelled...but it's not my
> predicament but rather Heil's original snow job that he buried
> hisself in 5 years ago.

You get worked up over a single typo but you've repeatedly used
"auxilliary" and "Attilla" even after they were drawn to your attention
several times.

Dave K8MN

2908. Re: County Issuing Radio Licenses

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 05:03:31 UTC
From: N8KDV <n8kdv@iserv.net>
Message-ID: <3E5AF923.88AA1D49@iserv.net>
Source record: 61941
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.shortwave

I believe you will find that the NTIA (National Telecommunications & Information Administration), which operates under the US Department of Commerce, operates the Office of Spectrum Management, which manages the Governments use of the radio frequency spectrum.

The FCC manages the private sectors use of the radio frequency spectrum.

Steve
Holland, MI

Drake R7, R8 and R8B

Jim Hampton wrote:

> True, the FCC doesn't control the DOD, and certainly the FCC isn't going to
> go in waving a badge. That said, someone said something to somebody and by
> the time it got to Guam, it was an order from the CNO. The reality of it is
> that we all have to co-exist and the US has a pretty small percentage of the
> world population. I'm sure in wartime, the military will do whatever it
> must - no questions asked.
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim
>
> ---
> Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
> Version: 6.0.458 / Virus Database: 257 - Release Date: 2/24/03

2909. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 05:07:08 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E5AFA48.A7CFF40A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61942

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E59A8C3.5A081B84@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
> >
> >No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> >government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
> >amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
> >Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
> >slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."
>
> Big Lie statement repeated.
>
> >N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
> >
> >No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> >government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
> >amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
> >Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
> >slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."
>
> Big Lie statement repeated.
>
> >N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
> >
> >No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> >government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
> >amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
> >Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
> >slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."
>
> Big Lie statement repeated.
>
> >N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
> >
> >No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> >government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
> >amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
> >Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
> >slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."
>
> Big Lie statement repeated.

I'd snip the proof of the pudding too if I were you, Leonard. Each time you see the N2EY quote, just look above it and you'll see the action by you fitting the profile.

> >The magazine is defunct. I have a whole shelf full of Radio Craft
> >magazine. It is defunct as well. There are no new issues of Radio
> >Craft yet, lo and behold, the old copies still reside on the shelf.
>
> "Radio Craft" was a Gernsback publication which changed its
> name to "Radio Electronics" and later used the familiar "RE"
> colloquialism of its readers in reference to itself within the
> magazine. As far as I've bothered to look on Fry's Electronics
> big newsstand, it was still in publication last year. I sold a
> two-part article to RE back in 1968. :-)

1968 was thirty five years ago, Leonard. "Radio Electronics" is not Radio Craft. Sell anything to Radio Craft lately? It is defunct you know. R-9 is defunct too. It was the predecessor to CQ but CQ is not R-9. R-9 is defunct, much like Ham Radio magazine.

Dave K8MN

2910. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 05:12:13 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E5A90D0.6F188166@att.net>
Source record: 61943

Mike Coslo wrote:

>
> Not that I have to prove anything....

Exactly, Mike, no one has to prove anything WRT ham radio AFAIC, Larry's admonitions aside. You participate where your interests lie, as does everyone. FCC requires nothing more than that one meet the current requirements for the license. From there it's strictly up to the individual. You can become an operator or just remain a licensee. Obviously many if not most individuals move into some level of active interest, often many varied interests within the hobby/service.

We've all got opinions which are formed by our backgrounds and experiences, or the lack thereof.
It's what makes the world go round. Most active conscientious hams who've been around awhile usually find themselves wanting to give back to the hobby some of what they've been given and that's a part of what has historically kept ham radio alive and healthy. What happens to it when or if that disappears would seem to be cause for concern for the future.

Dick

2911. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 05:12:16 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E5A9CEE.B2BE951F@att.net>
Source record: 61944

Floyd Davidson wrote:

> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:
> >Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote:
> >> > > I'll judge hams on what they did afterwards.
> >>
> >> For some strange reason that refrain was NEVER heard before the late
> >> restructuring. Another point in favor of Larry's point of view.
> >>
> >> Then we have geniuses like Slim Burke to offer up as genuine, current evidence.
> > >
> > >Dick, you're supposed to be the biggest, baddest Extra with a
> > >professional career in electronics, plus lots and lots of emergency
> > >comms experience. Yet you can't seem to be able to get a radio to
> > >work away from the power mains.
> >
> > I've been reading this thread, and frankly it is not amusing at
> > all. I've been licensed as KL7GPS for awhile and thought
> > amateur radio might be something to take up as a hobby now that
> > I'm retired (from a professional career in communications, which
> > included both commercial radiotelegraph and radiotelephone
> > licenses).
> >
> > I haven't gotten around to putting together a rig to get on the
> > air, and this type of exchange is cause to question whether it
> > would be worth the bother.
> >

So there you have it. You're not a ham radio operator at all, but
rather an FCC
licensee. You can't seem to find time to get around to actually getting
a rig together
and getting on the air although you've been licensed for "awhile". OK.
FCC nor anyone
else requires you to ever do any of that. You can sit it all out for a
lifetime if you
wish, just as most of the whiners and complainers posting here who have
for so long
decried the license requirements. And make no mistake, that's what this
NG is all about-
the protesters resisting all the "hoops" thrown in their way by -get
this- *us longtime
hams*, particularily old Extras who passed a 20wpm code test! Ain't it
amazing? And
now you sign on, claiming longtime professional service but none as a

ham, and still
you're the original "authority"!

Just another one of them, evidently. Len Anderson, aka "AVeryFineMan",
meet Floyd.
Birds of a feather, flock.

>
> It's a hobby folks.

Ah, another "it's all just a hobby" type. Tell it to the FCC. The day
they start to
consider it "just another hobby" will be the day all that valuable
spectrum is up for
grabs. Like right now. Folks like you speed it along. An avocation it
is, to be sure.
One that demands no more nor less than FCC licensees decide to devote to
it. CB, Tiddlywinks
and coin collecting are "just a hobby". No FCC needed. Ham radio is
more. How much more
-for you- is up to you. So far your not showing signs that it matters
much at all.

> Those tests are *all* meaningless to anyone
> who has worked in the field.

You have a right to your opinion, and that's all it is. FCC doesn't
agree with it,
obviously. Or they didn't untll recently.
Why should you presume that you're the only one here who has worked in
the field? You're
certainly not.

> Someone mentioned getting an Extra
> Class at age 16 and that it was tougher than a 1st Phone.

Read a little closer next time, in fact it seems it would be productive
if you'd just go
back and reread it now, and see if you can thrash out what was actually
said.

> I had
> a 1st Phone at age 16, but by age 20 I'd met at least a dozen
> people who'd been to a 6 week school that taught that test, and
> even though they didn't understand a bit of electronics, they
> were just as legal (and frankly at least a useful to the boss)
> for standing a transmitter watch as I was!

Most of us have known some of the First Phone 'crash school' grads, but
I sure wouldn't
characterize them as being useful as those who learned the material.
Makes one wonder if you
weren't one of them instead of one of us. It's one thing to babysit a

transmitter and
quite another matter to actually work on it or repair it.

Example- I got a call from one of "them" regarding an FM broadcast transmitter he had
been hired to retune to a different frequency than that which had been in use. The tuning
instructions for the exciter were missing and he wanted to know whether he should tune
the output for a dip or a peak indication on the meter. I asked him if the circuit was
a parallel tuned or series tuned circuit. I informed him that a parallel tuned circuit
passes minimium current at resonance, while a series tuned circuit passes peak current
(assuming of course that the meter is monitoring device current supply) so he'd need to know.
He didn't know. He hadn't learned the basics. He couldn't differentiate a series tuned
from a parallel tuned circuit. So I went to the station, took a look at the schematic diagram,
and tuned the exciter, and then the rest of the transmitter, for him. I used my Millen grid
dipper (a fine old piece of Ham Radio test gear) to move the final amp's tuned cavity to the
proper part of its tuning range.

I remember another case, when I was a kid with a new Novice ham ticket. One of the
'crash school' grads was hired as the engineer at the local BC AM. There was a failure
that he couldn't find, so he got my OT ham Elmer, who had no commercial license, to find the
problem for him. It turned out that a mouse had shorted the main power supply.

"Useful" isn't a word I'd use to describe that crash school grad.

Years later I had that same BC Engineering job -and a First Phone- when I got a call
saying that the station was way off frequency. I first did a visual inspection which
revealed the exciter deck tubes all had their plates glowing very red, very definitely
abnormally hot. Quickly checking their voltage supply revealed it to be abnormally high,
by nearly half. A look at the power supply schematic quickly revealed what the problem
HAD to be. It used a double pi section filter with inductive output. Recalling
that an inductive output filter provides average level voltage while a

capacitive output
filter delivers peak voltage, I reasoned that the output inductor
-filter choke- had shorted
across its winding, removing itself from action by becoming a virtual
piece of wire and effectively
converting the power supply filter into a capacitive output filter, thus
raising the output
voltage by X 1.414, to the peak value.

That's exactly what had happened. Replacing that output filter choke
brought the
voltage back down, the tubes back to normal operation and the station
back on frequency.
Total time elapsed, about 20 minutes.
That it didn't melt down or burn something up is a tribute to the
ruggedness of the old
Gates AM BC gear.

Ya got to learn *some* theory to get that far. How much would one of
your 'crash
school' grads be worth here?

So in your view, since some First Phone licenses were issued to
unqualified
individuals, it really doesn't matter whether or not anyone ever did
actually qualify for
one? Did you ever stop to consider that the proliferation of 'crash
school' grads and
the results of their unlearned and unskilled 'efforts' were instrumental
in the FCC doing
away with the license entirely? It sure gave lots of ammunition to those
eager to do away
with commercial radio licensing.
And then maybe that same situation applies to ham radio? So why even
bother with
licenses?

> I can't see either
> the Extra test or the 1st Phone as significant... compared to
> something like working in a modern telecommunications center.

So you worked in a comm center. Most hams have not and never will. So
they then
shouldn't bother to learn anything about the technical material?

To quote a favorite comment of an old Army master sergeant I and a
bunch of other techs once
worked for, "Your experience is somewhat different from mine". And just
for the record I've
worked in (and maintained) a "modern telecommunciations center" -a few
of them, in fact. At least they
were modern at that time. Things do change rapidly these days. I

wouldn't begin to walk in
and try to resume where I left off at retirement 9 years ago.
What does any of this have to do with ham radio?

>
> As for code, the military could teach the average GI to read
> code at 35 wpm, so I can't see much significance to that either,
> except that it required time and dedication that nobody except a
> GI just out of boot camp is likely to have once they reach age
> 18 or so.
>

So why all the whining here about 5wpm? It's not rocket science nor in
any way
difficult. It does explain a lot about those doing the whining.

>
>
> I personally like that idea of an Elmer

Where did anyone dispute that? How many hams have you ever Elmered?
How many do you
think I have?
But the first requirement is to have newcomers who want to be Elmered.
That is seriously
lacking in most of the protesting kids (of various ages) posting here.

> . It's a hobby, it is
> *supposed* to be fun. And it is when people at various levels
> get together and exchange ideas, help each other, and generally
> do whatever part of it they are capable of enjoying.

Yep, and when the Brian Burkes and Carl Stevensons sit on their
collective asses half a
lifetime whining about all those "hoops" they refused to jump through,
then continue
long past the time the "obstacles" are gone, don't you ever wonder about
their
motivations? Or did you just start typing here with no background
research at all?

>
>
> I'd suggest the Larry and Dick dump the chip on the shoulder
> routine.
>

I'd suggest you find out what you're talking about before issuing
advice. You DO have
the chips on the wrong shoulders. It's all there in the Google archive.

2912. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 05:12:18 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E5AB4F9.2B76AC5E@att.net>
Source record: 61945

N2EY wrote:

> In article <3E58605C.41600DD8@att.net>, Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> writes:
>
> >In fact the FCC examiner who administered my Extra told me at that time
> >that the Extra written was generally acknowledged to be a tougher test than
> the
> >First Phone - which I already had passed several years previously. And that
> >examiner was the FCC's District Engineer for the Kansas City district. (Before
> >some wag signs in insisting that District Engineers don't lower themselves to
> >administering tests - that one did. He made a point of it. He was an Extra
> class
> >ham himself and an EE to boot).
>
> >I don't see any way that anyone could have ever made such a statement
> >concerning the Extra class written I took in '69. There was a whole lot of
> quite
> >advanced and involved radio theory that demanded considerable
> >comprehensive learning of complex material. Definitely way beyond entry level.
>
> Hmmm.. I passed the Extra in 1970 at the age of 16. Tougher than the First
> Phone......
>
> Next time somebody starts waving their First Phone around...
>

Jim, whoever said that learning radio technology was/is difficult for a bright 16
year old? Sure seems to be
more than a bit touhgh for some of the lesser denizens of RRAP, but that's an
other matter. For sure the level of learning needed to actually pass the old First
Phone tests, and there were several different tests administered, was not trivial
nor "entryplevel". Just as the Extra class exams were not.

>
> >Then we have geniuses like Slim Burke to offer up as genuine, current
> >evidence.
>
> Only if you take him seriously, which many of us don't.

The fella is seriously delusional.

> After all, he can't or
> won't answer these simple questions about his alleged T5 operation:
>
> What callsign was used?
> What rigs and antennas were used?

> Who did the equipment belong to?
> What amateur bands and modes were used?
> What countries and continents were worked?
> How were the QSLs delivered?
>
> Simple, straightforward questions, but you'll not see a simple, straightforward
> answer to any of them.
>

There is one very good reason - he doesn't have rational, un-embarrassing answers to give.

Dick

2913. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 05:12:19 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E5AB62F.256B4D6B@att.net>
Source record: 61946

Floyd Davidson wrote:

>
>
> Actually I highly suspect that what they "know" is that they are
> *not* as good as the rest of us.

snipped

>
>
> Going through life thinking you have no value is not a picnic,
> and I do feel sorry for them.

Don't bother with your hobby analysis, it's no more valid than your ham radio experience which is
clearly non-existant.
Get back to us after you become something more than an FCC licensee - something

like an actual ham radio operator. So far you're just another Lennie clone - someone who
fancies that his commercial radio makes him an expert on ham radio..

2914. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 05:12:20 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E5ABB5A.7E9DFDF8@att.net>
Source record: 61947

KB9TMP wrote:

> > That's the *real* joke...
> >
> > Kim W5BOOB
>
> The real joke is I have a QSL card on my wall with
> the callsign of K3LT and you don't.

Doncha love all these FCC licensees, and another or two who aren't,
masquerading as ham radio operators?
Most wouldn't make a pimple on the backside of a real one.

> BTW Kim he's
> really rather nice on the air. We even tried a little
> Hellschriber along with the PSK 31 and RTTY. He
> only tends to get rabid when you talk about laziness
> and callsigns naming body parts ;^) OTOH I'm not
> to fond of lazy people either, be it in the ARS or
> just life in general.
>
> As for the assigning words to Larrys callsign here's
> my attempt at it. K3Let's Try
>
> He's the one who suggested we try Hellschriber which
> up to that point neither of us had ever tried. BTW it
> works pretty nice also!

Hell is a very neat mode. And to think, it's ALMOST as ancient as
radiotelegraphy!

Dick

2915. Re: Petition for retail point-of-sales record keeping -transmitters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 05:12:59 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030225001259.09921.00002447@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 61854

In article <b3ed90kqq1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:

>Can anyone say ripe-off ?

Most folks say "rip-off." I don't think the time is "ripe" for more
bureaucracy. [or do you ham types call it "buro?" :-)]

2916. Re: County Issuing Radio Licenses

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 05:13:00 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030225001300.09921.00002448@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 61853

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hat7mgf.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 24 Feb 2003 05:32:33 -0800, Brian wrote:
>
>>Jim, obviously you weren't on a military frequency. Does the FCC dole
>>out frequencies to the DoD?
>
> An FCC representative sits on the Interagency Radio Advisory
> Committee (IRAC) that does. Until NTIA got into the act, the
> FCC did the paperwork and provided the leadership for IRAC.

That's nice ancient radio stuff, Phil. Ain't the way the LAW
is NOW. Do you need some cites on the establishment of
NTIA and its scope of authority?

2917. Re: County Issuing Radio Licenses

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 05:13:00 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030225001300.09921.00002449@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 61856

In article <v5ilm4elhin13c@corp.supernews.com>, "Jim Hampton"
<aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:

>Brian, when I worked in circuit control on Guam Island, there was a **very**
>nasty blast from the Chief of Naval Operations concerning putting military
>transmissions on 75 meters. Seems it is an international ham band. Someone
>complained to the FCC. Hmmmm ... there **are** international treaties.

The US military is very aware of international treaties and
the US Army regulates its own radio activity. If you need
some ARs (Army Regulations) on that, I can supply them.

However, ALL US government, including military, radio is
coordinated by the NTIA, the National Telecommunications
and Information Agency. Even the CNO of the USN agrees
to that nowadays.

Nowadays there isn't much need for using HF radio for
military communications although the equipment, doctrine
and training is there for using it as a backup method.
However, if there is a national defense need to use some
HF frequency anyplace, the military WILL use it as it sees
fit. If hobbyists want to throw a fit over that, TS.

2918. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 05:13:01 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030225001301.09921.00002450@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 61852

In article <zay6a.5898$hj.1728404@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"Floyd Davidson" <floyd@ptialaska.net> wrote in message
>news:87smuds9dr.fld@barrow.com...
>> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote:
>> >On 23 Feb 2003 21:15:21 -0900, Floyd Davidson wrote:
>> >
>> >>Technical expertise in radio is *not* the measure of a Ham.
>> >
>> > I hope that you can agree with me that technical expertise is but
>> > -one- measure of a ham and there are other factors as well. It is
>> > not the -sole- factor.
>>
>> It is a *hobby*, and technical expertise is *not* the measure of
>> a Ham. It isn't even a part of that measure!
>
>First, it's a service, that some people choose to pursue as a hobby.

Ahem...throughout Title 47 CFR, the word "service" is a
regulatory term denoting a type and kind of radio activity.

See Part 95 and a number of "services," one of which is
most definitely a HOBBY. <shrug>

>Check out 97.1 ... to quote:
>ï¿½97.1 Basis and purpose.
>The rules and regulations in this Part are designed to provide an amateur
>radio service having a fundamental purpose as expressed in the following
>principles:
>
>(a) Recognition and enhancement of the value of the amateur service to the
>public as a voluntary noncommercial communication service, particularly with
>respect to providing emergency communications.
>
>(b) Continuation and extension of the amateur's proven ability to contribute
>to the advancement of the radio art.
>
>(c) Encouragement and improvement of the amateur service through rules which
>provide for advancing skills in both the communications and technical phases
>of the art.
>
>(d) Expansion of the existing reservoir within the amateur radio service of
>trained operators, technicians, and electronics experts.
>

>(e) Continuation and extension of the amateur's unique ability to enhance
>international goodwill.
>
>b, c, and d all point to the value of technical proficiency amongst hams
>as justifying rationales for our continued access to our spectrum
>allocations.
>
>NOWHERE in Part 97 does it refer to ham radio as a hobby ... it's a service.

What about the Radio-Control Radio SERVICE?

That's in Part 95. Want some more "services?"

>> Think about it! Some of the *least* technically inclined Ham
>> operators are the *best*.
>
>While I will admit that someone can be a polite, courteous,
>"good" *operator* with little technical knowledge, that does
>not mean that we should encourage folks to believe that
>technical knowledge has no merit or value and they should
>all become techno-ignorant appliance operators.

Gosh, chief, does the emotionally-loaded word "service"
inspire you to such heights of grandeur?

...just wondering if you had some kind of "transformation"
or other transcendental experience on getting that Extra.

2919. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 05:13:02 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030225001302.09921.00002451@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 61857

In article <3E5A5835.925A13E2@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Phil Kane wrote:
>>
>> On Mon, 24 Feb 2003 04:31:50 GMT, Dave Heil wrote:
>>
>> >I don't see anything wrong with lending a helping hand to a newcomer--as
>> >long as he or she doesn't refer to me as an "Elmer".
>>
>> Mr too. For a xouple of years I worked for a guy named Elmer
>> whom I didn't respect as a "mentor".
>
>I worked as an outside salesman for an industrial electronics
>distributor. We had a middle-aged counterman with two missing front
>teeth. The guy couldn't add two single digit numbers without a
>calculator. Want to guess as to his given name?

David?

2920. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 05:13:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030225001304.09921.00002452@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 61949

In article <3E5A5B76.3071A89@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Brian wrote:
>>
>> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3E599E32.E4F3BC9C@earthlink.net>...
>> > Brian wrote:
>> > >
>> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3E57EB7C.A0596401@earthlink.net>...
>> > > > Brian wrote:
>> > > > >
>> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3E565A51.B1C29552@earthlink.net>...
>> > > > > > Brian wrote:
>> > >
>> > > > > > > > Yet its Jim's radio. You're the one who cannot keep things
>straight.
>> > > > > > > > Don't sit up all night tuning the 160M band endlessly trying to
>snag a
>> > > > > > > > new one, then try to be coherent in replies. Doesn't work.
>> > > > > > >
>> > > > > > > I understand that ",Brian" gave you a problem.
>> > > > > >
>> > > > > > Brian only gives you problems.
>> > > > >
>> > > > Zat so? When did your stupidity or your playing dumb become my
>problem?
>> > > > You alone have to take the responsibility for what you write.
>> > > >
>> > > Dave, I can only respond to what you write. If its too inane, or too
>> > > smug, you get what you get.
>> > >
>> > So that we're sure I have this straight. I write something which you
>> > consider to be smug. You respond with an imcomplete idea. That makes
>> > me somehow responsible for your reply. Is that about it?
>>
>> No. You forgot inane.
>
>I'll correct that portion. "You respond with an incomplete and inance
>idea".

Note: I-N-A-N-E, not "inance."

It's not a Hunnish word or name.

>> > > > > > > I was not home when replying. Jump, jump, jump.
>> > > > > >
>> > > > > > Oh. Correct my statement to read: "We're not all gathered
>whereever it
>> > > > > > is that you are". You can explain your second sentence, the
>incomplete
>> > > > > > one, later if you have any interest in anyone being able to
>understand
>> > > > > > it.
>> > > > > >
>> > > > > You're supposed to be a bright boy.
>> > > > >
>> > > > It is tough to fill in the blanks on a supposed sentence which
>contains
>> > > > only the same three words. Those three repeated words of yours have
>> > > > about the same meaning as "Tree, tree, tree" or "Lift, lift, lift".
>If
>> > > > you can't complete an idea, don't expect others to do it for you.
>> > >
>> > Dave, try using context. Like when I said "Jump, jump, jump" (to
>> > conclusions).
>> >
>> You didn't write "Jump, jump, jump (to conclusions". You wrote "Jump,
>> jump, jump" Nothing about conclusions was written by you or me.
>>
>> I filled in the "(to conclusions)" so you'd finally get it. Poor
>> Dave.
>
>You also wrote some blather about context. Your three word non-sentence
>had no context.

Poor thing...it's below the Oberst to understand humor.

Maybe the Oberst eyeballs it as "vitreous humor?" :-)

[a "visual joke," Herr Robust...]

>
>> > > > > > > Why would I turn on Jim's radio? You're still confused, aren't
>you?
>> > > > > > >
>> > > > > > Phil may be on to something. Stupid seems to be your default
>mode. Ed
>> > > > > > Hare lost interest in the group when you ran extended versions of
>your
>> > > > > > nonsense replies.
>> > > > > >
>> > > > > That's really too bad. Law of unintended consequences. I liked
>Ed.
>> > > > >
>> > > > It wasn't apparent.

>> > >
>> > > Perhaps not to you, Mr Obtuse.
>> >
>> > I don't believe it was apparent to Ed.
>>
>> Ed was a decent enough guy before he hooked up with you. He just got
>> caught up running with the wrong crowd.
>
>I'm sure your comment will send him scurrying back here.

Ah...another who "knows things!" :-)

>
>> We all have our limits. I thought I met had mine, and announced I was
>> leaving the group. Then I decided not to let you guys run me off.
>
>You were wrong about your limits. You were wrong to announce anything
>if there was the possibility that you would nearly instantly change your
>mind. Alec Baldwin found himself having to eat HIS words too after
>announcing that he'd be leaving the country if George Bush was elected.

Ooooooooo! Getting snarly are you Herr Robust?

Is Alec Baldwin a radio amateur? Is George Bush a radio amateur?

Note: This is an amateur radio newsgroup, not a motion picture
gossip place or a venue for discussing US politics.

>You ran yourself off for a very brief time.

You really ought to try switching to Standby or Off (preferred)
as far as functioning in here. There's plenty of other mighty
macho morsemen to take up your line of haughty hate for
"inferior beings."

>> So next you start the "Kim and Alec Baldwin" routine on me. Didn't
>> work, didit?
>
>You, Kim and Alec have some traits in common.

Kim and Alec had a split not too long ago.

>> > > > > On the other hand, how many other people have been run off this
>group?
>> > > > > I don't see any litttle violins playing for them.
>> > > >
>> > > > I don't know of anyone who has been "run off this group". Ed left of
>> > > > his own volition. His tolerance for crap had been exceeded.
>> > >
>> > > As did mine.
>> >
>> > Did you mean "as was mine"?
>>

>> As in, "As was mine tolerance?" No. You'll have to be more specific.
>
>Read what you wrote. Read what I wrote. See if you can find any
>glaring grammatical goofs on your part. Let me know what you find.

...we got to that, mighty master of the Hunnish... :-)

>> > Were you run off this group? I only
>> > recalling you driving off in a Huff or leaving in a snit.
>>
>> Which was it; a Huff or a snit?
>
>It matters not.

It matters greatly if they are licensed... :-)

>
>> How has my leaving worked out?
>
>For you? Not very well. You don't seem to have much will power.

Poor colonel, still fighting his mighty mind battles of
Always Being Right, Always In Charge!

Gruss gott.

2921. Re: New Field Day Entry Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 05:13:05 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030225001305.09921.00002453@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 61855

In article <20030224182625.05845.00000081@mb-fz.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Attilla the Ham and George Clooney wannabe) writes:

>>Subject: Re: New Field Day Entry Class
>>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>>Date: 2/24/03 7:28 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <f45722ac.0302240528.1fda6062@posting.google.com>
>
>>Steve, spend a few moments reflecting on your career on rrap.
>>
>>Post your legacy as you see it.
>
> The difference here, Brain, is that I don't have an agenda to keep or a
>self-proclaimed mission other than poking holes in Lennie's lying.
>
> YOU are a added "bennie". Vippy is a joke. The three of you make up
>the Three Blind Mice of RRAP.

Poor baby. Can't get along with those who won't agree with him.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Needs "bennies" to perform. Not a good thing in
nurses "saving lives."

> Furthermore, I have no concern about how I am perceived in here.

Quite obvious sociopathy, personal hatred to opposition of any
kind is readily observable.

>My "legacy", as I have told you before, exists outside this forum.

Then the "legate" should go outside and DO his "legacy thing."

Demonstrated sociopathy in here IS curable by medical science
but medical science cannot (yet) introduce real smarts into
some amateur's heads.

>My "legacy" exists in REAL deeds...Not what is spewed about in here.

One good thing outside this newsgroup is to review present
practices on blood typing procedures.

> My Amateur Radio "personna" is exhibited ON Amateur Radio...Not a
>flamefest infected newsgroup.

Apparently the great medical legate has not learned the basics
of communicable things. Flames in a newsgroup are started
and maintained by individuals. Sgt Atilllllllla the Ham is one
such example.

> Next?

Goodbye, Saddleback-sore EX-marine, don't let the newsgroup
door hit you in the ass on your way to a real world.

2922. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 05:13:06 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030225001306.09921.00002455@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 61851

In article <3E5A5911.9FAB8484@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Phil Kane wrote:
>>
>> On Mon, 24 Feb 2003 05:33:05 GMT, Dave Heil wrote:
>>
>> >....and you still can't spell the word "Attila".
>>
>> My friend with that name spells it exazctly the way you do. It's a
>> common Yugoslavian first name mowadays.
>
>Len's now off in search of a "Hun language" dictionary online.

No, a gardener who is Yugoslav and does mowing.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. A State Department retiree who doesn't understand
that there is NO "Yugoslavia" anymore?!?

2923. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 05:13:06 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030225001306.09921.00002454@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 61950

In article <20030224183732.23546.00000140@mb-mk.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>From N2EY:
>>>>You were the one who started waving degrees around.
>
>I never was "waiving" my degree, just stated my interests. I mentioned my
>degree to show why I would be interested in the electronics aspects of
>amateur radio.

You'll notice the "mirror" thing in here. Your accuser has been waving his degrees around like a Medal of Honor yet never stated anything but vague generalities of where he works, if at all. :-)

>From K4YZ:
>> But as demonstrated before (with references to established secondary
>>education facilities within spitting distance of Lennie's hole) the Amateur
>>License MAY confer college credit as an elective
>
>Did you just read what you wrote? I seriously doubt any accredited college
>would offer college credit, even 1 credit, for getting an amateur radio
>license. Using a question pool format, most people can pass the test within a
>week. Giving college credit for that would be wrong. Which college does this?

You have to give this poor demented soul some slack. Way back in newsgroup time when he tried to pull off that nonsense about "academic credit for amateur radio experience," I called the college mentioned. The registrar's office gal said she "doesn't really know." A formal letter was never answered.

A couple months later at a local luncheon, I brought up that subject to two instructors at local colleges (Pierce and CSUN), one a licensed amateur, the other having been one. When the laughter subsided they said simply "no credit is given in California colleges and universities for amateur radio activity."

It's a popular theme done by the ignorant of academic subjects. More than a rationalization, those who use it want to puff themselves up more in the mental department than what they are...or have a decided inferiority complex on their status in life. Academic material involving physics is DIFFICULT and should be written in all-caps to prove it. :-)

>The subject material for the test is very good - if one truly mastered those
>areas. One way to make use of this would be to offer ARRL certification

>courses. Its not the same as the amateur radio license. Certifications mean
>you went into more detail in a specific area.

<shrug> :-)

2924. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 05:13:08 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030225001308.09921.00002456@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 61948

In article <3E5A5EB3.617021E1@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Brian wrote:
>>
>> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3E599B49.56F5378E@earthlink.net>...
>> > Brian wrote:
>> > >
>> > > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20030222140633.12173.00000653@mb-mr.aol.com>...
>> > >
>> > > >
>> > > > I prefer to think they are simply "not serious". Just like ol' Cecil,
>who swore
>> > > > he'd never get an Extra...
>> > >
>> > > First you'se guys incessantly "encourage" lower class hams to upgrade,
>> > > then complain when they do.
>> >
>> > I've not encountered many radio amateurs who swear that they'd never
>> > upgrade.
>>
>> I've encountered Extras that wanted to downgrade to Advanced so they
>> could prove to the world that they were "old-time" hams who knew the
>> Morse Code. I can only wonder why they don't prove to the world that
>> they know the code by simply using the code.
>
>A downgrade would seem to be an impossibility.

Nothing is impossible if you really put your mind to it,
work real hard, show your devotion, dedication, and
courage to the ancient ones of the service. :-)

>
>> > Likewise, I've not encountered many non-radio amateurs who claim they
>> > are going for an "Extra right out of the box" and who haven't done zip
>> > several years down the road.
>
>> Dave, I'm sorry you have such limited experiences with people. Thats
>> what happens when you spend the majority of your life in a comm shack
>> handing out Q's at a 4 per minute rate.
>
>I've never handed out "Q's" from a "comm shack".

How about weak-signal "599s?" :-)

>> Let me help you out. People often don't do what they say.
>
>I was aware of that. We have only to look at Cecil, you, Kim and Len in
>this very group to confirm that.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. All of whom didn't intrinsically worship das
Oberst and agree with everything the Great One said... :-)

>> There are
>> rare exceptions, such as yourself, whom always do what they say, and
>> don't do what they say they won't do. But not everyone is like you.
>
>I was aware of that as well.

I will say an extra prayer of thanks on Sunday for that...

>> Trust me.
>
>I'm going to have problems with this one. You told us that you were
>leaving the group but your absence was very brief. How can I trust you?

You don't have a "need to know." You aren't cleared for trust.

>> For example, many people find trying to learn the Morse code confusing
>> and frustrating. Some just can't do it, whether they have a learning
>> or hearing disability, or just can't get past the frustration part.
>> In another time and place, those people became Cooks and MP's. Your
>> only experience has been inside the comm shack, where you see a bunch
>> of ditty-boppers. You assume anyone can be a ditty-bopper.
>
>I never worked with a bunch of ditty-boppers anywhere.

Not even in Guinea-Bisseau? :-)

>My last year in
>the military was spent doing news releases for the Lackland AFB Office
>of Information.

Lackland wasn't "in-country." :-)

Ah...! A REAL clerk job! Rear-area, too!!

>I never encountered ditty-boppers in any of the several
>rock and blues bands of which I was a member. While a couple of the
>electronics distributors I worked for had hams as employees (I even had
>a radio amateur, W8PBX as a sales manager at one place), none were real
>CW aficionados.

Hmmm...rock music, sales clerk for a distributor (several),
knew some hams...that made you qualified for State? :-)

>I believe that just about anyone can learn morse code at a rate of five
>words per minute in very short order.

You were a short-order cook too? Gosh, no end of talent!

>> Do you suppose that there might be a person out there who has no
>> interest in VHF+ amateur communications, but having had a career in HF
>> communications, would like to get an HF license? But then finds that
>> they cannot learn the code? Perhaps even reflects back on his or her
>> experiences on HF, and ask why the Code is so necessary to amateur
>> communications in the year 2003?
>
>We've been through all this before. I don't believe there are many
>people who can't learn morse code at five words per minute. I don't
>believe there will be any morse test at all within a short period. I
>believe that even Len Anderson can learn morse at five words per
>minute. After all, he has told us that he already knows morse code.
>How much of a stretch can it be for him to become "proficient" with it
>at five words per minute?

Why?!?!?

I've never used, or needed to use morse code for any
communications on HF since the 1950s...and I learned
the proper use of "order-wires" back then...which hasn't
changed any since then despite some retirees from State.

>I believe that morse is used as much in 2003
>as it was in 1998 in amateur radio.

I don't "believe" in the FCC's statements of 1990, I KNOW
what they wrote in 90-53. They didn't think morsemanship
was of any value in determining anyone's amateur license
grant then, nor did they believe different 9 years later.

>> I hope I've helped you out on this subject.
>
>Not really.

WE can ALL see that you don't change your Belief system.

There's no need for constant reminders.

2925. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 05:13:27 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E5AFBC3.A0B03B1E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61858

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E59AC03.14A19AEF@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <f45722ac.0302210503.716575a8@posting.google.com>,
> >> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> >>
> >> >> > Anything else you would like me to pass on to Len?
> >> >>
> >> >> No, you'd likely get it screwed up too.
> >> >>
> >> >>Just like you to jump to conclusions.
> >> >>
> >> Pssst...mention the cashews... :-)
> >> >
> >> >Dave, I've got a message for you from Len: "Cashews."
> >>
> >> I don't think it does any good. The Oberst only listens to
> >> what he wants to hear. He is not good about taking advice.
> >> He is above such things.
> >
> >Let's see if you are good at taking advice, Lynnard. To become a
> >participant in HF amateur radio, 1) become "proficient" in morse code at
> >the rate of 5 wpm and 2) pass the appropriate written exams. Maybe
> >you're above such things.
>
> Misdirection. Herr Robust is confused and angry, not
> understanding that his legs were pulled or perhaps enraged
> that someone had the temerity to tweak his royal nose. :-)

No, that isn't misdirection, Leonard. You commented that I am not good
at taking advice. That is yet another thing you know nothing about. I
respond by challenging you to prove that you can take advice. I gave
you some. Are you having difficulties with it already? I'm not
confused, not angry and not enraged. I'm actually having quite a good
time.

> "Cashews" refers to the principal export of Guinea-Bisseau,
> a rather small former colony in the middle of Africa...the
> location of the US embassy where radio officer Heil used
> manual CW as the "order-wire" of an RTTY circuit.

I wasn't in the export business in Bissau. The country wasn't a colony when I was there. I was never a "radio officer".

> Poor feller must be nuts, can't focus on anything but
> himself.

Where would that leave you? You seem obsessed with my former employer, my job and cashews.

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr. Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

Dave K8MN

2926. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 05:56:09 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E5B05BA.7DE49BEE@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61859

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E59AB4F.6316C763@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <3E5652A1.65D2C4DB@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >> In article <G545a.187100$HN5.815085@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net>, "Jackie"
> >> >> <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> writes:
> >> >>
> >> >> >"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> >> >> >news:20030220021035.29944.00000027@mb-fi.aol.com...
> >> >> >
> >> >> >> "It's the LAW!" Right. Laws in force now cannot ever
> >> >> >> be changed, cannot be talked about (absolutely never
> >> >> >> by those without official authorized licenses!). Yup.
> >> >> >
> >> >> >Who sez?
> >> >>
> >> >> Heh...that phrase "It's the LAW!" turns up from time to
> >> >> time in here, written by several. It's the "turf" mentality
> >> >> of the old-timers.
> >> >
> >> >The turf in question is amateur radio, in which we are participants and
> >> >in which you are not a participant.
> >>
> >> ...and I suppose you think you "own" your own callsign, too?
> >
> >My callsign is mine as long as I breathe and continue to renew it.
>
> That "callsign" is NOT real property, is not personal property.
> It is the registry of your permission to operate according to
> US amateur radio regulations, the registry maintained by the
> FCC. The FCC has the perfect right to take away that
> callsign if it sees fit to do so.

My statement is correct as written.

> >No one else is authorized to use my callsign.
>
> Quite true. The same thing applies to driver's license numbers,

> hunting and fishing license registry numbers, and many other
> licenses having registry alphanumerics.

Those licenses don't have an associated radio callsign and do not permit amateur radio operation.

> >You are less a
> >participant in the issue of my callsign than you are in amateur radio.
>
> The FCC may take away your license (and the callsign) any
> time they see fit. No staff or commissioner in the FCC is
> required to have any amateur radio license.

I didn't write anything about the FCC. I said that you are less a participant in the issue of my callsign than you are in amateur radio. Why all the babble about the FCC?

> >No, the statement I made is irrefutable fact.
>
> Incorrect.

Easily correct. You snipped it for some reason.

> >Ummmm...again, you weren't remotely involved with any Department of
> >State communications operations ever. You have made a couple of false
> >statements.
>
> Not. While details of US Department of State activities are
> not fully public, indeed some are quite classified, much of it
> IS quite public

Wow! That's quite a mouthful, Leonard--not fully public, some quite classified, much quite public.

. DSN listings of embassy and consulate staffs
> are an example. If you wish to embellish staff listings as
> "key lists," that is your own title hunger growling. "Key lists"
> is the familiar name of master cryptographic keys, not staff
> listings.

I embellished nothing. I didn't write it. I didn't edit it. I didn't provide the title. The Department of State url below has nothing to do with crypto keys and is not a DNS listing. In fact, it provides only embassy switchboard numbers and offers no extension numbers. You'll note that no one who worked for me was listed. The full staff of the Political, Economics, Regional Affairs Office, USAID, USIS, Peace Corps, etc. are not listed. Shall I repost a couple of Google quotes of the moronic claims you made?

http://www.state.gov/www/about_state/contacts/key_officers99/index.html

Note title. Click on Tanzania. Eat words.

Now you know, don't you, where this is going to lead?

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

> State Department radio communications facilities' capabilities
> on HF isn't publicized in amateur radio magazines, yet their
> size and nature are known to other radio professionals involved
> in HF communications for the various military and government
> agencies and groups.

Something of State's capabilities might be known to someone--certainly
not to you.

> Within the USA international networks of
> radio, State has always been one of the smaller ones. Their
> procedures on HF are generally that of all other HF radio
> communications involving both message traffic and as common
> carriers for messages of several agencies using a network.

That paragraph is simply a load of steamed crap. "USA internationa
networks of radio"? "Procedures on HF are that of all other HF radio
communications"? You're wandering in the desert.

> A term such as "order-wire" is not well-known to radio
> amateurs. It is the command circuit, full-time or part-time,
> used to maintain a radio circuit or circuits to a receiving
> location. It is familiar to those few of us who have been in
> government, military, or common-carrier communications.
>
> What was done in here was to mention "order-wire" casually
> on an opinion of the superiority of using manual telegraphy
> on a radio teleprinter circuit, claiming that conditions in the
> middle of Africa made it too difficult to "synchronize" schedules
> and other circuit commands. On the face of it, that is highly
> illogical. If a radio circuit cannot handle RTTY as an "order-
> wire" function, then it cannot handle normal message traffic
> using TTY. It should be a full-time CW telegraphy circuit. On
> the other hand, if normal TTY message traffic works, then there
> is no reason whatsoever not to use TTY for the scheduling and
> command instructions. The switchover to CW telegraphy just
> for "order-wire" information exchange makes no sense.

You're surely fouling it up, Leonard. The only reason the use of
CW-as-order-wire was brought up at all was to correct someone (you?) who
claimed that the U.S. government was no longer using morse.

Beyond that, you had nothing to do with it. State was under no
obligation to consult you or advise you. I do find it interesting that
you're still attempting to make some kind of case of it.

> That snow job might have passed unnoticed among a group of
> average radio amateurs, hobbyists who have probably not had
> any experience with full-time HF messaging. Unfortunately, it
> did not and the snow cover-up has been going on for 5 years.

Don't you think people are on to you by this time? Your absurd claim
for origination of the CW order wire *poof* blew up in your face. You
silly State Department Key Officers claim *poof* blew up in your face.
Don't you ever tire of looking goofy?

> >Those have come back to bite you in the ass.
>
> Not mine. :-)

Yes....yours.

> >You have no more way of knowing that than you do of State Department
> >communications operations.
>
> Snow jobs are snow jobs. Some fancy description of government
> activity can't cover up lots of snow.

Right; and the ARRL is dishonest. There is suspicious activity all
around and something is afoot. Children are obtaining amateur radio
licenses. Black helicopters whirl overhead. Some guy who claims to have
worked for the Department of State, claims to have used a CW order
wire. He claims to be appear in the Key Officers List of Foreign
Service Posts and--Oh Damn! He IS in the Key Officers List. You've
told us all about it. Have a nice nap, kindly old gent.

> >N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
> >
> >No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> >government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
> >amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
> >Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
> >slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."
>
> No problem with me. If Herr Robust wants to perpetuate a
> Big Lie technique in propaganda, I am willing to help him
> out by repeating it every time he uses that macro. :-)

No big lie. No little lie. Remember: All folks have to do is look
above the quote for you comments. Those comments will be all the proof
anyone needs.

> >I have a stake in that I am a participant in amateur radio.
>
> That isn't the principal cause of all this snow job coverup.
> You have a "stake" only because of ego and pride not
> allowing you to give in to any correction. You will insist
> and obfuscate and misdirect any correction of an obvious
> original flaw until you are no more.

You're babbling again. Why do you persist in snipping relevant
material?
What coverup is going on, Leonard? Why would you be correcting me or
the Department of State? Who are you supposed to be?

> >> There shall be NO dissent in the ranks.
> >
> >You aren't in the ranks.
>
> True. My military Honorable Discharge was received in 1960.

Oh. So when you wrote "There shall be NO dissent in the ranks" you
referred only to your own military service?

> >I don't determine whether you participate in amateur radio, Len.
>
> Misdirection again. One does not have to be a participant in
> amateur radio to understand that the alleged CW "order-wire"
> on an RTTY circuit was illogical. Those of us who had been
> in HF messaging for the military and government knew it wasn't
> good procedure.

Why do you keep snipping and drifting? Why the obsession with State
Department order wires circuits? I am, I'll admit, entertained by your
last sentence.
You don't know whether it was good or bad procedure. You weren't
involved.
It's just like your relationship to amateur radio.

> >You'll have to pass the exam if you want to do that.
>
> Continual misdirection. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

We'll never know. You keep snipping the relevant portions.

Dave K8MN

2927. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 05:58:52 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E5B060C.82DA7974@att.net>
Source record: 61860

Floyd Davidson wrote:

> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote:
> >On 23 Feb 2003 21:15:21 -0900, Floyd Davidson wrote:
> >
> >>Technical expertise in radio is *not* the measure of a Ham.
> >
> > I hope that you can agree with me that technical expertise is but
> > -one- measure of a ham and there are other factors as well. It is
> > not the -sole- factor.
>
> It is a *hobby*, and technical expertise is *not* the measure of
> a Ham. It isn't even a part of that measure!

This guy is obviously a refugee from 27 mHz.......

2928. Re: IT ISN'T A BBS WORLD ANY MORE

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 06:10:38 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <771m5v0gupr3loridt2allkkj9u10qoge1@4ax.com>
Source record: 61864
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On 25 Feb 2003 00:21:20 GMT, Lloyd@no.spammmmm (Lloyd) wrote:

>On Mon, 24 Feb 2003 13:05:04 -0500, Dave Hall <nojunk_n3cvj@worldlynx.net> wrote:
>(snip)
>
>[It's really easy stuff to find. Now let's see you rationalize this away,
>based upon both of your ancient and therefore irrelevant BBS experience.]
>
>In http://www.seattleweekly.com/features/9927/features-gunn.shtml:
>
>"ISPs have themselves been the target of an increasing number of "John
>Doe" lawsuits, which hamstring individual users' attempts to shield
>their identity. A John Doe suit is filed before the names of the
>defendants are actually known; the complainants' lawyer can then
>subpoena an ISP or online service for the real name and personal
>information of the user they claim has done them wrong. (In fact, in
>some cases an actual lawsuit is overkill; the Digital Millennium
>Copyright Act makes it possible to issue subpoenas to get such
>information without any suit being filed.) Many of these suits have
>been filed by companies hunting down online detractors, but at least
>one has been filed by the Church of Scientology to obtain the identity
>of a former church member who has posted copyrighted Church texts in
>the past."
>
>
>In http://www.businessknowhow.com/money/legalreach.htm:
>
>"The long arm of the law got a little longer this spring for people who
>participate in Internet discussion groups.
>
>"In the case of Bochan v. La Fontaine, a federal district court in
>Alexandria, ruled that a Texas resident could be sued in Virginia
>because he allegedly used his AOL account to post a defamatory message
>to a USEnet newsgroup. According to the ruling, such use of an email
>account gives the state jurisdiction because the message was initially
>stored and published on a computer server located in Virginia.
>
>"Due to the high costs and inconvenience of defending oneself in an
>out-of-state law suit, the ruling should be an important reminder that
>"free" speech means responsible speech. You can get sued for what you
>say on the Internet and as a result, and if you do get sued - you
>could possibly lose everything you own."

In neither of these cases was there any mention of a precedent being set, or what the outcome of the case was. Anyone can sue for anything. Wining the suit is quite different. Even if a subpoena were obtained, all you have is the holder of the account. Do you have any idea how common it is for multiple users to post using one account?

2929. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 06:21:07 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E5B0B9F.AD1209E3@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61861

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E59959D.2AF97AAF@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <3E553A2E.859D91C9@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> writes:
> >
> >Allow me to add some of the parts you've snipped just for the sake of
> >clarity:
> >
> >LHA: "Geez, will you Three Morseketeers make up your collective
> > mind? :-)"
> >
> >> >We don't have a collective mind.
> >>
> >> Do you have hives?
> >
> >So your response to my statement is just more of your nonsense.
>
> ...still no answer. :-)

Here come the emoticons.

> >> >No, I simply called attention to your playing fast and loose with the
> >> >truth.
> >>
> >> "Fast and loose?" Heavens no...everything is Strict and Proper,
> >> in formation, dressed right and covered down. Hut-too-tree-foah!
> >
> >So that's your response to a statement which accuses you of outright
> >fabrication?
>
> That's as good as your worth... :-)

Wanna see the Google reposts again?

> >Me: "When I tell you, 'It's raining',
> > that is not a command, it is a statement based in fact."
> >
> >LHA: "Of course. You will also say 'the sky is blue, the grass is
> > green' and other colorful statements of fact while red in

> > the face. Go for it."
> >
> >> >Those aren't commands either.
> >>
> >> Oh, that's right! You issue Commandments!
> >
> >Wrong again. I made statements.
>
> Jawhol, Herr Robust! :-)

Here comes the ethnic stuff along with the emoticons.

> >Me: "Don't blame someone else that you allowed several decades of
> >"interest"
> > in amateur radio to pass without acting on that 'interest'."
> >
> >LHA: "I have interest in my bank, too, but don't want to become a
> > banker. There, two facts, absolute truth. :-)"
> >
> >> >Only dodges from you, Leonard?
> >
> >> No, I only drive Chevrolets...
> >
> >Yet more nonsense from you in lieu of an actual response.
>
> I've written it before and continue to write it.

I dare say you're right. You've written nonsense before I believe
you'll continue to write it.

> My original
> purpose was to argue against the morse code test for an
> amateur radio license, any class, in the USA. That is
> still my objective.

But you've left out the "civil debate" and you've added much, much more
to that original purpose. Perhaps that is the reason for leaving out
"civil debate".

> Personally taking and passing an amateur radio test was
> not my personal objective, personally speaking.

It was a couple of years back according to your own statement.

> Unfortunately, a small group of anal-retentive macho
> morsemen cannot see arguing anything except from a
> point of view equivalent to their own personal ideals.

...and we all know that we should simply accept YOUR personal ideals as
our goal. Let's all simply take the word of a non-radio amateur on how
amateur radio is to be regulated.

> >You aren't knowledgeable about amateur radio.
>
> Wrong. US amateur radio is one of the most-publicized
> hobby activities involving radio in the United States. The US
> regulations on amateur radio forbid transmission with the
> intent to obscure communications. There is nothing secret
> about US amateur radio.

I didn't write that amateur radio isn't publicized. I wrote that you aren't knowledgeable about amateur radio.

> >You aren't a participant in amateur radio.
>
> True. That's also true of every single unlicensed person who
> might, someday, want to get a license.

I'm pretty sure that there aren't a great many individuals who declare an "interest" in amateur radio spanning several decades and who never ever take action toward becoming radio amateurs. I haven't noticed any of the others haunting an amateur radio newsgroup and making like an expert in amateur radio.

> The FCC does not require any staffer or commissioner to have
> amateur radio licenses, yet they MAKE the regulations regarding
> US amateur radio.

Irrelevant (to use your format). FCC staffers are paid to regulate radio. It is their job. You aren't a regulator of amateur radio. You aren't a participant in amateur radio.

> >Why would anyone be swayed toward your view of how
> >amateur radio should be regulated?
>
> It is not possible to change the very set-in-old-mental-concrete
> minds of superior beings who have a need to control what is
> "best for amateur radio." I do not attempt to change their
> minds. They are unmoveable in any event. They, as self-
> styled "superior beings" become quite unglued when confronted
> by others having opposite viewpoints about a radio activity.

I asked why would anyone be swayed toward your view of how amateur radio should be regulated?

> >That isn't what I wrote.
>
> >That isn't what I wrote.
>
> Your exact words are not inviolate. You cannot take any criticsm
> of your "superior" viewpoints so you go on tirades of rebuke and
> false charges, fantasies of conspiracy that others aren't saying
> what they are writing. No problem. You are an "untouchable"
> who feels he must always be obeyed just because you exist.

Not inviolate? Hoo-haaaaa! Why'd you snip the relvant portions,
Leonard?
Your rant doesn't address what I wrote.

> Now you are angry at a light tone in response, demanding some
> kind of penance for false sins. Pfui. Ptui.

Why is it that you keep writing that I'm angry, Len? Why don't you list
a few of the demands that you believe I've made.

> >Just more nonsense from you.
>
> >Your material isn't as cute when the stuff you snipped is reinserted.
>
> Awwwww.....
>
> >We weren't discussing commercial radio licenses. We weren't discussing
> >driving licenses. We surely weren't discussing poetic license.
>
> We surely weren't discussing US Department of State, either,
> yet you are using that as one of your "superior" attributes. :-)

Uhhhh...YOU were discussing the Department of State, Len. Do try and
keep up with what is going on.

> Shirley, you lack a sense of humor.

That wasn't even funny the few dozen times that Cecil wrote it.

> >Still no amateur radio license either. Maybe if you make a wish...
>
> False argument. Only you were demanding that all have a
> federal merit badge for amateurism to achieve your concept
> of amateurism.

Demanding? No, Len. I'm stating that you are not a participant in
amateur radio. As to my concept of amateur radio, even children may
obtain a license, and they DO so in the here and now. You'll need that
"Federal merit badge" in order to ever become a radio amateur. There is
no way around it.

Dave K8MN

2930. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 06:21:38 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@NOSPAMdiamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <b3fqd402qjj@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 61881

And the worst part of it all.... you all (me too) take it
hook-line-and-sinker too.....

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF/MFR
REMOVE "NOSPAM" in email address to reply.
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

"Jackie" <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> wrote in message
news:99z6a.247115$HN5.1052450@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net...
>
> > "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
>
> > > Len:
> > >
> > > You've just been given bad advice. You ARE a "dumbed down Extra
Lite"
>
> Pay no mind to Larry. He trolls this newsgroup like it's a lake full of
> walleye.
>
> Jackie KC0ODY
>
>
>

2931. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 06:22:46 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E5B0C14.8987D9E6@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61862

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E59AF81.1EC7C031@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
> >
> >No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> >government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
> >amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
> >Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
> >slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."
>
> Keep on repeating that over and over and over and over again.

Oh, you can bank on it.

> It is very important (in your personal viewpoint) to emphasize
> those words. It justifies your existance?

No, it illustrates yours.

Dave K8MN

2932. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 06:27:58 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E5B0D3A.C1AE5CA7@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61863

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E59AED4.8CBC5059@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <3E56536D.1DE84A8D@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >You never did tell us, Len. To which ethnic minority do you belong?
> >>
> >> It's a majority, Herr Oberst...the rest of the human race not
> >> afflicted with this sense of ethnic cleansing to keep US amateur
> >> radio sacred, held to the thoughts of those already licensed
> >> in it.
> >
> >Please explain how those not licensed as radio amateurs make up an
> >ethnic group? Please explain how the "rest of the human race" gives a
> >hoot about amateur radio at all.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. Does Herr Robust think the rest of the human
> race cares anything about amateur radio? They are, after all,
> amateurs. :-)

But how do all those folks not licensed as radio amateurs make up an
ethnic group. You wrote that it was such a group. Enlighten us.

Dave K8MN

2933. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 06:36:58 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E5B0F57.1276FE6A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61870

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E59ADED.FDB0AD51@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <3E56566B.8DCCFB5B@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> writes:

> >> Well, it's a good thing the US government no longer has you on
> >> some embassy or counsulate staff. Good for the USA, that is...
> >>
> >You are ever true to form.
>
> In praising the US government, yes. :-)
>
> State Department is not known for a history of correct procedure
> in communications. A rather infamous story on that in 1943 is
> told in David Kahn's "The Codebreakers: A History of
> Cryptography." That book was on the NY TIMES bestseller lists
> (non-fiction) in the early 1960s.
>
> There's more that came out in the Iran-Contra hearings made
> public over television, some more in Bamford's book on NSA,
> "Body of Secrets." I don't think Herr Robust wants to hear of
> those and the newsgroup isn't for the history of gaffes and
> giraffes in the US Department of State. :-)
>
> At least Foggy Bottom has managed to clean itself up. A pity
> that some amateurs (who once worked for them) can't. :-)

That's certainly strong praise for the U.S. government. As for your
last sentence, it helps you live up to the N2EY profile below:

> >N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
> >
> >No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> >government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
> >amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
> >Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
> >slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. A "big lie" technique, Herr Robust. You keep on

> repeating that word for word. Maybe someone will believe it if
> you keep it up. It worked once for a particular political party in
> Yurp in the 1930s and early 1940s. Feel proud. :-)

I plan to repeat it often, Len. Your responses here are filled with insults, ridicule, factual errors. The excessive use of emoticons is in evidence and so is your generally infantile bahavior. The ethnic slurs showed up right on time. It would be hard to improve upon Jim's quote. It describes you quite accurately.

Dave K8MN

2934. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 06:36:59 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030225013659.20477.00000704@mb-fb.aol.com>
Source record: 61869

In article <3E5AF573.E0A01B7B@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <3E59A691.95829A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >>
>> >> In article <3E57E82F.2EE444A5@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
>> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> >> writes:
>> >>
>> >> >Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >> >>
>> >> >> In article <3E553338.C2DE600C@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
>> >> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> >> >> writes:
>> >>
>> >> >> Poor baby. Way back in time he got his snow job melted...all
>> >> >> about using CW as an order-wire for an RTTY circuit in some
>> >> >> small embassy (?) in the middle of Africa in the 1980s.
>> >> >
>> >> >You mean the order wire circuit which you claimed on numerous occasions
>> >> >that I had originated--the one I corrected about repeatedly? That
>claim
>> >> >of yours was pasted by a repost from the Google archives. Watch out
>for
>> >> >those six-year-olds waving the straight keys around. You could get
>> >> >hurt.
>> >>
>> >> If an RTTY radio circuit has such bad performance that you
>> >> need manual telegraphy through OOK CW to communicate
>> >> schedules and orders, then it will not be a good RTTY circuit
>> >> for regular traffic.
>> >
>> >You really haven't been paying attention, have you. Go back and check
>> >those Google archives and enlighten yourself.
>>
>> I know what was good doctrine and procedure on HF radio
>> as used by US government and military communicators.
>
>So you didn't go back and refresh your memory. You only know what

>doctrine was for the Army in the early 1950's.

Incorrect. Doctrine and training for the 1950s, 1980s, 1990s,
and now into the new millennium for the US military...proper
procedures in HF radio from the 1930s onward to about the
beginning of the 1990s.

>
>> The subject originally was using CW telegraphy as an
>> "order-wire" on an RTTY circuit. Illogical procedure.
>> Not used by other agencies.
>
>State is not obligated to use what any other agency uses.

They are not obligated to use any radio of their own. They
could do it all with CW, right? :-)

The "hotline" TTY circuit between the White House and
the Kremlin was run on the US end by US Army Signal
Corps. [that's just an example]

>State was not
>obligated to consult with you before implementing the system.

True enough. State Department is answerable only to the
President of the United States. It's a cabinet function.
Every so often us US citizens "kick out" a President
through a system called a General Election. The honchos
of State usually get kicked out in the process.

>State had its reasons for using the system.

Yes, stubbornness and ignorance, refusal to listen to
other agencies in government. :-)

>It worked well.

"Well?" Deep and wet? I suppose it "worked" about
the same as US foreign policy in the African continent.
Lotsa "success" there, wasn't it?

Did State ever get that bombed embassy rebuilt?

>> > It should become an OOK CW circuit
>> >> instead.
>> >
>> >That wasn't for you to decide.
>>
>> True, but that didn't make it "good" or "logical," did it?
>
>No, that didn't make it good or logical. That it worked and worked well
>proved it to be both good and logical. Your advice wasn't needed.

"...proved it to be both good and logical." Geez, big cheese,
how much other non-amateur HF have you seen? Some ads
in a trade magazine somewhere?

>> >> If an RTTY radio circuit is passing TTY messages fine in
>> >> regular traffic, then it doesn't need any OOK CW for
>> >> schedules and orders in order-wire use.
>> >
>> >Again, you haven't been paying attention.
>>
>> I pay attention to practical procedure that makes sense in
>> radio, especially that which was worked out years before.
>
>State isn't obligated to use what has been "worked out years before".
>State needed something more reliable than what was "worked out years
>before".

Of course, Mr. Macaroni, on an RTTY circuit one uses CW
for skeds and things because it isn't clear enough to read,
but lets the regular traffic go through on a rotten circuit.
Yeah, sure. Put a feather in his cap.

Geez, at least four decades before the 1980s and State's
foggy brained trust can't look around at other agencies and
militaries who've already done it the logical way?

Arf, arf, arf.....more barking by talking heads doing cover-up
operations to the public.

>
>> >> That's logical. One or the other.
>> >
>> >It wasn't for you to decide.
>>
>> Yes it was five years ago. Heil tried to pull off a snow job
>> on pro techniques, got bit on the ass then, hasn't stopped
>> hurting since.
>
>Ever ask yourself why it is that you always end up looking like the guy
>who has his brogans in his yap? Are you learning anything, Windy?

Don't have "brogans," old-timer. Poor thing...you got bit on the
ass five years ago and your wound still isn't healed! I'd see a
doctor if I were you. But, I'm not you, and I was shown how to
run an HF circuit properly back in the 1950s...by those who'd
done it in the 1940s.

>
>> >> Even in the 1980s other HF radio users didn't do such illogical
>> >> procedures. Only, has the Oberst explained, the "State
>> >> Department."
>> >
>> >The Department of State was not obligated to do everything some other HF

>> >radio users did, Spock.
>>
>> Yes, Nurse Chapel, there's no Bones about it. If anyone
>> Chekovs old messages they won't find any actual reference
>> to State's procedure, will they? Uhura along and find that the
>> only "authority" on State is the one shoveling the snow job
>> about CW telegraphy order-wires on an RTTY circuit. Even
>> Scotty wouldn't do that all the way to Sulu land. Don't have
>> a Roddenberry, Kirk.
>
>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

Yo! Mr. Originality shines again! :-)

>> >You mean that you aren't impressed? You don't know anything about my
>> >radio expertise. How is my having a government job "getting away with"
>> >anything, Leonid?
>>
>> Poor baby. All that time in a diplomatic service and never
>> learned any lessons of diplomacy. :-)
>
>Sure I did, Leonard. I never said that someone who had a government job
>was "getting away with" anything. Poor baby.

Ah, but you DID, you clever devil...fleecing the tax-payer
just like all the other con-men.

>
>> >N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>> >
>> >No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>> >government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>> >amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>> >Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>> >slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."
>>
>> Big Lie statement repeated. :-)
>
>It'd only be a lie if you didn't keep living up to it. You really can't
>help yourself.

No problem, there Mr. Originality. You want the big lie technique
to succeed and I'm trying to help your character assassination
game in here. :-)

2935. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 06:37:00 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030225013700.20477.00000705@mb-fb.aol.com>
Source record: 61866

In article <3E5AFA48.A7CFF40A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <3E59A8C3.5A081B84@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>> >
>> >No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>> >government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>> >amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>> >Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>> >slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."
>>
>> Big Lie statement repeated.
>>
>> >N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>> >
>> >No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>> >government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>> >amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>> >Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>> >slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."
>>
>> Big Lie statement repeated.
>>
>> >N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>> >
>> >No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>> >government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>> >amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>> >Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>> >slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."
>>
>> Big Lie statement repeated.
>>
>> >N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>> >
>> >No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>> >government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>> >amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.

>> >Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>> >slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."
>>
>> Big Lie statement repeated.
>
>I'd snip the proof of the pudding too if I were you, Leonard. Each time
>you see the N2EY quote, just look above it and you'll see the action by
>you fitting the profile.

Snip all you want, mighty macho morseman. I'll even repeat it
all in quotes so everyone can see it. :-)

For the "big lie technique" to be successful, you need to saturate
the audience, the viewers, with the propaganda. I just know they
will all love to see your constant repetition of someone else's
words. Makes the unemployed (?) one's words almost worth
money. :-)

>1968 was thirty five years ago, Leonard. "Radio Electronics" is not
>Radio Craft. Sell anything to Radio Craft lately?

It's called a Name Change of a publication, expert publisher
wizard. Radio Craft didn't lose any subscribers or advertisers
from the name change, they just did some appropriate legal
stuff and some format and design changes and it kept on being
published as "Radio Electronics" magazine.

>It is defunct you
>know. R-9 is defunct too. It was the predecessor to CQ but CQ is not
>R-9. R-9 is defunct, much like Ham Radio magazine.

Poor thing...you, like your buddy Sgt Putz, just LOVE the idea
of being defunct, gone, dead, a relic. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

Why don't you pass out some R-9 CDs, Mr. Wizard, show us
all about Olde Raddio as you young'ns learned it? Here's a
wizard thought: Send those R-9 CDs to "Electric Radio!"
Liven up everyone. If it is truly "defunct" then there aren't any
copyright restrictions, are there? :-)

2936. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 06:37:01 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030225013701.20477.00000706@mb-fb.aol.com>
Source record: 61865

In article <3E5AF8AE.399D8469@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <3E59967B.3B38934E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>> >
>> >No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>> >government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>> >amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>> >Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>> >slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."
>>
>> Another macro repeat of a Big Lie item, really the opinion of
>> another. As stated in another message, I will repeat such
>> to aid a propagandist wanna-be. :-)
>
>Yes, it was opinion. I happen to think it was extremely well crafted
>and accurate.

"Accurate?" :-)

That implies you have telepathic powers, mighty Seer.

>For it to be a lie, there'd have to be evidence that you
>are never guilty of the things written.

Oooooo! Tsk, tsk, tsk, watching too many lawyer TV
shows, amateur shames.*

How can a personal opinion be "proved" accurate? How
can a personal opinion be "proven" false? [they can't]

Poor thing. Pointed out the illogical radio procedure
allegedly doctrine in State five years ago and he still
licks his wounds and vows eternal revenge! :-)

>As anyone can see, I've used
>the quote below comments made by you which exemplify actions in the
>profile Jim put together. There's no legwork involved in tying the
>evidence to the profile.

Poor Davie. Poor Jimmie. All hurt!

Sound the Hue and Cry! Avenge the sullied hams of the
extra! Light the wood pile and prepare for the Burning to
cleanse the souls of the inquisitors! :-)

>You get worked up over a single typo but you've repeatedly used
>"auxilliary" and "Attilla" even after they were drawn to your attention
>several times.

Awwww... Why don't you scan the appropriate page in the
Hun dictionary and send it to everyone in e-mail? Show
everyone who's Boss in the newsgroup! :-)

By the way, how are those classes in remedial arithmetic
coming along? Memorize the multiplication tables yet?

Remember, 7 x 24 = 168, not 148...

* not "shamus." "shames" is a temple custodian (although
my Anglicized Hebrew spelling may be in error...so TS, take
away my yarmulke). The "temple" in this case is the ancient
cult of the Morseodists.

2937. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 06:37:02 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030225013702.20477.00000707@mb-fb.aol.com>
Source record: 61868

In article <3E5AF688.58F71B4D@earthlink.net>, Nostradamus <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <c2356669.0302240921.23049fdf@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
>> (N2EY) writes:
>>
>> >Did you not understand: "I've been employed full time in design(and a
>> >few other EE-related activities) since graduation from college.", Len?
>> >What do you think it means? ;-)
>>
>> Looks like an unsubstantiated statement of employment to
>> me. No details of anything, just generalities.
>>
>> What are those "EE-related activities," mighty worker?
>>
>> Do you have any idea of the different fields/disciplines in
>> electricity and electronics? Over two dozen different large
>> groupings in the IEEE Transactions alone.
>
>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."
>
>It's almost like a self-fulfilling prophecy isn't it, Len?

Gosh, Big Seer, you just can't do much originality, can you?
:-)

You keep repeating the same personal opinion over and over
and over and over and over again...but they aren't YOUR
words, mighty macho morseman, are they? :-)

>You just can't stop yourself.

It's just too much fun after seeing someone so long in a
snow job pile struggling. :-)

2938. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 06:37:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030225013704.20477.00000708@mb-fb.aol.com>
Source record: 61867

In article <3E5AF1CC.CD427B27@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <3E59A4ED.56C5F8CC@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >How would you know what someone is likely to encounter on the air,
>> >Leonard?
>>
>> 1. Get an HF receiver.
>> 2. Connect receiver to an antenna.
>> 3. Turn receiver on.
>> 4. Listen.
>>
>> No problem.
>
>I'll grant that you could do or could have done those things but I have
>no indication that you've actually done so since your statement runs
>opposite to anything I've encountered on the bands.

:-) If Davie Baby doesn't hear it, it doesn't exist!!!!

Magnanimity on a conditional basis! Marvelous!

Mighty macho morseman marvelous magnanimity! Has a ring
to it...

>> >> >The "tougher than the First Phone" thing was a quote from an FCC
>examiner.
>> >>
>> >> Surrrre it was, long-timer.
>> >
>> >How would you know, Leonard?
>>
>> Tsk, tsk, tsk. I was agreeing with the unemployed person. :-)
>
>No, you weren't.

You mean...<gasp>...he got a job again? :-)

>> Oh, and I took such a First Phone test in 1956. Must have
>> changed since then, though, what with COLEMs and all.
>

>What has that to do with anything?

What is the meaning of all existance? :-)

Gosh, big Davie, if you had some wit you could be a Wittgenstein
or something! :-)

>> >N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>> >
>> >No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>> >government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>> >amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>> >Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>> >slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."
>>
>> Big Lie repeated. [always willing to oblige... :-)]
>
>Are you suggesting that the Google archives, filled with evidence which
>supports Jim's profile of your likely actions, can be manipulated? We
>have the evidence in the post to which I responded. You completed the
>profile there for all to see.

Engrave it on silver plate, air-blast it into a marble slab, take out
full-page ads in newspapers, lease billboards nationwide. Get
some donations and buy air time.

Run the big lie technique as far as it can go. No problem with
me. I've seen good propagandists at work. You're not a good
propagandist. You're just a little two-bit character assassin on
a newsgroup too filled with himself to give in on anything.

>> >What was the percentage of those taking the aptitude tests which showed
>> >little or no aptitude for learning morse again, Leonard?
>>
>> You tell us, mighty macho morseman from the wilds of
>> the African experience. :-)
>
>I never provided a percentage, Leonard. You did. Have you lost your
>notes?

Awwww...you've been living in Google Archives again, haven't
you? :-)

Picture little Davie with this evil little smirk, fingers poised on
the keyboard ready to cut and paste a copy from Google, small
bit of saliva running down from the corner of his mouth, eyes
wide and staring...ready to pounce with a *QUOTE* From the
Past!!!!

[this is a total box of laughs...up-tight anal retentives having
this fiendish delight in character assassination...:-)]

>> >That's funny. Air Force DI's at Amarillo routinely referred to Basic
>> >Training as "boot camp" in October and November 1968. I still heard the
>> >term used at Lackland in 1971 and '72 after I returned from Vietnam.
>> >You weren't in the Air Force either were you, Len?
>>
>> No. As a civilian engineer I've only been to Wright-Patterson,
>> Chanute, Edwards AFB as far as USAF-only installations.
>>
>> Why is it so important to you, mighty macho morseman?
>> Is US amateur radio some kind of military auxilliary?
>
>It is important as an example of yet another thing which you "know" but
>which flies in the face of fact--like your knowledge of amateur radio,
>your knowledge of Department of State communications operations, your
>knowledge of Department of State Key Officers lists and the like. If it
>wasn't important, why did you feel it necessary to make the claim?

Who is "making claims?" :-)

Tsk, tsk, tsk, the only "flies" are on some of the olde-tyme
raddio procedures you've described...all about some State
rinky-dink operation in the cashew capital of das welt.

Now you want to misdirect all about Basic Training versus
Boot Camp! :-) :-) :-)

>Oh yeah--"auxiliary" like "Attila" has but one "L".

Oooooo! Your spell-checker IS better than mine?

You are the definitive etymological guru on Hunnish?

>> >> Civilian intercept operators for the
>> >> US government are trained at Fort Huachuca as well.
>> >
>> >Don't believe everything you read on a web page, Leonard.
>>
>> Been to "Fort Sneeze," too, fat stuff. Several times.
>
>I've been to Natural Bridge. Several times.
>
>> Missed the UAV section there (wasn't fully in on last trip),
>> would have been interesting.
>>
>> >N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>> >
>> >No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>> >government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>> >amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>> >Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>> >slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."
>>
>> Big Lie thing repeated.

>>
>> No problem on repetition. Takes very little effort to do. Always
>> glad to help mighty macho morsemen in their quest for Truth,
>> Justice, and the Amateur Way. :-)
>
>All anyone need do is read the thread, Leonard. Your behavior fits the
>N2EY profile precisely.

Ah...so now he's a white bread version of Johnnie Cochrane!

Da glove don' fit, ya can't convict.

2939. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 07:00:39 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030225020039.11537.00000671@mb-fl.aol.com>
Source record: 61873

In article <3E5AFBC3.A0B03B1E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <3E59AC03.14A19AEF@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >>
>> >> In article <f45722ac.0302210503.716575a8@posting.google.com>,
>> >> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>> >>
>> >> >> >> > Anything else you would like me to pass on to Len?
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> No, you'd likely get it screwed up too.
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> >Just like you to jump to conclusions.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> Pssst...mention the cashews... :-)
>> >> >
>> >> >Dave, I've got a message for you from Len: "Cashews."
>> >>
>> >> I don't think it does any good. The Oberst only listens to
>> >> what he wants to hear. He is not good about taking advice.
>> >> He is above such things.
>> >
>> >Let's see if you are good at taking advice, Lynnard. To become a
>> >participant in HF amateur radio, 1) become "proficient" in morse code at
>> >the rate of 5 wpm and 2) pass the appropriate written exams. Maybe
>> >you're above such things.
>>
>> Misdirection. Herr Robust is confused and angry, not
>> understanding that his legs were pulled or perhaps enraged
>> that someone had the temerity to tweak his royal nose. :-)
>
>No, that isn't misdirection, Leonard. You commented that I am not good
>at taking advice.

That's true. You can't take much of anything. :-)

>I wasn't in the export business in Bissau. The country wasn't a colony
>when I was there. I was never a "radio officer".

Now, now, calm down...take your little pill and relax...

You weren't really in Guinea-Bisseau and you weren't
a radio officer and the embassy didn't exist in a colony.

Repeat that over and over. It has a calming effect.

Now tell us all the technical reason for an RTTY circuit so
bad that skeds and orders have to be passed by CW yet
you've got that TTY still connected for message traffic.

That's so fascinating!

>
>> Poor feller must be nuts, can't focus on anything but
>> himself.
>
>Where would that leave you? You seem obsessed with my former employer,
>my job and cashews.

Nah, it's your cashews. Your nuts.

>
>
>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>
>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

Go for it, Goebbels 2! :-)

2940. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 07:00:40 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030225020040.11537.00000672@mb-fl.aol.com>
Source record: 61871

In article <3E5B060C.82DA7974@att.net>, Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> writes:

>> It is a *hobby*, and technical expertise is *not* the measure of
>> a Ham. It isn't even a part of that measure!
>
> This guy is obviously a refugee from 27 mHz.......

Dickiebird...there is NO "27 milliHertz band."

ITU-R Recommendations go no lower than 9 KHz.

If you can't identify a frequency correctly, how can
you possibly stay within your ham bands? You
have band-aids for that?

2941. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 07:00:40 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030225020040.11537.00000673@mb-fl.aol.com>
Source record: 61872

In article <3E5B0D3A.C1AE5CA7@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Enlighten us.

Impossible to teach the ossified brain-dead anything. :-)

Continue with the character assassination, oh seeker of
Truth, Justice, and the Olde Amateur Way!

2942. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 07:47:11 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@ptialaska.net>
Message-ID: <877kbossxs.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 61874

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote:
>Floyd Davidson wrote:
>> I've been reading this thread, and frankly it is not amusing at
>> all. I've been licensed as KL7GPS for awhile and thought
>> amateur radio might be something to take up as a hobby now that
>> I'm retired (from a professional career in communications, which
>> included both commercial radiotelegraph and radiotelephone
>> licenses).
>>
>> I haven't gotten around to putting together a rig to get on the
>> air, and this type of exchange is cause to question whether it
>> would be worth the bother.
>>
>
> So there you have it. You're not a ham radio operator at all,
> but rather an FCC licensee. You can't seem to find time to
> get around to actually getting a rig together and getting on
> the air although you've been licensed for "awhile".

Well, you have a point. I've only been licensed for 43 years
Dick. It is true that I haven't had time for ham radio for some
time, but it isn't like I wouldn't know what we are talking
about, eh?

Maybe you want to stop and look at what I said instead of making
assumptions.

> .... And make no mistake, that's what this NG is all about-
>the protesters resisting all the "hoops" thrown in their way by
>-get this- *us longtime hams*, particularily old Extras who
>passed a 20wpm code test! Ain't it amazing? And now you sign
>on, claiming longtime professional service but none as a ham,
>and still you're the original "authority"!

I have neither said "none" as a ham, nor have I claimed to be
any "original" authority. But certainly I can claim to have the
experience to make the kinds of comments that I do.

I don't think my technical background makes me a "better" ham
than *most* of the best hams, who almost all have less technical
experience than I do. I'm not impressed with whatever your
technical background is that you think gives you something
special compared to newer less experienced hams. If either of
us are special, that isn't the reason why.

>> It's a hobby folks.
>
> Ah, another "it's all just a hobby" type. Tell it to the
>FCC. The day they start to consider it "just another hobby"
>will be the day all that valuable spectrum is up for
>grabs. Like right now. Folks like you speed it along. An
>avocation it is, to be sure.

The FCC *does* consider it just a hobby. Look at the way they administer it! Draw a few comparisons to other services, including CB.

And while you are researching that, look up "avocation" in a dictionary. It means... "hobby". And it is, to be sure!

>> Those tests are *all* meaningless to anyone
>> who has worked in the field.
>
> You have a right to your opinion, and that's all it is. FCC
>doesn't agree with it, obviously. Or they didn't untll
>recently.

Yes they *do* agree with it. We might also note what happened to the 1st Phone license too! And yet, since I worked for many years on government owned radio systems where a commercial license was not needed I worked many very fine technicians who were simply not good at taking tests and never did get a commercial ticket.

I do think the Amateur radio tests serve a purpose at the "entry level". It is indeed a valid, and very necessary, requirement to demonstrate knowledge of rules and understanding of enough theory to presumably operate within those rules.

The Extra Class (and the old Advanced Class too) fill no purpose or need other than as an incentive to reward people for making the effort. It can be a fun thing, not unlike DXCC or WAS or whatever. But it is an experience, and not in itself some measure of a good ham.

>Why should you presume that you're the only one here who has
>worked in the field? You're certainly not.

Who claimed that? But... I am quite clearly one of the more senior members here too. Probably about on the same level as you for example, both as a licensed ham operator where you probably have more experience than I do, and in the commercial arena where I probably have a broader background. I am also not at all alone in what I have been saying, and I think you must have noticed that most responses to what I've posted have supported my comments.

>> Someone mentioned getting an Extra
>> Class at age 16 and that it was tougher than a 1st Phone.

>
> Read a little closer next time, in fact it seems it would be
>productive if you'd just go back and reread it now, and see if
>you can thrash out what was actually said.

I read it right the first time. And the person who made the comment didn't disagree with my interpretation of it, so I fail to see what your problem is. As I said, virtually everyone back then felt the Amateur Extra was the more difficult test.

>> I had
>> a 1st Phone at age 16, but by age 20 I'd met at least a dozen
>> people who'd been to a 6 week school that taught that test, and
>> even though they didn't understand a bit of electronics, they
>> were just as legal (and frankly at least a useful to the boss)
>> for standing a transmitter watch as I was!
>
>
>Most of us have known some of the First Phone 'crash school'
>grads, but I sure wouldn't characterize them as being useful as
>those who learned the material.

DJ's with a 1st Phone who could sign off the transmitter log were highly prized. Dummies like me were considered excess baggage, forced on them by the bureaucracy, because between hourly initials in the log, what good was I! That's why they paid us peanuts too, and it's why I never saw that as part of my future. (An attitude that really annoyed some of the people I worked for while I was going to school, but...)

>Makes one wonder if you weren't one of them instead of one of
>us. It's one thing to babysit a transmitter and quite another
>matter to actually work on it or repair it.

How many people capable of working on it did they need though? Only one, but they can't operate 24 hours a day with that one guy signing the log. Typically they needed one Chief Engineer and a bunch of log signers!

>I remember another case, when I was a kid with a new Novice ham
>ticket. One of the 'crash school' grads was hired as the
>engineer at the local BC AM.

Anyone who hires an inexperienced person as "the" one and only engineer gets what they deserve. What's your point? The fact is the license didn't mean he could do the work, or even ever learn how.

And that is exactly what a couple of us have been trying to explain the significance of to you. Being a ham is similar in a small way, because we've seen here an example of a ham who has passed the toughest test there is, and he still sets a poor example. We can also find many others who will never be able to

pass that same test who happen to be great examples of what a
ham should be.

> "Useful" isn't a word I'd use to describe that crash school grad.

If they weren't useful do you really think people would have
been wasting their time and money on a crash school???? Take
the blinders off. There are useful things and useful people in
this world who do things you don't.

> Ya got to learn *some* theory to get that far. How much would
>one of your 'crash school' grads be worth here?

Are you really so hung up on your own self that you think what
you do is the important stuff and what anyone else does isn't,
just because you are all that smart?

Wow. But, I just don't think so.

> So in your view, since some First Phone licenses were issued
>to unqualified individuals, it really doesn't matter whether or
>not anyone ever did actually qualify for one?

Where do you get off calling them "unqualified"???? They took
the same test everyone else did. They were just as qualified
for the ticket as you or I.

I don't know about you, but I certainly was never qualified to
do the jobs they did, and they weren't qualified to do the jobs
I did. But I did notice that they were getting paid a heck of a
lot more than me!

So I went and found a job that paid more than they got. It
didn't require a 1st Phone either...

> Did you ever stop to consider that the proliferation of 'crash
>school' grads and the results of their unlearned and unskilled
>'efforts' were instrumental in the FCC doing away with the
>license entirely? It sure gave lots of ammunition to those
>eager to do away with commercial radio licensing.

It rather proved that we didn't need those licenses anyway. In
all honesty, the 3rd Class license covering rules and regulations
was more significant than either a 2nd Class or 1st Class.

> And then maybe that same situation applies to ham radio? So
>why even bother with licenses?

You're mixing apples and oranges. I have no problem with things
like the entire concept of "incentive licensing" as it was
implemented in the 50's. But I never saw much purpose in either
the Advanced or the Extra Class, and even though CW was always
the fun for me personally, I don't mind a bit that they've
reduced the requirements to a minimum.

Hence if they had a single license, and it covered rules and regs and had a minimal amount of radio theory and a 5 wpm code test... I would not have a problem with it.

But... I don't mind either if there are 8 classes, as long as we don't deny people significant privileges just because they are not professional level engineers or technicians. I.e., it seems they *have* a pretty good license structure right now! Bravo!

>> I can't see either
>> the Extra test or the 1st Phone as significant... compared to
>> something like working in a modern telecommunications center.
>
> So you worked in a comm center. Most hams have not and never
>will. So they then shouldn't bother to learn anything about the
>technical material?

That is exactly the kind of logic you use that I object to. Nothing I said suggests that people who *want* to learn something should not. The point is there is no reason to *force* anyone to learn that in order to engage in Amateur Radio as a hobby.

You seem to think that just because you have learned something, suffered through an exam, or whatever, that everyone else should do the same. I'm saying that is absurd, and I am the perfect example of why. In the past 40 years I've worked on so many different kinds of communications equipment that it would take all week to remember half of it. There simply is *no* need for ham radio operators to be forced to seek that level of experience just because a relative few of us actually do have it. The fact is I am relatively unique because it is almost impossible to find the opportunity have that range of experience. (I'm fond of pointing out to people that they used to say the Bell System was designed by geniuses to be operated by idiots, while in Alaska we had idiots design the system and it took genius to operate it. The effect was that those of us in operations had an opportunity that just wasn't available in many other places.)

> To quote a favorite comment of an old Army master sergeant I
>and a bunch of other techs once worked for, "Your experience is
>somewhat different from mine". And just for the record I've
>worked in (and maintained) a "modern telecommunciations center"

Most places that means you and a whole raft full of other people, each of you assigned to a single area for months or years at a time. I had the good fortune to work in a system where all of us were expected to do anything.

My point is that you are not implementing what the sarg was implying.

>-a few of them, in fact. At least they were modern at that
>time. Things do change rapidly these days. I wouldn't begin to
>walk in and try to resume where I left off at retirement 9
>years ago. What does any of this have to do with ham radio?

Why do you think the average ham is less of a ham if he cannot
compete with the technical expertise your experience should give
you? I think *you* are another great example of why we
shouldn't measure hams by that yard stick! Requiring, in any
way, that hobbiest compete technically with you or I is
ridiculous.

>> As for code, the military could teach the average GI to read
>> code at 35 wpm, so I can't see much significance to that either,
>> except that it required time and dedication that nobody except a
>> GI just out of boot camp is likely to have once they reach age
>> 18 or so.
>>
>
> So why all the whining here about 5wpm? It's not rocket
>science nor in any way difficult. It does explain a lot about
>those doing the whining.

Please re-read my comment. "nobody except a GI just out of boot
camp is likely to have" the time to devote to it. That's why:
it is just unrealistic.

>> I personally like that idea of an Elmer
>
> Where did anyone dispute that? How many hams have you ever
>Elmered? How many do you think I have?

What does that have to do with anything I've said?

> But the first requirement is to have newcomers who want to be
>Elmered. That is seriously lacking in most of the protesting
>kids (of various ages) posting here.

I distinctly do not agree. As I originally said, anyone who
looks at what people like Larry says (and you support) is *not*
going to see it as a friendly hobby to take up, and they are
not going to open up to anyone like you and ask for help. It
isn't that they don't exist, it is that you are running them
off!

>> . It's a hobby, it is
>> *supposed* to be fun. And it is when people at various levels
>> get together and exchange ideas, help each other, and generally
>> do whatever part of it they are capable of enjoying.
>
> Yep, and when the Brian Burkes and Carl Stevensons sit on
>their collective asses half a lifetime whining about all those
>"hoops" they refused to jump through, then continue long past
>the time the "obstacles" are gone, don't you ever wonder about

>their motivations? Or did you just start typing here with no
>background research at all?

Heh heh, apparently *you* needed to do a bit of research... ;-)

>> I'd suggest the Larry and Dick dump the chip on the shoulder
>> routine.
>>
>
> I'd suggest you find out what you're talking about before
>issuing advice. You DO have the chips on the wrong
>shoulders. It's all there in the Google archive.

Seems you assumed a few things...

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://www.ptialaska.net/~floyd>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

2943. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 07:57:42 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@ptialaska.net>
Message-ID: <873cmcssg9.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 61875

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote:
>Floyd Davidson wrote:
>
>>
>>
>> Actually I highly suspect that what they "know" is that they are
>> *not* as good as the rest of us.
>
>snipped
>
>>
>>
>> Going through life thinking you have no value is not a picnic,
>> and I do feel sorry for them.
>
> Don't bother with your hobby analysis, it's no more valid
>than your ham radio experience which is clearly non-existant.

Clearly you are mistaken. My ham radio experience started in
1960, and I've held a ham ticket for 43 years now.

> Get back to us after you become something more than an FCC
>licensee - something like an actual ham radio operator. So far
>you're just another Lennie clone - someone who fancies that his
>commercial radio makes him an expert on ham radio..

Not quite correct Dick. My commercial experience gives me a
technical background that very few ham operators even realize
could exist, but my less extensive background as a ham operator
also happens to be not exactly insignificant.

I've pounded brass on the low end of 40. I've been in a pile up
on 20 phone. I've operated an RTTY station for years, back when
a Model 15 was a thing of beauty. I've modified about as many
ARC-5 sets as anyone. None of that makes me special in any way
that I know of, so I just don't see what you think makes you so
special.

But you know, I never did use a linear, and I never did put
one of those chips on my shoulder...

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://www.ptialaska.net/~floyd>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

2944. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 08:01:53 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@ptialaska.net>
Message-ID: <87y944rdou.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 61876

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote:
>KB9TMP wrote:
>
>> > That's the *real* joke...
>> >
>> > Kim W5BOOB
>>
>> The real joke is I have a QSL card on my wall with
>> the callsign of K3LT and you don't.
>
> Doncha love all these FCC licensees, and another or two who aren't,
>masquerading as ham radio operators?
>Most wouldn't make a pimple on the backside of a real one.

But then again, maybe you *are* just a pimple?

I'd suggest you back off from that kind of remark because it just
digs you into a deeper hole.

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://www.ptialaska.net/~floyd>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

2945. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 10:34:52 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030225053452.25154.00000513@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 61877

In article <20030224210223.22973.00001465@mb-bd.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <c2356669.0302240921.23049fdf@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
>(N2EY) writes:
>
>
>>Did you not understand: "I've been employed full time in design(and a
>>few other EE-related activities) since graduation from college.", Len?
>>What do you think it means? ;-)
>
> Looks like an unsubstantiated statement of employment to
> me. No details of anything, just generalities.

You don't need to know any more than what was posted.
>
> What are those "EE-related activities," mighty worker?
>
You don't have the need to know.

> Do you have any idea of the different fields/disciplines in
> electricity and electronics?

Yep. I'm a degreed EE. I've been employed full time in design (and a
few other EE-related activities) since graduation from college. 27 years as of
July 2003.

There's no reason to give you more information because you don't accept what
you've already been given.

Besides, here's a plain, simple fact: No matter what job, educational level,
employer, or government/military service that I have, you will use it as a
target of insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic/racial slurs,
excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior. You've done so so many
times that it makes your behavior very predictable.

> Over two dozen different large
> groupings in the IEEE Transactions alone.

That's nice.
>
>>> Without any evidence of employment or no one receiving
>>> professional services, we can consider you unemployed.
>>
>>You would be mistaken, then. Who is "we"? :-)
>
> Any reader who has had the endurance to read these

> statements. That's about four of us in the "we" category.
>
Who are they?
>
>>No, I'm not. It's quite clear that you are really ticked off that I
>>won;t tell you where I work. Too bad, learn to live with it. ;-)
>
> Poor baby. Must not be taking this "seriously!"
>
That's right, I don't take you seriously at all, Len.

>>No more new issues of "Ham Radio" magazine. That means "defunct". Like
>>the allegedly shagged-out Norwegian Blue in the Monty Python "Dead
>>Parrot" sketch. 8-(
>
> I'm not familiar with the references to aviary creatures mentioned.

Look them up. You have the time.

> Are those carried in QST?
>
Look them up. You have the time.

>>Lots of vacuum tube information in those old issues of "Ham Radio",
>>too. :-)))
>
>>So? Sounds like you have an obsessive-compulsive need for that
>>information. Too bad. Learn to live without it. ;-)
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. Getting testy about being unemployed?

That's almost funny, Len. But I'm not unemployed. I've been employed full time
in design (and a few other EE-related activities) since graduation from
college. 27 years as of July 2003. That's a fact.
>
>>> >His hobby is wasting time....
>>>
>>> Lots of offended beings waste their time replying, don't they? :-)
>>
>>You reply to almost every post I make here, whether addressed to you
>>or not. You are afraid of the truth. And that's no joke.
>
> I'm not a marine named Colonel Jessup. [motion picture
> "A Few Good Men" available on DVD (a form of CD)]

Typical unfunny nonsequitir.
>
> I have the time. :-)
>
Then look it up.

Time for me to run - literally. Then it's off to work. I'm not going to waste any more time on you, Len.

Jim, N2EY
>
>
>

2946. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 11:10:02 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302250310.a9e490c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61878

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030225020040.11537.00000672@mb-fl.aol.com>...
> In article <3E5B060C.82DA7974@att.net>, Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> writes:
>
> >> It is a *hobby*, and technical expertise is *not* the measure of
> >> a Ham. It isn't even a part of that measure!
> > >
> > > This guy is obviously a refugee from 27 mHz.......
> >
> > Dickiebird...there is NO "27 milliHertz band."
> >
> > ITU-R Recommendations go no lower than 9 KHz.
> >
> > If you can't identify a frequency correctly, how can
> > you possibly stay within your ham bands? You
> > have band-aids for that?

He shudda stuck with "cycles" from his 1962 exam.

2947. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 13:12:55 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <rZJ6a.5945$hj.1799139@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 61879

"Floyd Davidson" <floyd@ptialaska.net> wrote in message
news:87d6lhrt5b.fld@barrow.com...
>
> *My* point is that technical expertise is not the measure of a
> Ham operator, which is an entirely different matter than what
> you speak of.

My point was that technical knowledge certainly IS one of
the measures of a ham ... and 3 of 5 points in the "basis and
purpose" of the service, as outlined in Part 97.1 point to that.

Agreed that it's not the ONLY measure ... good operating
practices, courtesy, helping others, participating in emergency
and other public service communications, and many other
measures also exist.

The idea is balance ... to only be good at one thing leaves one
lacking in other important areas.

Do you agree with this?

73,
Carl - wk3c

2948. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 13:26:33 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030225082633.15486.00000203@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 61880

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 2/24/03 5:37 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030224183732.23546.00000140@mb-mk.aol.com>

>From N2EY:
>>>>You were the one who started waving degrees around.
>
>I never was "waiving" my degree...(SNIP)

It wasn't addressed to you, Vipul. UNLESS, of course, you are really
Lennie pretending to be Vipul.....

>From K4YZ:
>> But as demonstrated before (with references to established secondary
>>education facilities within spitting distance of Lennie's hole) the Amateur
>>License MAY confer college credit as an elective
>
>Did you just read what you wrote? I seriously doubt any accredited college
>would offer college credit, even 1 credit, for getting an amateur radio
>license.

Hey Vippy, I DID read what I wrote, and who gives a rat's kazoo what YOU
think, other than for comical relief...?!?!

>Using a question pool format, most people can pass the test within a
>week. Giving college credit for that would be wrong.

Please cite YOUR credentials in education that make YOU qualified to
determine what should and should not be given credit for electives.

The time frame and circumstances under which credit was granted was
discussed several times, including within the last 2 weeks. Please pay
attention.

>Which college does this?

Colleges...Emphasis on the plural.

Orange Coast Community College in Costa Mesa, CA, and Saddleback Community
College in Mission Viejo, CA. As I said before, this was as late as 1991, and
I have not been in CA since 92.

They also granted credit for other "life experience" achievements such as
the GROL, Private Pilot's license, and certain military vocational programs.

Please pay attention in the future.

Steve, K4YZ

2949. Thanks For The Laughs, Lennie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 13:36:40 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030225083640.15486.00000204@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 61882

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/24/03 11:13 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030225001306.09921.00002454@mb-md.aol.com>

>>Did you just read what you wrote? I seriously doubt any accredited college
>>would offer college credit, even 1 credit, for getting an amateur radio
>>license. Using a question pool format, most people can pass the test within
>a
>>week. Giving college credit for that would be wrong. Which college does
>this?
>
> You have to give this poor demented soul some slack. Way back
> in newsgroup time when he tried to pull off that nonsense about
> "academic credit for amateur radio experience," I called the
> college mentioned. The registrar's office gal said she "doesn't
> really know." A formal letter was never answered.

"Doesn't really know"...?!?! (some minimum wage clerk working her way
through a liberal arts degree, no doubt...)

"Never answered"...?!?! Probably because your "letter" was NEVER sent,
Lennie! Can't "answer" what wasn't received, now can they?

THOSE were ANSWERS...?!?!
BBBWWWHAHAHA

Thanks for the laugh! Now you finally HAVE made yourself look COMPLETELY idiotic!

More absolutely assinine crap from a creep who can't even fake a good lie anymore!

Thanks, Lennie! I needed that!

2950. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 13:45:28 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030225084528.15486.00000205@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 61883

>Subject: Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/24/03 11:13 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030225001301.09921.00002450@mb-md.aol.com>

>>First, it's a service, that some people choose to pursue as a hobby.
>
> Ahem...throughout Title 47 CFR, the word "service" is a
> regulatory term denoting a type and kind of radio activity.

Ahem...It's a radio service that SOME people choose to pursue as a hobby.
THAT is a FACT substantiated by FCC policy.

>See Part 95 and a number of "services," one of which is
> most definitely a HOBBY.

The Citizen's Radio Service, Family Radio Service, Radio Control Radio
Service, etc, combined under PArt 95 are radio SERVICES that many people use AS
a hobby.

Just as no Amatuer is FORCED to use a specific mode, neither must one use
any of the subparts of Part 95 as a hobby.

Parts 95 and 97 both have specific "Basis and Purposes", neither of which
use the word "hobby". As a matter of fact, "service is repeated frequently
while "hobby" is not used at all.

>>NOWHERE in Part 97 does it refer to ham radio as a hobby ... it's a service.
>
> What about the Radio-Control Radio SERVICE?
>
> That's in Part 95. Want some more "services?"

The cited paragraph went into dettail on Part NINETY SEVEN. So what's
with this diversion to Part 95...???

>>While I will admit that someone can be a polite, courteous,
>>"good" *operator* with little technical knowledge, that does
>>not mean that we should encourage folks to believe that
>>technical knowledge has no merit or value and they should
>>all become techno-ignorant appliance operators.
>
> Gosh, chief, does the emotionally-loaded word "service"
> inspire you to such heights of grandeur?

He's talking about good operating skills and the importance of encouraging
technical competence, and you come off sleighting him for it.

Imagine that. Lennie chastising someone for promoting technical
comptetence.

> ...just wondering if you had some kind of "transformation"
> or other transcendental experience on getting that Extra.

Why don't YOU get the one you said you were going to get, and then tell
us, Lennie?

Ya PUTZ!

2951. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 13:52:22 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030225085222.15486.00000206@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 61884

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/24/03 8:02 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030224210239.22973.00001480@mb-bd.aol.com>

>>>Three decades a ham with your "own callsign" and you haven't
>>> learned anything about electronics-radio theory?
>>
>> Who told you that...?!?!
>
> You did.

Lennie, Lennie, Lennie...

Show the quote, or we get to add this to the "I'll Just Make Another Lie Up Hoping No One Notices" pile.

And juding by the stack, it's a pretty robust pile already.

Ya Putz.

Steve

2952. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 14:02:43 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030225090243.15486.00000207@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 61885

>Subject: Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/24/03 8:02 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030224210225.22973.00001467@mb-bd.aol.com>
>
>In article <3E59A8C3.5A081B84@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>writes:
>
>
>>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>>
>>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."
>
> Big Lie statement repeated.

What "Big Lie"...?!?!

The content of the item is accurate. You ARE "guilty" of all of the
points noted therein.

>I sold a two-part article to RE back in 1968.

Oooooeeeeee! Thirty-five years ago! Geewhizz...

As Janet Jackson beg's us to answer...."What Have You Done For
Me...LATELY...?!?!"

Well...what HAVE you done, LATELY, Lennie???

Steve

2953. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 14:07:45 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030225090745.15486.00000208@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 61886

>Subject: Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/25/03 12:37 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030225013700.20477.00000705@mb-fb.aol.com>

>For the "big lie technique" to be successful, you need to saturate
> the audience, the viewers, with the propaganda

Well, you've certainly been trying to do that, Lennie!

Not very successfully, though, as we won't LET you get away with it.

>I just know they
> will all love to see your constant repetition of someone else's
> words.

Hey...if it works... ! ! !

>Poor thing...you, like your buddy Sgt Putz, just LOVE the idea
> of being defunct, gone, dead, a relic.

It is impossible to subscribe to "Ham Radio" magazine.

"Letter's to the Editor" will be returned unanswered.

Nothing but reprints (in various media) are available.

"Ham Radio" IS defunct. It's a fact. Spin it as yuo will, there are no
editorial offices for HR, except perhaps, in your memories, Lennie.

2954. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 14:10:26 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <6301A9BF4C65A02D.26282D47EB9B9D8D.E6B815BD64492070@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 61955

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3E5A8FB9.1CA0D9B8@ix.netcom.com...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> >
> > You might as well have taken the First Phone test, you wouldn'thave
been the first
> > 16 year old to get one. Obviously you could have done it. Wasn't any
huge deal. But
> > I get a little tired of hearing repeatedly that all the ham radio tests
have always
> > been "entry level" and trivial. Not so.
> >
>
> Depends on what background you had when you took the tests. Sure, the
> extra writtens are not a big deal for a person with a BSEE to handle.
> But for someone in a non technical field it would take some effort.
>

I wonder if Dick Carroll is capable of only passing amateur radio tests...

Kim W5TIT

2955. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 14:16:35 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <20ACDB7E5A564397.D6A06E33015FA6C5.0F6D69D4371530A0@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 61953

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
news:3E5ABB5A.7E9DFDF8@att.net...
>
>
> KB9TMP wrote:
>
> > > That's the *real* joke...
> > >
> > > Kim W5BOOB
> >
> > The real joke is I have a QSL card on my wall with
> > the callsign of K3LT and you don't.
>
> Doncha love all these FCC licensees, and another or two who aren't,
> masquerading as ham radio operators?
> Most wouldn't make a pimple on the backside of a real one.
>
>
>
> > BTW Kim he's
> > really rather nice on the air. We even tried a little
> > Hellschriber along with the PSK 31 and RTTY. He
> > only tends to get rabid when you talk about laziness
> > and callsigns naming body parts ;^) OTOH I'm not
> > to fond of lazy people either, be it in the ARS or
> > just life in general.
> >
> > As for the assigning words to Larrys callsign here's
> > my attempt at it. K3Let's Try
> >
> > He's the one who suggested we try Hellschriber which
> > up to that point neither of us had ever tried. BTW it
> > works pretty nice also!
>
> Hell is a very neat mode. And to think, it's ALMOST as ancient as
> radiotelegraphy!
>
> Dick
>
>

And, you're a legend in your own mind, Little Dick. Why don't you impress
us with other successes you've had in your life...you know: those that
required other "tough" tests?

Kim W5TIT

2956. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 14:19:24 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030225091924.15486.00000209@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 61887

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/24/03 8:02 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030224210240.22973.00001481@mb-bd.aol.com>

>I spent my adult life working for money in electronics engineering.

Uh huh.

>Sometimes mistakes happened.

Judging from conversations I had with folks at Johnsville, they happened a
lot when you were around.

>We knew how to correct those and then corrected it.

"We"...?!?! More like "they"...Especially when "they" didn't renew
contracts or moved you elsewhere.

>Do we need to dwell on the consequences of mistaken blood
> typing in certain medical fields?

In as much as I have never done it, why don't you tell us, Oh Enlightened
One...?!?! And while you are at it, please tell us to which registries you are
posted as a profesional laboratory technician?

>>You are a liar. It's documented in your own posts.
>
> Poor baby...lost the ability to tell right from wrong. Typical
> sociopath's rationalization.

Nope. No problem here.

>>You make unsubstantiated accusations against
>>organizations and individuals alike without the least bit of intent of
>>validating your claims.
>
> Like ARRL charging shipping charges on direct orders to
> Newington?

If it costs $3.00 to ship it, what does it matter if it's across town or
across the continent? If someone is too lazy to drive across town to pick
somehting up, they deserve what they get.

But that STILL doesn't "validate" the charges of "fraud" and "dishonesty"
that you have alleged against the ARRL, Your Scumminess.

>>You claim to be a professional engineer, yet you can't
>>even send e mail without making an error.

>
> Incorrect. I've claimed to be a professional, as in accepting
> money for services rendered. I've claimed to be an electronics
> design engineer...which I have been in several corporations and
> continue to be.

Obviously not a very competent one.

>The title "professional engineer" is for a state-licensed engineer
> and I've never claimed to be one of those.

With good reason...You are neither very professional nor does it reflect
anything approaching what one would expect from an "engineer".

>Get some treatment and come back when you are sane.

Uh huh. Right.

Ya Putz.

2957. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 14:20:10 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <15B155A8DD6ACCC1.DDFA9179AD9FA69C.1426A5E3C1D7A4E6@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 61954

"Floyd Davidson" <floyd@ptialaska.net> wrote in message
news:87y944rdou.fld@barrow.com...
> Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote:
> >KB9TMP wrote:
> >
> >> > That's the *real* joke...
> >> >
> >> > Kim W5BOOB
> >>
> >> The real joke is I have a QSL card on my wall with
> >> the callsign of K3LT and you don't.
> >
> > Doncha love all these FCC licensees, and another or two who aren't,
> >masquerading as ham radio operators?
> >Most wouldn't make a pimple on the backside of a real one.
>
> But then again, maybe you *are* just a pimple?
>
> I'd suggest you back off from that kind of remark because it just
> digs you into a deeper hole.
>

Hey, he's the one who apparently thinks there are 1X4 callsigns....

Kim W5TIT

2958. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 14:26:34 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <u2L6a.7389$8f7.803@nwrdny02.gnilink.net>
Source record: 61888

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030224183732.23546.00000140@mb-mk.aol.com...
> From K4YZ:
> > But as demonstrated before (with references to established secondary
> >education facilities within spitting distance of Lennie's hole) the
Amateur
> >License MAY confer college credit as an elective
>
> Did you just read what you wrote? I seriously doubt any accredited college
> would offer college credit, even 1 credit, for getting an amateur radio
> license. Using a question pool format, most people can pass the test
within a
> week. Giving college credit for that would be wrong. Which college does
this?

Well Vipul, (I'm assuming that's your name. Please correct me if I'm
mistaken.)

I went to school for aeronautical engineering and for my degree project, I chose 'The Design and Construction of a Yagi-Uda Directional Antenna.' The degree project was worth two credits and was a prerequisite for graduation. You must chose a technical topic and submit it to the professor for approval before you begin work.

Now for most AROs, this is a nice and fairly quick exercise in research and paper preparation, which worked to my advantage since I was also working full-time while carrying a full semester load. So while AR may not be "overtly" worth college credits, it certainly supplies one with more tools in his/her tool box...and an almost limitless supply of subjects from which to choose. My 15-yr. old niece has also written a paper for science class on AR. (W/a little help from her uncle.) How many kids do you know who'd choose Samuel Morse as the subject for his/her history (NOT science!) class. Really stands out in a sea of Abraham Lincoln and Thomas Jefferson papers. A+ for originality alone. Something to think about the next time you hear someone talk about how outdated Morse/CW is. It ain't all about dits and dahs. ;-)

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

P.S. My degree project professor turned out to be a Tech+ and head of the college ARC. Grade: A.

2959. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 14:33:41 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030225093341.15486.00000211@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 61889

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/24/03 8:02 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030224210238.22973.00001479@mb-bd.aol.com>

>> Please remind me how many bands YOU can get on right now, Your
>>Sleaziness?
>
> Any local union band. Dues all paid up

Uh huh. About what I expected.

>> (Remember...the back of your GROL says you can NOT "operate" without an
>>FCC authorized station license...)
>
> Really? Two months ago I was on HF from a private boat in
> a Ventura marina

Oh wow...NOW I am impressed. Fixed channel operation with single mode.

Be still, my heart......

>Weren't you the one getting all bitchy and whiny about "CVs?"

In as much as there is no Amateur operation (unless Jim Fisk or otehrs at
"HR" magazine let you do some "3rd Party"), I imagine it's a short list.

>> Nope...I wanted to learn about radios. Got that and lot's more.
>
> So far, what has the Putzman learned? How to "carefully tune
> in another station?"

Why are you asking yourself this question, Lennie? Just need to hear it
outloud so you can be sure of what you heard?

Spooooooooky.

>>Whelp, Lennie, for the meantime it's mine.
>
> It does not belong to you as if it were real property. FCC can
> take it away from you any time it wants to. You won't have
> much say about that and you may have to pay a rather large
> fine in addition to being stripped of permission to operate.

And it STILL does not negate the fact that until I die or the FCC removes
it for whatever reson, it is MINE to use.

>You have achieved uniqueness and glory by being assigned
> a 1x2 AMATEUR callsign.

Yep. I earned the privilege of being able to obtain one.

You could too.

>>Please remind us about yours?
>
> You mean...the First Class Radiotelephone...(SNIP)

Idiot.

>You mean about the VHF station license that I co-owned with
> some partners a while back? Business band, of course.

Of course. A license that anyone could buy.

>You don't really want to be reminded, do you?

Naw...I just like seeing you trying to substitute ANYTHING for an Amateur
license...Kinda like you just did here.

Thanks, Putz.

2960. Re: New Field Day Entry Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 14:47:37 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030225094737.15486.00000212@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 61890

>Subject: Re: New Field Day Entry Class
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/24/03 8:02 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030224210234.22973.00001473@mb-bd.aol.com>

>P-U-T-Z and C-R-E-E-P. Guess who used those?

It WASN'T the person who used "Nazi", "jackbooted thug", "elitist", etc.

>I see nothing "dishonorable" about being proud of my signal
> battalion, the men who served in it from 1946 on through 1957.

No, there's nothing "dishonorable" in that. Just as I am proud of the
Marine Corps units I belonged to. They too sustained many KIA's in combat.

But UNLIKE you, I never found a need to invoke thier memories or
sacrifices in order to embellish my career in the Armed Forces or to make
myself somehow look "better" than someone else.

For that you are dispicable beyond words.

>> Nice job, YA PUTZ!
>
> Thank you. Is that some sort of marine thing, to salute another
> military branch's performance using middle-European ethnic-
> Jewish words for "dickhead?"

Who was citing another branch's performance, Lennie?

We ARE discussing YOU...And you ARE a PUTZ.

That the U. S. Army tolerated your BS for eight years was a milestone of
patience. I wudda parked your behind on the DMZ with a rifle and a pair of
binoculars.

Of course, knowing you, you would have been looking the wrong way and
some GI or SKN would have gotten shot by you.

>temper fry

Ya Putz.

Steve

2961. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 15:45:01 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030225104501.00831.00001115@mb-fh.aol.com>
Source record: 61893

In article <519A34C8E4709EEF.AC7F390307B99120.575E74F4FFC2D370@lp.airnews.net>,
"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>Maybe if Larry would display the same kind of characteristics on this
>newsgroup as you apparently were afforded on HF, there are those of us who
>would not have the opinions we do. I do not find Larry nice at all... Nor
>do I care to investigate any further...
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

Yep -- you're mind is made up and nothing's gonna change it! Unfortunately,
this is the attitude of the typical spoiled 5-year old brat. Which, BTW, is
exactly how you come off in this newsgroup!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2962. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 15:45:02 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030225104502.00831.00001116@mb-fh.aol.com>
Source record: 61891

In article <3E5A8C82.670C7E36@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
>>
>> Actually, it stands for "Lotsa Talent."
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>"Lima Tango"?

Isn't that a dance they do in Peru?

73 de Larry, K3LT

2963. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 15:45:02 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030225104502.00831.00001117@mb-fh.aol.com>
Source record: 61894

In article <f45722ac.0302241327.474d19a5@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>
>And I agree with eliminating outdated, unnecessary and superfluous
>requirements.
>
>But please reflect on what some of the PCTA Extras have stated
>regarding current theory exams. As far as the code exam goes, does
>Extra Dick want the elimination of outdated requirements? Does Extra
>Jim want outdated requirements removed? Does Extra Kelly want
>outdated requirements removed? Does Extra Phil want outdated
>requirements removed? Does Extra Larry (non-electronics career) want
>outdated requirements removed?
>

Brian:

Define an "outdated requirement." If you're going to answer that code
testing is an "outdated requirement," then why wasn't it eliminated as
soon as single sideband became widely available? Keep in mind that
by then we also had RTTY capability as well. Anyone involved in
amateur or professional radio communication could have easily
argued that testing for code proficiency was an "outdated requirement,"
but that simply didn't happen!

Personally, I don't think it's possible for an amateur radio operator to
learn too much about operational theory or practical communications
skills (like Morse/CW). Therefore, hardly any knowledge required for
licensing in the past can be considered an "outdated requirement."
And, IMHO, the only motivation for arguing against this premise would
be laziness.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2964. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 15:45:03 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030225104503.00831.00001118@mb-fh.aol.com>
Source record: 61892

In article <20030224210221.22973.00001463@mb-bd.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <20030223224420.09808.00001227@mb-fk.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam
>(Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
>
>>Is this enough, Mike?
>
> Earned your WAS yet? Need help? :-)

Lennie:

No and Yes. What help are you offering? All you have to do is find a way to
make a certain station in North Dakota send me a QSL card, and I've got it!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2965. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 15:45:04 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030225104504.00831.00001119@mb-fh.aol.com>
Source record: 61895

In article <v5j2rg137b05a1@corp.supernews.com>, "KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com>
writes:

>
>The real joke is I have a QSL card on my wall with
>the callsign of K3LT and you don't. BTW Kim he's
>really rather nice on the air. We even tried a little
>Hellschriber along with the PSK 31 and RTTY. He
>only tends to get rabid when you talk about laziness
>and callsigns naming body parts ;^) OTOH I'm not
>to fond of lazy people either, be it in the ARS or
>just life in general.
>
>As for the assigning words to Larrys callsign here's
>my attempt at it. K3Let's Try
>
>He's the one who suggested we try Hellschriber which
>up to that point neither of us had ever tried. BTW it
>works pretty nice also!
>
>--
>'73' From KB9TMP
>"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
>if you can fake that, you've got it made."
>-Groucho Marx
>

Bill:

Nice try, and you have my most humble thanks. However, I fear that
you have wasted your valuable time. Kim and her newfound YL fellow
traveller Jackie aren't the least bit interested in hearing about what I'm
really like in person and my enthusiasm to help fellow hams explore
new modes. They're probably far too indoctrinated in popular Feminist
culture to think of me as anything other than a mean-spirited, misanthropic,
misogynist ogre who hates his fellow man, especially if they're women.
However, quite the opposite is true. I only want what is best for my
fellow man, and particularly my fellow amateur radio operators. I dare
say I am a bit more qualified to know what that is than they ever could.

This notion that amateur radio needs to be some kind of all-inclusive,
politically-correct, touchy-feely bunch of happy campers all gathered
around the campfire singing "Kumbuya" is largely propaganda of the
ARRL, which has an agenda to stay in business as long as possible. To
do this, they need to keep amateur radio viable as long as possible, and

they've tried every trick in the book to do that. This includes their lack of action to support relevant licensing standards, even to the violation of their own 1993 Board of Directors resolution to do so. Kim and Jackie are child-like in their lack of understanding and their reactions to reasonable, mature judgments made by those qualified to do so. Just like the new generation of anti-war protesters, they are not going to be convinced by any argument counter to their own point of view. If either of them made an attempt to work me on-the-air using digital modes as we did, they might change their minds about me, and that would be a terrible inconvenience to them.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2966. Re: Petition for retail point-of-sales record keeping -transmitters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 16:38:53 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <b3g673hsr1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 61896

Excuse me, my finger kept walking.

Dan/W4NTI

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.52.0302250114340.163@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
> On Mon, 24 Feb 2003, Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> >What maintenance fee is that? It seems to me that once a 'special and/or
> >vanity call' is issued it is then in the data base..right? Why the
> >additional charges for a vanity call upon renewal?
> >
> >Can anyone say ripe-off ?
>
> What's "ripe" about that?
>
> >"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> >news:8iy6a.5901$hj.1729292@nnrp1.ptd.net...
> >>
> >> "garigue" <garigue@attbi.com> wrote in message
> >> news:Pzr6a.245321$vm2.189863@rwcrnsc54...
> >> > The only baby steps that I would like to see is a return to the
> >> enforcement
> >> > that was present back in the 60s ...and that would return these days
> >only
> >> > with a yearly license fee. I am sure that would go over big with the
> >> > "somfin fer nutin" crowd.
> >>
> >> If Congress would permit the FCC to keep the money and use it for
> >> increased enforcement in the ham bands, I'd gladly pay an annual fee
> >> of, say $10.00, for my ham license (or $100.00 for a 10 year license,
> >> plus the maintenance fee for my callsign)
> >>
> >> Carl - wk3c
> >>
> >
> >
> >

2967. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 17:23:03 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0302250923.1cf6cdae@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61897

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0302241327.474d19a5@posting.google.com>...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<2Xp6a.5836$hj.1655097@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > news:f45722ac.0302231242.203ee0a9@posting.google.com...
> > >
> > > Many of the Extras on here, whom most of work in the field as
> > > electronics engineers, want the rest of us to learn everything to
> > > their level of professional detail, without getting paid a handsome
> > > salary for the effort.
> > >
> > That is blatantly false ...

Agreed!

> > I, for one, have REPEATEDLY stated
> > that, while technical proficiency could/should be improved in our
> > ranks, that there should NOT be anything even remotely approaching
> > an EE level of knowledge requirement.

And we have had numerous discussions here about how the written tests
could be made better - not harder. As I recall, Carl and I agreed on
many if not most of those issues.

For the record, I passed the old Advanced and General writtens at the
age of 14, in the summer when I was between 8th and 9th grades. Passed
Extra written at the age of 16, in the summer when I was between 10th
and 11th grades. Would've gotten the Extra earlier but for the
then-required 2 year experience requirement. That was back in the bad
old days of FCC secret tests, etc., and it was not unusual back then.
No handsome paycheck back then, either.
>
> Now Carl, is that false for every Extra on here, or just for you?

False for Carl and false for me, too.
>
> > > They really do want something for nothing.
> > >
> > Also blatantly false ... all we want is to eliminate an outdated,
> > unnecessary
> > requirement that only serves as a barrier to entry by qualified people (the
> > Morse proficiency requirement).

That goal has already been achieved here in the USA, because there's
no way a reasonable person could consider the current 5 wpm test as a

"Morse proficiency requirement". That test is simply a demonstration
of a single basic Morse skill, at an entry level.
>
> I think you completely misread my comment.
>
> And I agree with eliminating outdated, unnecessary and superfluous
> requirements.

Me, too.
>
> But please reflect on what some of the PCTA Extras have stated
> regarding current theory exams.

Like what?

> As far as the code exam goes, does
> Extra Dick want the elimination of outdated requirements? Does Extra
> Jim want outdated requirements removed?

Who is "Extra Jim"?

If you mean me, then I'll say that I've always been FOR the
elimination of outdated requirements. Like removing questions about
the Advanced subbands from the tests, because no new ham really needs
to know that stuff since no new Advanceds are being issued.

I also say that the code tests are not an outdated requirement. YMMV.
>
> Nope.

You are mistaken. You're repeating the old Cecil trick of assuming
your conclusion.

There was a time when an employer or educational institution
considered the possession of a ham radio license as a significant
qualification. I know that when I applied to EE schools in 1972 my
Extra class license made at least some difference in getting admitted.
(I was accepted at every school I applied to, btw). Does that same
situation exist today? I don't know.

None of this is meant to mean or imply anything negative about new
hams or old ones. But the written tests can and should be made better.
Many of us suggested ways of accomplishing this to the FCC as part of
the 2000 restructuring.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2968. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 18:10:01 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E5BB173.D65C2B35@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61898

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E5A5835.925A13E2@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Phil Kane wrote:
> >>
> >> On Mon, 24 Feb 2003 04:31:50 GMT, Dave Heil wrote:
> >>
> >> >I don't see anything wrong with lending a helping hand to a newcomer--as
> >> >long as he or she doesn't refer to me as an "Elmer".
> >>
> >> Mr too. For a xouple of years I worked for a guy named Elmer
> >> whom I didn't respect as a "mentor".
> >
> >I worked as an outside salesman for an industrial electronics
> >distributor. We had a middle-aged counterman with two missing front
> >teeth. The guy couldn't add two single digit numbers without a
> >calculator. Want to guess as to his given name?
>
> David?

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

You just can't help it, can you?

Dave K8MN

2969. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 18:12:51 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030225131251.22711.00001131@mb-fe.aol.com>
Source record: 61899

In article <3E5B0F57.1276FE6A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>I plan to repeat it often, Len. Your responses here are filled with
>insults, ridicule, factual errors. The excessive use of emoticons is in
>evidence and so is your generally infantile bahavior. The ethnic slurs
>showed up right on time. It would be hard to improve upon Jim's quote.
>It describes you quite accurately.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Repeat it and repeat it and repeat it as long as
you like. It will soothe your terribly-injured ego, won't it?

You are no longer arguing anything about amateur radio or even
any part of radio or communications. It is all involved about
personal pride and a thirst for vengence and retribution at any
cost.

<shrug>

2970. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 18:20:52 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E5BB451.DE623EC3@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61900

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E5A5B76.3071A89@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Brian wrote:
> >>
> >> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >news:<3E599E32.E4F3BC9C@earthlink.net>...
> >> > Brian wrote:
> >> > >
> >> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >news:<3E57EB7C.A0596401@earthlink.net>...
> >> > > > Brian wrote:
> >> > > > >
> >> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >news:<3E565A51.B1C29552@earthlink.net>...
> >> > > > > > Brian wrote:
> >> > >
> >> > > > > > > Yet its Jim's radio. You're the one who cannot keep things
> >straight.
> >> > > > > > > Don't sit up all night tuning the 160M band endlessly trying to
> >snag a
> >> > > > > > > new one, then try to be coherent in replies. Doesn't work.
> >> > > > > > >
> >> > > > > > > I understand that ",Brian" gave you a problem.
> >> > > > > >
> >> > > > > > Brian only gives you problems.
> >> > > > >
> >> > > > > Zat so? When did your stupidity or your playing dumb become my
> >problem?
> >> > > > You alone have to take the responsibility for what you write.
> >> > > >
> >> > > Dave, I can only respond to what you write. If its too inane, or too
> >> > > smug, you get what you get.
> >> >
> >> So that we're sure I have this straight. I write something which you
> >> consider to be smug. You respond with an imcomplete idea. That makes
> >> me somehow responsible for your reply. Is that about it?
> >>
> >> No. You forgot inane.
> >
> >I'll correct that portion. "You respond with an incomplete and inance
> >idea".

>
> Note: I-N-A-N-E, not "inance."
>
> It's not a Hunnish word or name.

Once is a typo, Len. If I used "inance" more than once, it could be
considered misspelling--much like your use of "Attilla" or "auxilliary".

> >> > > > > > > Why would I turn on Jim's radio? You're still confused, aren't
> >you?
> >> > > > > > >
> >> > > > > > > Phil may be on to something. Stupid seems to be your default
> >mode. Ed
> >> > > > > > > Hare lost interest in the group when you ran extended versions of
> >your
> >> > > > > > > nonsense replies.
> >> > > > > >
> >> > > > > > That's really too bad. Law of unintended consequences. I liked
> >Ed.
> >> > > > >
> >> > > > > It wasn't apparent.
> >> > > >
> >> > > Perhaps not to you, Mr Obtuse.
> >> >
> >> I don't believe it was apparent to Ed.
> >>
> >> Ed was a decent enough guy before he hooked up with you. He just got
> >> caught up running with the wrong crowd.
> >
> >I'm sure your comment will send him scurrying back here.
>
> Ah...another who "knows things!" :-)

I'm patient. Let's sit around and see if Ed shows up.

> >
> >> We all have our limits. I thought I met had mine, and announced I was
> >> leaving the group. Then I decided not to let you guys run me off.
> >
> >You were wrong about your limits. You were wrong to announce anything
> >if there was the possibility that you would nearly instantly change your
> >mind. Alec Baldwin found himself having to eat HIS words too after
> >announcing that he'd be leaving the country if George Bush was elected.
>
> Ooooooooo! Getting snarly are you Herr Robust?

Just a statement of fact, Leonid.

> Is Alec Baldwin a radio amateur? Is George Bush a radio amateur?

Why no! There is common ground between you, the President and Alec
Baldwin!

None of you holds an amateur radio license. Where you differ is that
the President nor Baldwin expressed a decades-long "interest". I don't
recall either one posting here regarding his views of how amateur radio
should be regulated.

> Note: This is an amateur radio newsgroup, not a motion picture
> gossip place or a venue for discussing US politics.

What's any of that to you? You aren't involved in amateur radio.

> >You ran yourself off for a very brief time.
>
> You really ought to try switching to Standby or Off (preferred)
> as far as functioning in here. There's plenty of other mighty
> macho morsemen to take up your line of haughty hate for
> "inferior beings."

Why would I take your suggestion to leave? You aren't a radio amateur.

>
> >> So next you start the "Kim and Alec Baldwin" routine on me. Didn't
> >> work, didit?
> >
> >You, Kim and Alec have some traits in common.
>
> Kim and Alec had a split not too long ago.

So did the amoebae.

> >> > > > > On the other hand, how many other people have been run off this
> >group?
> >> > > > > I don't see any litttle violins playing for them.
> >> > > > >
> >> > > > I don't know of anyone who has been "run off this group". Ed left of
> >> > > > his own volition. His tolerance for crap had been exceeded.
> >> > > >
> >> > > As did mine.
> >> >
> >> > Did you mean "as was mine"?
> >>
> >> As in, "As was mine tolerance?" No. You'll have to be more specific.
> >
> >Read what you wrote. Read what I wrote. See if you can find any
> >glaring grammatical goofs on your part. Let me know what you find.
>
> ...we got to that, mighty master of the Hunnish... :-)

You found Brian's knowledge of the language lacking? :-) :>(

>
> Poor colonel, still fighting his mighty mind battles of
> Always Being Right, Always In Charge!
>

> Gruss gott.

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

Dave K8MN

2971. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 18:30:02 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E5BB676.9C34F1CC@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61951

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E5A5911.9FAB8484@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Phil Kane wrote:
> >>
> >> On Mon, 24 Feb 2003 05:33:05 GMT, Dave Heil wrote:
> >>
> >> >....and you still can't spell the word "Attila".
> >>
> >> My friend with that name spells it exazctly the way you do. It's a
> >> common Yugoslavian first name mowadays.
> >>
> >Len's now off in search of a "Hun language" dictionary online.
>
> No, a gardener who is Yugoslav and does mowing.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. A State Department retiree who doesn't understand
> that there is NO "Yugoslavia" anymore?!?

I didn't write anything about Yugoslavia but I recognize that like Ham Radio magazine, it is defunct.

Phil retired from the State Department? Be sure to let him know that those sorry immigrants should get their act together and begin referring to themselves as "natives of the former Yugoslavia/Jugoslavia".

Dave K8MN

2972. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 18:35:45 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <525D06627F8FC92A.6103727FC67AB56E.CFA7EF81A940B912@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 61956

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030225104504.00831.00001119@mb-fh.aol.com...
> In article <v5j2rg137b05a1@corp.supernews.com>, "KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@juno.com>
> writes:
>
> >
> >The real joke is I have a QSL card on my wall with
> >the callsign of K3LT and you don't. BTW Kim he's
> >really rather nice on the air. We even tried a little
> >Hellschriber along with the PSK 31 and RTTY. He
> >only tends to get rabid when you talk about laziness
> >and callsigns naming body parts ;^) OTOH I'm not
> >to fond of lazy people either, be it in the ARS or
> >just life in general.
> >
> >As for the assigning words to Larrys callsign here's
> >my attempt at it. K3Let's Try
> >
> >He's the one who suggested we try Hellschriber which
> >up to that point neither of us had ever tried. BTW it
> >works pretty nice also!
> >
> >--
> >'73' From KB9TMP
> >"The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing,
> >if you can fake that, you've got it made."
> >-Groucho Marx
> >
>
> Bill:
>
> Nice try, and you have my most humble thanks. However, I fear that
> you have wasted your valuable time. Kim and her newfound YL fellow
> traveller Jackie aren't the least bit interested in hearing about what I'm
> really like in person and my enthusiasm to help fellow hams explore
> new modes. They're probably far too indoctrinated in popular Feminist
> culture to think of me as anything other than a mean-spirited,
misanthropic,
> misogynist ogre who hates his fellow man, especially if they're women.
> However, quite the opposite is true. I only want what is best for my
> fellow man, and particularly my fellow amateur radio operators. I dare
> say I am a bit more qualified to know what that is than they ever could.
>
> This notion that amateur radio needs to be some kind of all-inclusive,

> politically-correct, touchy-feely bunch of happy campers all gathered
> around the campfire singing "Kumbuya" is largely propaganda of the
> ARRL, which has an agenda to stay in business as long as possible. To
> do this, they need to keep amateur radio viable as long as possible, and
> they've tried every trick in the book to do that. This includes their
> lack of action to support relevant licensing standards, even to the
> violation of their own 1993 Board of Directors resolution to do so.
> Kim and Jackie are child-like in their lack of understanding and their
> reactions to reasonable, mature judgments made by those qualified to
> do so. Just like the new generation of anti-war protesters, they are
> not going to be convinced by any argument counter to their own
> point of view. If either of them made an attempt to work me on-the-air
> using digital modes as we did, they might change their minds about
> me, and that would be a terrible inconvenience to them.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>

PAH!!!! You're hilarious, Larry. 'Zat why some of the more respected (and accomplished, I might add) hams in this newsgroup *also* express such high regard for you?

Yeah...thought so...

Kim W5TIT

2973. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 18:44:25 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <073F3410B608F536.324189FE868F301C.9EBE5CF4E5BC331C@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 61957

```
"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> wrote in message
news:20ACDB7E5A564397.D6A06E33015FA6C5.0F6D69D4371530A0@lp.airnews.net...
> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
> news:3E5ABB5A.7E9DFDF8@att.net...
> >
> >
> > KB9TMP wrote:
> >
> > > > That's the *real* joke...
> > > >
> > > > Kim W5BOOB
> > >
> > > The real joke is I have a QSL card on my wall with
> > > the callsign of K3LT and you don't.
> >
> > Doncha love all these FCC licensees, and another or two who aren't,
> > masquerading as ham radio operators?
> > Most wouldn't make a pimple on the backside of a real one.
> >
> >
> >
> > > BTW Kim he's
> > > really rather nice on the air. We even tried a little
> > > Hellschriber along with the PSK 31 and RTTY. He
> > > only tends to get rabid when you talk about laziness
> > > and callsigns naming body parts ;^) OTOH I'm not
> > > to fond of lazy people either, be it in the ARS or
> > > just life in general.
> > >
> > > As for the assigning words to Larrys callsign here's
> > > my attempt at it. K3Let's Try
> > >
> > > He's the one who suggested we try Hellschriber which
> > > up to that point neither of us had ever tried. BTW it
> > > works pretty nice also!
> >
> > Hell is a very neat mode. And to think, it's ALMOST as ancient as
> > radiotelegraphy!
> >
> > Dick
> >
> >
>
> And, you're a legend in your own mind, Little Dick. Why don't you impress
```

> us with other successes you've had in your life...you know: those that
> required other "tough" tests?
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

I forgot to add my callsign phonetics for Larry:

Kastrated 3 Lacks Testosterone...

Kim W5TIT

2974. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 18:46:52 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E5BBA08.4EA6611C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61952

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E5A5EB3.617021E1@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Brian wrote:
> >>
> >> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >news:<3E599B49.56F5378E@earthlink.net>...
> >> > Brian wrote:
> >> > >
> >> > > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> >news:<20030222140633.12173.00000653@mb-mr.aol.com>...
> >> > > >
> >> > > > I prefer to think they are simply "not serious". Just like ol' Cecil,
> >who swore
> >> > > > he'd never get an Extra...
> >> > > >
> >> > > First you'se guys incessantly "encourage" lower class hams to upgrade,
> >> > > then complain when they do.
> >> >
> >> > I've not encountered many radio amateurs who swear that they'd never
> >> > upgrade.
> >>
> >> I've encountered Extras that wanted to downgrade to Advanced so they
> >> could prove to the world that they were "old-time" hams who knew the
> >> Morse Code. I can only wonder why they don't prove to the world that
> >> they know the code by simply using the code.
> >
> >A downgrade would seem to be an impossibility.
>
> Nothing is impossible if you really put your mind to it,
> work real hard, show your devotion, dedication, and
> courage to the ancient ones of the service. :-)

It's going to be doubly difficult for you, Leonard. First you'll have
to obtain a license at least one level higher than the entry level.
Afterward, you can proceed to attempt your downgrade. Let us know how
it works out.

:-) :) :>) ;-)

> >
> > Likewise, I've not encountered many non-radio amateurs who claim they

> >> > are going for an "Extra right out of the box" and who haven't done zip
> >> > several years down the road.
> >
> >> Dave, I'm sorry you have such limited experiences with people. Thats
> >> what happens when you spend the majority of your life in a comm shack
> >> handing out Q's at a 4 per minute rate.
> >
> >I've never handed out "Q's" from a "comm shack".
>
> How about weak-signal "599s?" :-)
>
> >> Let me help you out. People often don't do what they say.
> >
> >I was aware of that. We have only to look at Cecil, you, Kim and Len in
> >this very group to confirm that.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. All of whom didn't intrinsically worship das
> Oberst and agree with everything the Great One said... :-)

Why no, kindly old gent--all of the people mentioned did the opposite of
what they claimed they were going to do.

> >> For example, many people find trying to learn the Morse code confusing
> >> and frustrating. Some just can't do it, whether they have a learning
> >> or hearing disability, or just can't get past the frustration part.
> >> In another time and place, those people became Cooks and MP's. Your
> >> only experience has been inside the comm shack, where you see a bunch
> >> of ditty-boppers. You assume anyone can be a ditty-bopper.
> >
> >I never worked with a bunch of ditty-boppers anywhere.
>
> Not even in Guinea-Bisseau? :-)

Not unless a total of two individuals makes up a bunch.

> >My last year in
> >the military was spent doing news releases for the Lackland AFB Office
> >of Information.
>
> Lackland wasn't "in-country." :-)

Well clue us in. Where is it?

> Ah...! A REAL clerk job! Rear-area, too!!

How does writing news releases and reading them on-air for radio and
television stations equate to a clerk job, Leonard?

Thanks anyway for further input in your continuing effort to live up to
the N2EY profile:

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

> >I never encountered ditty-boppers in any of the several
> >rock and blues bands of which I was a member. While a couple of the
> >electronics distributors I worked for had hams as employees (I even had
> >a radio amateur, W8PBX as a sales manager at one place), none were real
> >CW aficionados.
>
> Hmmm...rock music, sales clerk for a distributor (several),
> knew some hams...that made you qualified for State? :-)

You read "outside salesman" as "sales clerk"? I not only know some
hams, I am a licensed radio amateur. I was a radio op in the military.

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

Dave K8MN

2975. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 19:10:52 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E5BBFA8.63BC9875@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61958

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E5AF573.E0A01B7B@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <3E59A691.95829A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >> >>
> >> >> In article <3E57E82F.2EE444A5@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> >> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> >> writes:
> >> >>
> >> >> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> In article <3E553338.C2DE600C@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> >> >> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> >> >> writes:

> >> I know what was good doctrine and procedure on HF radio
> >> as used by US government and military communicators.
> >
> >So you didn't go back and refresh your memory. You only know what
> >doctrine was for the Army in the early 1950's.
>
> Incorrect. Doctrine and training for the 1950s, 1980s, 1990s,
> and now into the new millennium for the US military...proper
> procedures in HF radio from the 1930s onward to about the
> beginning of the 1990s.

Why is it then that you had no idea of what the U.S. Department of State
was doing on the African continent?

> >
> >> The subject originally was using CW telegraphy as an
> >> "order-wire" on an RTTY circuit. Illogical procedure.
> >> Not used by other agencies.
> >
> >State is not obligated to use what any other agency uses.
>
> They are not obligated to use any radio of their own. They
> could do it all with CW, right? :-)

That's as much of a non-response as I've seen.

> The "hotline" TTY circuit between the White House and
> the Kremlin was run on the US end by US Army Signal
> Corps. [that's just an example]

WHCA is used for one reason only. The military members do not have to
be paid overtime. [that's just an example]

> >State was not
> >obligated to consult with you before implementing the system.
>
> True enough. State Department is answerable only to the
> President of the United States. It's a cabinet function.
> Every so often us US citizens "kick out" a President
> through a system called a General Election. The honchos
> of State usually get kicked out in the process.

The only "honchos" who leave are the Secretary of State and other
political appointees to include some ambassadors. Everyone else stays.
That is the reason for the existence of a professional foreign service.
I'm surprised you didn't know that.

> >State had its reasons for using the system.
>
> Yes, stubbornness and ignorance, refusal to listen to
> other agencies in government. :-)

More praise of the U.S. government?

> >It worked well.
>
> "Well?" Deep and wet? I suppose it "worked" about
> the same as US foreign policy in the African continent.
> Lotsa "success" there, wasn't it?

More praise of the U.S. government?

> Did State ever get that bombed embassy rebuilt?

Pick up your phone and ask 'em.

> >> > It should become an OOK CW circuit
> >> >> instead.
> >> >
> >> >That wasn't for you to decide.
> >>
> >> True, but that didn't make it "good" or "logical," did it?
> >
> >No, that didn't make it good or logical. That it worked and worked well
> >proved it to be both good and logical. Your advice wasn't needed.
>
> "...proved it to be both good and logical." Geez, big cheese,
> how much other non-amateur HF have you seen? Some ads
> in a trade magazine somewhere?

Get ready for the N2EY quote. Three of my four years in the military
were spent entirely in HF communications. I have ten years of
additional State Department HF experience. I have almost forty years of
HF amateur radio experience. Now here it comes:

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

> >> >> If an RTTY radio circuit is passing TTY messages fine in
> >> >> regular traffic, then it doesn't need any OOK CW for
> >> >> schedules and orders in order-wire use.
> >> >
> >> >Again, you haven't been paying attention.
> >>
> >> I pay attention to practical procedure that makes sense in
> >> radio, especially that which was worked out years before.
> >
> >State isn't obligated to use what has been "worked out years before".
> >State needed something more reliable than what was "worked out years
> >before".
>
> Of course, Mr. Macaroni, on an RTTY circuit one uses CW
> for skeds and things because it isn't clear enough to read,
> but lets the regular traffic go through on a rotten circuit.
> Yeah, sure. Put a feather in his cap.

No, you haven't done your homework. The regular RTTY traffic didn't
always go through and couldn't always go through.

> Geez, at least four decades before the 1980s and State's
> foggy brained trust can't look around at other agencies and
> militaries who've already done it the logical way?

More praise for the U.S. government?

> Arf, arf, arf.....more barking by talking heads doing cover-up
> operations to the public.

More praise for the U.S. government?

> >
> >> >> That's logical. One or the other.
> >> >
> >> >It wasn't for you to decide.
> >>
> >> Yes it was five years ago. Heil tried to pull off a snow job
> >> on pro techniques, got bit on the ass then, hasn't stopped
> >> hurting since.
> >

> >Ever ask yourself why it is that you always end up looking like the guy
> >who has his brogans in his yap? Are you learning anything, Windy?
>
> Don't have "brogans," old-timer.

Not any more. You've eaten enough shoe leather for ten men just here.

> Poor thing...you got bit on the
> ass five years ago and your wound still isn't healed! I'd see a
> doctor if I were you. But, I'm not you, and I was shown how to
> run an HF circuit properly back in the 1950s...by those who'd
> done it in the 1940s.

You mean you've attempted to make a case but it hasn't quite worked out
for you. "I say, son. That ain't no way to tie your punkin down!"

>
> >> >You mean that you aren't impressed? You don't know anything about my
> >> >radio expertise. How is my having a government job "getting away with"
> >> >anything, Leonid?
> >>
> >> Poor baby. All that time in a diplomatic service and never
> >> learned any lessons of diplomacy. :-)
> >
> >Sure I did, Leonard. I never said that someone who had a government job
> >was "getting away with" anything. Poor baby.
>
> Ah, but you DID, you clever devil...fleecing the tax-payer
> just like all the other con-men.
>
N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

Dave K8MN

2976. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 19:17:02 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E5BC117.1161D0DB@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61959

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E5AF8AE.399D8469@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <3E59967B.3B38934E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
> >> >
> >> >No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> >> >government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
> >> >amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
> >> >Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
> >> >slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."
> >>
> >> Another macro repeat of a Big Lie item, really the opinion of
> >> another. As stated in another message, I will repeat such
> >> to aid a propagandist wanna-be. :-)
> >
> >Yes, it was opinion. I happen to think it was extremely well crafted
> >and accurate.
>
> "Accurate?" :-)
>
> That implies you have telepathic powers, mighty Seer.

No, that only implies that I am capable of reading the material you
write here.

> >For it to be a lie, there'd have to be evidence that you
> >are never guilty of the things written.
>
> Oooooo! Tsk, tsk, tsk, watching too many lawyer TV
> shows, amateur shames.*
>
> How can a personal opinion be "proved" accurate? How
> can a personal opinion be "proven" false? [they can't]

Why that's a simple matter. All that is necessary is for someone to
read the profile and then read some of your posts. It is plain to see
that you actually do what the profile says you do. You yourself provide

the proof, time after time.

> Poor thing. Pointed out the illogical radio procedure
> allegedly doctrine in State five years ago and he still
> licks his wounds and vows eternal revenge! :-)

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

Dave K8MN

2977. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 19:19:44 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E5BC221.6B0520D0@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61960

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E5AF688.58F71B4D@earthlink.net>, Nostradamus <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <c2356669.0302240921.23049fdf@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> >> (N2EY) writes:
> >>
> >> >Did you not understand: "I've been employed full time in design(and a
> >> >few other EE-related activities) since graduation from college.", Len?
> >> >What do you think it means? ;-)
> >>
> >> Looks like an unsubstantiated statement of employment to
> >> me. No details of anything, just generalities.
> >>
> >> What are those "EE-related activities," mighty worker?
> >>
> >> Do you have any idea of the different fields/disciplines in
> >> electricity and electronics? Over two dozen different large
> >> groupings in the IEEE Transactions alone.
> >
> >N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
> >
> >No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> >government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
> >amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
> >Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
> >slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."
> >
> >It's almost like a self-fulfilling prophecy isn't it, Len?
>
> Gosh, Big Seer, you just can't do much originality, can you?
> :-)
>
> You keep repeating the same personal opinion over and over
> and over and over and over again...but they aren't YOUR
> words, mighty macho morseman, are they? :-)

They're repeated because you continue to live up to them. No, they
aren't my words. That's why I quote the material written by N2EY. I
don't believe I could improve on them. They're accurate.

Dave K8MN

2978. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 19:37:49 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E5BC65F.EFB00153@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61961

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E5AF1CC.CD427B27@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <3E59A4ED.56C5F8CC@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >How would you know what someone is likely to encounter on the air,
> >> >Leonard?
> >>
> >> 1. Get an HF receiver.
> >> 2. Connect receiver to an antenna.
> >> 3. Turn receiver on.
> >> 4. Listen.
> >>
> >> No problem.
> >
> >I'll grant that you could do or could have done those things but I have
> >no indication that you've actually done so since your statement runs
> >opposite to anything I've encountered on the bands.
>
> :-) If Davie Baby doesn't hear it, it doesn't exist!!!!
>
> Magnanimity on a conditional basis! Marvelous!
>
> Mighty macho morseman marvelous magnanimity! Has a ring
> to it...

So all anyone has to do is read what you've written above, read the N2EY
quote below and decide if you fit the profile.

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

> >Are you suggesting that the Google archives, filled with evidence which
> >supports Jim's profile of your likely actions, can be manipulated? We

> >have the evidence in the post to which I responded. You completed the
> >profile there for all to see.
>
> Engrave it on silver plate, air-blast it into a marble slab, take out
> full-page ads in newspapers, lease billboards nationwide. Get
> some donations and buy air time.

Thanks for you ideas but reposting it here seems to work just fine.

> Run the big lie technique as far as it can go.

I've explained this before. Nothing is a lie which can be plainly seen
to be true. Your own actions prove the statement to be true.

> No problem with
> me. I've seen good propagandists at work. You're not a good
> propagandist. You're just a little two-bit character assassin on
> a newsgroup too filled with himself to give in on anything.

Your paragraph above is a good example of proof of the N2EY quote.

>
> >> >What was the percentage of those taking the aptitude tests which showed
> >> >little or no aptitude for learning morse again, Leonard?
> >>
> >> You tell us, mighty macho morseman from the wilds of
> >> the African experience. :-)
> >
> >I never provided a percentage, Leonard. You did. Have you lost your
> >notes?
>
> Awwww...you've been living in Google Archives again, haven't
> you? :-)
>
> Picture little Davie with this evil little smirk, fingers poised on
> the keyboard ready to cut and paste a copy from Google, small
> bit of saliva running down from the corner of his mouth, eyes
> wide and staring...ready to pounce with a *QUOTE* From the
> Past!!!!

The past is filled with examples of you living up to the N2EY quote.
You do exactly what it is that Jim said you do. You've done it again in
your paragraph above. You can't help yourself.

> [this is a total box of laughs...up-tight anal retentives having
> this fiendish delight in character assassination...:-)]

For this to be character assassination, your actions would have to be
other than those described by N2EY. Your actions are not different.
They are the same.

> >> >That's funny. Air Force DI's at Amarillo routinely referred to Basic
> >> >Training as "boot camp" in October and November 1968. I still heard the

> >> >term used at Lackland in 1971 and '72 after I returned from Vietnam.
> >> >You weren't in the Air Force either were you, Len?
> >>
> >> No. As a civilian engineer I've only been to Wright-Patterson,
> >> Chanute, Edwards AFB as far as USAF-only installations.
> >>
> >> Why is it so important to you, mighty macho morseman?
> >> Is US amateur radio some kind of military auxilliary?
> >
> >It is important as an example of yet another thing which you "know" but
> >which flies in the face of fact--like your knowledge of amateur radio,
> >your knowledge of Department of State communications operations, your
> >knowledge of Department of State Key Officers lists and the like. If it
> >wasn't important, why did you feel it necessary to make the claim?
>
> Who is "making claims?" :-)

Pay attention. You are.

> Tsk, tsk, tsk, the only "flies" are on some of the olde-tyme
> raddio procedures you've described...all about some State
> rinky-dink operation in the cashew capital of das welt.

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

> Now you want to misdirect all about Basic Training versus
> Boot Camp! :-) :-) :-)

Someone else referred to boot camp. Though you know little about what
goes on in the Air Force and though you now claim that any discussion of
the term "boot camp" is misdirection, you felt compelled to make a
statement that the term "boot camp" is not used in the Air Force. You
were wrong (again).

> >Oh yeah--"auxiliary" like "Attila" has but one "L".
>
> Oooooo! Your spell-checker IS better than mine?

Is it? My dictionaries would certainly appear to be better than your
spellchecker.

> You are the definitive etymological guru on Hunnish?

I don't believe the Huns ever used the term "auxiliary".

> Ah...so now he's a white bread version of Johnnie Cochrane!
>
> Da glove don' fit, ya can't convict.

...and if the glove fits, might as well jam it in your yap with those brogans.

Dave K8MN

2979. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 19:40:09 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E5BC6F8.E20A989C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61962

Len Over 21 wrote:

> Go for it, Goebbels 2! :-)

N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."

Dave K8MN

2980. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 20:12:52 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302251212.37da315b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61963

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030225104502.00831.00001117@mb-fh.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0302241327.474d19a5@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >
> >And I agree with eliminating outdated, unnecessary and superfluous
> >requirements.
> >
> >But please reflect on what some of the PCTA Extras have stated
> >regarding current theory exams. As far as the code exam goes, does
> >Extra Dick want the elimination of outdated requirements? Does Extra
> >Jim want outdated requirements removed? Does Extra Kelly want
> >outdated requirements removed? Does Extra Phil want outdated
> >requirements removed? Does Extra Larry (non-electronics career) want
> >outdated requirements removed?
> >
>
> Brian:
>
> Define an "outdated requirement." If you're going to answer that code
> testing is an "outdated requirement," then why wasn't it eliminated as
> soon as single sideband became widely available?

It's in the works, but you know how slow the government is on some
things.

Keep in mind that
> by then we also had RTTY capability as well. Anyone involved in
> amateur or professional radio communication could have easily
> argued that testing for code proficiency was an "outdated requirement,"
> but that simply didn't happen!

That's laughable. We're the only ones still arguing about it because
we're the only ones still using it.

> Personally, I don't think it's possible for an amateur radio operator to
> learn too much about operational theory or practical communications
> skills (like Morse/CW).

Personally, I think your right. But universally, learning about
something doesn't always culminate in a government examination.

Therefore, hardly any knowledge required for
> licensing in the past can be considered an "outdated requirement."
> And, IMHO, the only motivation for arguing against this premise would

> be laziness.

Larry, you've been saying that for years, but the government is about to say otherwise.

73, Brian

2981. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 20:24:53 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <piQ6a.6026$hj.1833336@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 61964

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030225104504.00831.00001119@mb-fh.aol.com...
>
> Bill:
>
> Nice try, and you have my most humble thanks. However, I fear that
> you have wasted your valuable time. Kim and her newfound YL fellow
> traveller Jackie aren't the least bit interested in hearing about what I'm
> really like in person and my enthusiasm to help fellow hams explore
> new modes. They're probably far too indoctrinated in popular Feminist
> culture to think of me as anything other than a mean-spirited,
misanthropic,
> misogynist ogre who hates his fellow man, especially if they're women.

So, they have you accurately pegged, I guess ...

> However, quite the opposite is true. I only want what is best for my
> fellow man, and particularly my fellow amateur radio operators. I dare
> say I am a bit more qualified to know what that is than they ever could.

Yes, a legend in your own mind ...

Carl - wk3c

2982. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 20:43:54 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302251243.140d5bf4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61965

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E5A9CEE.B2BE951F@att.net>...

> So there you have it. You're not a ham radio operator at all, but
> rather an FCC
> licensee.

Extra Dick welcomes another new ham aboard.

2983. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 20:50:40 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <240EDB9030184812.0622A60C7CA3AB1A.562A9A9BAE91468F@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 61966

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0302251243.140d5bf4@posting.google.com...
> Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5A9CEE.B2BE951F@att.net>...
>
> > So there you have it. You're not a ham radio operator at all, but
> > rather an FCC
> > licensee.
>
> Extra Dick welcomes another new ham aboard.

Woohoo!!! From Little Dick to Extra Dick...LOL

Er, OK, never mind...

Kim W5TIT

2984. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 21:17:25 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030225161725.13805.00000215@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 61967

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/25/03 12:12 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030225131251.22711.00001131@mb-fe.aol.com>

>You are no longer arguing anything about amateur radio or even
> any part of radio or communications. It is all involved about
> personal pride and a thirst for vengence and retribution at any
> cost.

No more than YOUR presence here is a vendetta against Amateur Radio for whatever reason, Lennie.

Your ENTIRE "argument" here is nothing BUT a personal vendetta, launched for whatever reason. No more...no less.

>Repeat it and repeat it and repeat it as long as
> you like. It will soothe your terribly-injured ego, won't it?

Speakinging of "terribly-injured"...I know you don't see it, but it is ever-so-evident in everything you post, especially when you start back on that "engineer-vs-Amatuer" rant. Somewhere along the line you bumped up against some Amateur who not only THOUGHT he knew more than you, but probably did...And you've been hell-bent on avenging that event ever since...And now we are stuck with you and your vile spewings.

THAT is YOUR "retribution".

Steve

2985. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 21:47:00 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@ptialaska.net>
Message-ID: <873cmckp7v.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 61975

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:
>Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E5A9CEE.B2BE951F@att.net>...
>
>> So there you have it. You're not a ham radio operator at all, but
>> rather an FCC
>> licensee.
>
>Extra Dick welcomes another new ham aboard.

Or at least he _thought_ it was a new ham. But he blew that one
in every way possible.

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://www.ptialaska.net/~floyd>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

2986. Re: Thanks For The Laughs, Lennie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 21:59:32 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030225165932.22973.00001556@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 61970

In article <20030225083640.15486.00000204@mb-cs.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
(Attttillllla da Hammmmm) writes:

>>>Did you just read what you wrote? I seriously doubt any accredited college
>>>would offer college credit, even 1 credit, for getting an amateur radio
>>>license. Using a question pool format, most people can pass the test within
>>a week. Giving college credit for that would be wrong. Which college does
>>this?
>>
>> You have to give this poor demented soul some slack. Way back
>> in newsgroup time when he tried to pull off that nonsense about
>> "academic credit for amateur radio experience," I called the
>> college mentioned. The registrar's office gal said she "doesn't
>> really know." A formal letter was never answered.
>
> "Doesn't really know"...?!?! (some minimum wage clerk working her way
>through a liberal arts degree, no doubt...)

I have no idea of the personnel at Saddleback or their qualifications.
Caller-ID does not yield a resume.

> "Never answered"...?!?! Probably because your "letter" was NEVER sent,
>Lennie! Can't "answer" what wasn't received, now can they?

It was sent.

> THOSE were ANSWERS...?!?!

Awwww...you don't like answers? Poor thing.

> YOU LYING CREEP!
>
> Sheesh! You can't even manufacture a good lie anymore, Lennie!

Well, another charming inducement to enter the service of
amateur radio...

>>A couple months later at a local luncheon, I brought up that
>> subject to two instructors at local colleges (Pierce and CSUN),
>> one a licensed amateur, the other having been one. When the
>> laughter subsided they said simply "no credit is given in
>> California colleges and universities for amateur radio activity."
>
> NEITHER of which were the colleges mentioned... ! ! !

True, both Pierce and CSUN are some distance from
Saddleback. Perhaps you would like ARRL to make

academic statements about entrance standards to
California colleges and universities? If you need
geographic location guidance, try mapquest.com.

> Now you look absolutely INFANTILE!
>
> What a scumbag, Lennie! Sheesh!
>
> Thanks for the laugh! Now you finally HAVE made yourself look
>COMPLETELY idiotic!
>
> More absolutely assinine crap from a creep who can't even fake a good
>lie anymore!

Tsk, tsk, tsk, over-dosing on those mood-altering drugs again,
medicine man?

Keep that up and you will be fired from another hospital.

2987. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 22:00:20 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030225170020.22973.00001562@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 61968

In article <20030225090243.15486.00000207@mb-cs.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
(Atttttilllllla the Ham) writes:

>>In article <3E59A8C3.5A081B84@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>>writes:
>>
>>
>>>N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>>>
>>>No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>>>government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>>>amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr.
>>>Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic
>>>slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."
>>
>> Big Lie statement repeated.
>
> What "Big Lie"...?!?!
>
> The content of the item is accurate. You ARE "guilty" of all of the
>points noted therein.

"heah com de judge, heah com de judge..." [Sammy Davis, Jr.,
on
Laugh-In, NBC-TV]

> As Janet Jackson beg's us to answer...."What Have You Done For
>Me...LATELY...?!?!"

Note: There is no apostrophe for possessive words.

> Well...what HAVE you done, LATELY, Lennie???

"You don't have a need to know" [Rev.Jimmie, policy laugh-in group]

:-)

2988. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 22:00:20 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030225170020.22973.00001561@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 61969

In article <20030225090745.15486.00000208@mb-cs.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
(Atttttilllllla da Hammmm) writes:

>>For the "big lie technique" to be successful, you need to saturate
>> the audience, the viewers, with the propaganda
>
> Well, you've certainly been trying to do that, Lennie!

How? :-)

> Not very successfully, though, as we won't LET you get away with it.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, I'm still here. :-)

>>I just know they
>> will all love to see your constant repetition of someone else's
>> words.
>
> Hey...if it works... ! ! !

Ah, but it doesn't work... :-)

>>Poor thing...you, like your buddy Sgt Putz, just LOVE the idea
>> of being defunct, gone, dead, a relic.
>
> It is impossible to subscribe to "Ham Radio" magazine.

It is impossible to be a marine after a discharge (medical or
otherwise). :-)

> "Letter's to the Editor" will be returned unanswered.

You've just now learned that? :-)

> Nothing but reprints (in various media) are available.

$150 for a 3-volume set from amazon.com, shipping free.

Same price from ARRL plus added shipping charges.

> "Ham Radio" IS defunct. It's a fact.

Not quite. Ham Radio Bookstore is still there, now run by
CQ. Slightly better shipping charges from CQ than from
ARRL at the Ham Radio Bookstore.

>Spin it as yuo will, there are no
>editorial offices for HR, except perhaps, in your memories, Lennie.

Note: Y-O-U, not "yuo." You are speaking Asian now, Hun.

2989. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 22:00:21 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030225170021.22973.00001563@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 61971

In article <20030225053452.25154.00000513@mb-cb.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <20030224210223.22973.00001465@mb-bd.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>>In article <c2356669.0302240921.23049fdf@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
>>(N2EY) writes:
>>
>>
>>>Did you not understand: "I've been employed full time in design(and a
>>>few other EE-related activities) since graduation from college.", Len?
>>>What do you think it means? ;-)
>>
>> Looks like an unsubstantiated statement of employment to
>> me. No details of anything, just generalities.
>
>You don't need to know any more than what was posted.

Nothing was posted. Is this a Seinfield Thing, a post
about nothing? :-)

>> What are those "EE-related activities," mighty worker?
>>
>You don't have the need to know.

:-)

>Yep. I'm a degreed EE. I've been employed full time in design (and a
>few other EE-related activities) since graduation from college. 27 years as
>of July 2003.
>
>There's no reason to give you more information because you don't accept what
>you've already been given.

Forgive me, your highness. I did not bow or sink to my knees
in a worshipful attitude. Will Your Grace allow us to live?

>Besides, here's a plain, simple fact: No matter what job, educational level,
>employer, or government/military service that I have, you will use it as a
>target of insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic/racial
slurs,
>excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior. You've done so so many
>times that it makes your behavior very predictable.

"There you have it." :-)

>> Poor baby. Must not be taking this "seriously!"
>>
>That's right, I don't take you seriously at all, Len.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. :-)

>That's almost funny, Len. But I'm not unemployed. I've been employed full time
>in design (and a few other EE-related activities) since graduation from
>college. 27 years as of July 2003. That's a fact.

How is that "fact" factual? :-)

Oh, yes, we take your "word" for it! Yes, your "word" is always
"factual," is it not? You are a licensed amateur, therefore your
"word" is always "factual." Of course.

>Typical unfunny nonsequitir.

Note: N-O-N S-E-Q-U-I-T-U-R, two words. Latin.

>Time for me to run - literally. Then it's off to work. I'm not going to waste
>any more time on you, Len.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, you've already wasted a whole heap of time
as an amateur pedant. Pity to let all that go to waste... :-)

2990. Re: New Field Day Entry Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 22:00:25 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030225170025.22973.00001564@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 61973

In article <20030225094737.15486.00000212@mb-cs.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>P-U-T-Z and C-R-E-E-P. Guess who used those?
>
> It WASN'T the person who used "Nazi", "jackbooted thug", "elitist", etc.

Ooooo! Someone had the temerity to call you a nasty name,
did they? How dare they? :-)

> But UNLIKE you, I never found a need to invoke thier memories or
>sacrifices in order to embellish my career in the Armed Forces or to make
>myself somehow look "better" than someone else.

Oh, my, the poor thing is reading between the lines, imagining
words that aren't there...

> For that you are dispicable beyond words.

Note: D-E-S-P-I-C-A-B-L-E, not "dispicable." :-)

> We ARE discussing YOU...And you ARE a PUTZ.

:-)

> That the U. S. Army tolerated your BS for eight years was a milestone of
>patience. I wudda parked your behind on the DMZ with a rifle and a pair of
>binoculars.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. For any disputes with another's military service,
contact the Adjutant General's Office, United States Army.

Note: W-O-U-L-D H-A-V-E, not "wudda."

A "wudda" is what hoagie-munchers have on the stewn of dey
boats for steewing. :-)

> Of course, knowing you, you would have been looking the wrong way and
>some GI or SKN would have gotten shot by you.
>
>>temper fry
>
> Ya Putz.

Well, so much for amateur radio and ham comportment... :-)

2991. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 22:00:27 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030225170027.22973.00001565@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 61972

In article <20030225084528.15486.00000205@mb-cs.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
(Attilllllla the Ham) writes:

>>>First, it's a service, that some people choose to pursue as a hobby.
>>
>> Ahem...throughout Title 47 CFR, the word "service" is a
>> regulatory term denoting a type and kind of radio activity.
>
> Ahem...It's a radio service that SOME people choose to pursue as a
>hobby. THAT is a FACT substantiated by FCC policy.

Not really "fact," just political phraseology common in many
many pieces of legislation, rules, regulations in the USA.

The word "service" is a regulatory term denoting a type and
kind of radio activity all throughout Title 47 CFR. It isn't a
military service, it is not a table service, it is not a service
elevator or a service entrance.

> The Citizen's Radio Service, Family Radio Service, Radio Control Radio
>Service, etc, combined under PArt 95 are radio SERVICES that many people use
>AS a hobby.

Does Part 95 specifically say the word "hobby?" :-)

> Just as no Amatuer is FORCED to use a specific mode, neither must one
>use any of the subparts of Part 95 as a hobby.

Note: A-M-A-T-E-U-R, not "amatuer." Tsk, tsk, tsk, common
mistake under rage of typing...

So, does the Hun think that model aircraft radio control is some
kind of service to the aircraft industry?

> Parts 95 and 97 both have specific "Basis and Purposes", neither of which
>use the word "hobby". As a matter of fact, "service is repeated frequently
>while "hobby" is not used at all.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. That sounds like all those servicemen and
servicewomen have to do national duty or something, doesn't
it? :-)

Okay, if it isn't an avocation or hobby, is it a regligious calling?
You know, like a "cult?" :-)

Is the word "fun" or "enjoyment" anywhere in Part 97? No?
How about "recreation?" No? Does that mean no one can
have any fun or enjoyment or recreation with ham radio?

Oh, by the way, is "ham" radio anywhere in Part 97? Better
go look it up. :-)

> The cited paragraph went into dettail on Part NINETY SEVEN. So what's
>with this diversion to Part 95...???

Note: D-E-T-A-I-L, net "dettail." Tsk, tsk, tsk.

What "diversion?" Does Part 2 or Title 47 CFR involve regulations
of amateur radio? It does. In any Part of Title 47, any regulation
regarding transmission out of codified limits apply to all other
Parts.

> He's talking about good operating skills and the importance of
>encouraging technical competence, and you come off sleighting him for it.

Note: S-L-I-G-H-T-I-N-G, not "sleighting." Tsk, tsk, tsk.

Please no snow jobs and sleighing through the snow...:-)

> Why don't YOU get the one you said you were going to get, and then tell
>us, Lennie?

Get what? :-)

> Ya PUTZ!

Calling others "dickhead" in a language not native to you does
not absolve you, dill instructor.

2992. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 22:00:31 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030225170031.22973.00001566@mb-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 61974

In article <20030225091924.15486.00000209@mb-cs.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>I spent my adult life working for money in electronics engineering.
>
> Uh huh.

I've given a list of my employers in here. You haven't verified anything from them. I've given the callsigns and names of licensed radio amateurs whom I've worked with (not complete) in here but you've not verified anything.

You resent anyone who has radio-electronics experience and who disagrees with your opinions. That's a personality problem you have, your own, not anyone disagreeing with you.

>>Sometimes mistakes happened.
>
> Judging from conversations I had with folks at Johnsville, they happened
>a lot when you were around.

You've not had any "conversations with folks at Johnsville" concerning myself and any project work there. First of all, I was never employed at the Naval Air Development Center, Warminster, PA, but a full time employee of RCA Corporation in the early 1970s. Katapult Kellie tried to imply otherwise in a small attempt to start a flame war but he was wrong. Secondly, the time period was in the early 1970s and the military personnel at NAS Warminster (the one-runway airfield across the road from NADC) were USN, not USMC.

The only "accident" or "mistake" at either NADC or NAS Warminster occurred at the airfield when the NAVSTAR test crew lowered the wings of an RA-2 onto the top of a yellow-painted service truck to check the top blade antenna on the RA-2. Minor damage to the right folding wing of the RA-2. I was not involved in NAVSTAR tests at NADC, but that project crew had lab facilities at NADC adjacent to the lab facilities used by the RCA SECANT program.

NAVSTAR was an eventual success. It is now known as the GPSS.

SECANT and a similar, competing system for aircraft collision-avoidance by Minneapolis-Honeywell were technical successes but political influences favored a relatively untested system from MIT and became the limited-use ATCRBS found

now only on large air carrier aircraft.

>>We knew how to correct those and then corrected it.
>
> "We"...?!?! More like "they"...Especially when "they" didn't renew
>contracts or moved you elsewhere.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Still so involved in Personality Conflicts that
you can only see imagined fantasies generated by others?
That's rather sick as well as ignorant of the larger world of
electronics. [short-time purchasing agent temps don't get
to see much]

Government contracts have had fixed times to completion
for years, with many controls over funding and over-run
(both time and money) penalties. R&D contracts may have
some slight flexibility negotiated but none of that is in any
way "automatically renewable" or even extendable. A
contract time is for a certain period and that is that.
Companies engaged in that work realize that and try to get
other work to take over when a contract normally ends.
Quite often a development group must dovetail previous work
with phasing-in on a new contract project. That is quite
normal. That is business, professional work.

When the first air tests of SECANT were completed, there
was still a great deal of data reduction done by both RCA
and NADC personnel. That was done. RCA Electromagnetic
and Aviation Systems (EASD) based in Van Nuys, CA, did
the required part of that SECANT contract in California, not
in Pennsylvania. Similarly, the Minneapolis-Honeywell
group did theirs in Minnesota; their air tests were planned
at different times at NADC to avoid aircraft scheduling
problems. Both corporate contract groups used analysis
data to modify systems and procedures for a second phase
of tests for this DoT-funded overall project (NADC was tasked
with administering the tests and providing common facilities).
Both corporate systems operated at 1.6 GHz with permission
of the US government specifically for this project; those
permission details were worked out by legal staffs as part of
contract administration and were not handled by technical
project groups.

Second phase of ground and air testing was successful for
both corporate groups. A third phase was to design pre-
production flyable prototype versions that incorporated data
recording interfaces and separate in-flight magnetic recorders
compatible with the NADC CDC main computer. That was
done at Van Nuys for the RCA SECANT third generation.
Form factor for each transponder was a 1/3 ATR case in size
using a simultaneous 8-band SAW filter (1 MHz bandwidth
quartz substrate SAW filter for a 1 uSec received pulse

width in a "matched" filter) with an LSI digital tracking servo and threat computation. RF section was essentially frequency-hopping over a limit of 8 frequencies using PIN RF switches for speed. Environmental testing was complete and the CDC computer interface already tested in the summer of 1975, hardware was ready to fly. Higher levels in DC cancelled the third phase air testing of both RCA and M-H equipments, opting to adopt the limited-test MIT system to be compatible with existing ATC equipments. Political decision out of both corporations' hands and into old-school buddies at the Haystack.

Meanwhile, 1972 through 1974, RCA EASD worked out an accurate low-L-band RIHANS (River Inland Harbor Area Navigation System) with a +/- 3 yard accuracy anywhere below the radio horizon. That was field tested at both San Pedro harbor area of Los Angeles and along the Houston Ship Canal outside of Galveston, TX. The R&D project group deployed en masse in three groups to Galveston to field test it with USCG officers monitoring the test and following the annual NOAA survey crew at Galveston to insure accuracy from selected land points. That bracketed the Easter weekend of 1974; I was on-site there in the first group. RIHANS was a pronounced technical success even if the Galveston shipyard area presented an enormous number of multipath problems to another system.

What was not foreseen was the success of NAVSTAR which had just begun air testing on the east coast (at NADC) and its modifications into what is now GPSS. Department of Transportation cancelled the RIHANS program due to budget problems despite a ship collision that occurred in the Houston Ship Canal during the Easter holiday time (was not at all involved with the RIHANS testing). The RIHANS technical testing was a complete success. At least seven patents (assigned to RCA) resulted from both SECANT and RIHANS projects.

In late 1975 RCA Corporation was in negotiations with General Electric on the purchase of RCA by GE. RCA decided to eliminate EASD en toto, electronic warfare engineering transferred to Space Division (somewhere in New England), selling the Commercial Aviation group to Sperry, and just cancelling other groups such as Position Location Engineering (my group). Although the GE purchase negotiations dragged on for a few more years, EASD downsized over the next three years until it was eventually gone and the building complex leased to James B. Lansing Sound and a number of smaller firms. [JBL made the Cadillac of speakers and enclosures]

I can write of the preceding because it is public, unrestricted information. I cannot write of other things which are restricted or still under a Non-disclosure agreement. I was a full-time employee of RCA Corporation for 8 years beginning in late 1967 and in a position as Staff Engineer doing electronics and radio design. Contrary to Katapult Kellie's statements, I was never a "temp" or "job-shopper."

That was an interesting time to be engaged in R&D. Outside of having to do a job search afterwards, I regret not being a part of a "white paper" proposal by manager James R. Hall (still KD6JG, now retired and living in gold country of central California) for a completely solid-state commercial aircraft radar...Gunn Diode transmitter with coded pulse train having same average power but without the peak power of a magnetron, LCD display screen, SAW transversal-finger dechirper to both time-collapse the return echo into a short pulse and to near cancel interference and "rabbit spokes." The group had experience with all those subsystems but none were in the same project. No magnetron, no klystron, no CRT needed. Totally solid-state and compact, lightweight. Something similar was on the aircraft market over 20 years later.

>> Incorrect. I've claimed to be a professional, as in accepting
>> money for services rendered. I've claimed to be an electronics
>> design engineer...which I have been in several corporations and
>> continue to be.
>
> Obviously not a very competent one.

Any cursory background check of personnel departments will show continuous employment, never being fired for any alleged incompetence. Your charge is bogus.

> With good reason...You are neither very professional nor does it reflect
>anything approaching what one would expect from an "engineer".

Just how is a former short-term purchasing agent suddenly any judge of what constitutes an "engineering attitude?!?" :-)

I am a Life Member of the IEEE, a professional organization.

> Ya Putz.

That continuing ending comment from an amateur does not induce any desire to become a similar amateur. :-)

2993. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 22:53:44 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E5BF3F8.7080504@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 61981

W5TIT wrote:

>>Kim W5TIT
>>
>>
>
>
> I forgot to add my callsign phonetics for Larry:
>
> Kastrated 3 Lacks Testosterone...

Oh wow, that's hitting below the belt so to speak. LOL.

2994. Re: Petition for retail point-of-sales record keeping - transmitters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 23:03:58 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BA81608E.101EC%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 61976

"D. Stussy" wrote:
>
> On Mon, 24 Feb 2003, Dwight Stewart wrote:
>> Before we give another group authority to
>> collect even more information on us, I'd
>> rather see a few baby steps first. Such as
>> serious steps to better enforce the laws
>> already on the books and perhaps requiring
>> a license be shown when purchasing
>> equipment that requires a license to use.
>
> Just don't expect any gifts of radio equipment then.....

Since radio preference is highly subjective, I'd rather purchase the radio myself. If someone wants to give a gift, there are plenty of accessories to select from. The accessories don't require a license to use, so no license would be needed during purchase.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2995. Re: Petition for retail point-of-sales record keeping -transmitters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 23:16:25 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BA816378.101EE%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 61977

"Dan/W4NTI" wrote:

> What maintenance fee is that? It seems to me
> that once a 'special and/or vanity call' is
> issued it is then in the data base..right?
> Why the additional charges for a vanity call
> upon renewal?

I agree, Dan. I don't see an extra expense involved to "maintain" a vanity callsign above and beyond any other callsign. If there is no extra expense involved, why charge extra for it?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2996. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 23:18:55 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302251518.5ef4bc3f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61978

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E5BB451.DE623EC3@earthlink.net>...
> Len Over 21 wrote:

> > Note: I-N-A-N-E, not "inance."
> >
> > It's not a Hunnish word or name.
>
> Once is a typo, Len. If I used "inance" more than once, it could be
> considered misspelling--much like your use of "Attilla" or "auxilliary".

Simply Amazing. A lesson in typos from the guy who invented tripping
over OPs misspelled words. Thankew Dave.

2997. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 23:48:54 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302251548.16e02e8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61979

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0302250923.1cf6cdae@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0302241327.474d19a5@posting.google.com>...
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<2Xp6a.5836$hj.1655097@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> > > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > > news:f45722ac.0302231242.203ee0a9@posting.google.com...
> > > >
> > > > Many of the Extras on here, whom most of work in the field as
> > > > electronics engineers, want the rest of us to learn everything to
> > > > their level of professional detail, without getting paid a handsome
> > > > salary for the effort.
> > >
> > > That is blatantly false ...
>
> Agreed!

We'll see.

> > > I, for one, have REPEATEDLY stated
> > > that, while technical proficiency could/should be improved in our
> > > ranks, that there should NOT be anything even remotely approaching
> > > an EE level of knowledge requirement.
>
> And we have had numerous discussions here about how the written tests
> could be made better - not harder. As I recall, Carl and I agreed on
> many if not most of those issues.
>
> For the record, I passed the old Advanced and General writtens at the
> age of 14, in the summer when I was between 8th and 9th grades. Passed
> Extra written at the age of 16, in the summer when I was between 10th
> and 11th grades. Would've gotten the Extra earlier but for the
> then-required 2 year experience requirement. That was back in the bad
> old days of FCC secret tests, etc., and it was not unusual back then.
> No handsome paycheck back then, either.

Lets even that out. At 16, did you think that an Amateur Extra should
have had to know more than you knew, having just freshly passed the
exam and your head full of 1962 theory?

Do you enjoy a handsome paycheck today, courtesy of a career as an
Engineer?

> > Now Carl, is that false for every Extra on here, or just for you?
>

> False for Carl and false for me, too.

Do you now know more about electronics and radio today than you did at
age 16?

> > > > They really do want something for nothing.
> > >
> > > Also blatantly false ... all we want is to eliminate an outdated,
> > > unnecessary
> > > requirement that only serves as a barrier to entry by qualified people (the
> > > Morse proficiency requirement).
>
> That goal has already been achieved here in the USA, because there's
> no way a reasonable person could consider the current 5 wpm test as a
> "Morse proficiency requirement". That test is simply a demonstration
> of a single basic Morse skill, at an entry level.

Are you saying that the treaty has already been broken?

Are you saying that the Morse Exam presents no barrier to every
American who has ever had an interest in Amateur Radio?

> > I think you completely misread my comment.
> >
> > And I agree with eliminating outdated, unnecessary and superfluous
> > requirements.
>
> Me, too.

Yet the exams, which have more material at a complexity far greater
than the exam you took at age 16 is just not enough for you to be
satisfied with the present crop of Extras?

> > But please reflect on what some of the PCTA Extras have stated
> > regarding current theory exams.
>
> Like what?

Extra Dick refuses to administer the exams anymore, current crop of
examinees aren't worth the effort.

Extra Bruce, using himself as an example, says anyone can pass Extra
because the exam is worthless.

Extra Larry refuses to accept post restructuring Extras as anything
except floatsam.

Now Extra Jim says the current exams could be made "better."

> > As far as the code exam goes, does
> > Extra Dick want the elimination of outdated requirements? Does Extra
> > Jim want outdated requirements removed?
>
> Who is "Extra Jim"?

>
> If you mean me, then I'll say that I've always been FOR the
> elimination of outdated requirements. Like removing questions about
> the Advanced subbands from the tests, because no new ham really needs
> to know that stuff since no new Advanceds are being issued.

Then how will they ever become OO's?

And they'll wonder why Joe 2x2 can't play in the same playground.

> I also say that the code tests are not an outdated requirement. YMMV.

Vastly.

> > Nope.
>
> You are mistaken. You're repeating the old Cecil trick of assuming
> your conclusion.
>
> There was a time when an employer or educational institution
> considered the possession of a ham radio license as a significant
> qualification. I know that when I applied to EE schools in 1972 my
> Extra class license made at least some difference in getting admitted.
> (I was accepted at every school I applied to, btw). Does that same
> situation exist today? I don't know.

You must be assuming that some wouldn't, or you wouldn't have posted
it.

> None of this is meant to mean or imply anything negative about new
> hams or old ones. But the written tests can and should be made better.
> Many of us suggested ways of accomplishing this to the FCC as part of
> the 2000 restructuring.

You're the guy that wanted more license classes.

I'm the guy that asked for enforcement no matter which way it went.

2998. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-25 23:59:00 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302251559.373e5ab4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61980

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E5BB676.9C34F1CC@earthlink.net>...

Be sure to let him know that
> those sorry immigrants should get their act together and begin referring
> to themselves as "natives of the former Yugoslavia/Jugoslavia".
>
> Dave K8MN

Like the natives of the former Burma?

2999. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-26 00:10:17 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030225191017.23135.00000180@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 61982

From K4YZ:
>Orange Coast Community College in Costa Mesa, CA, and Saddleback Community
>College in Mission Viejo, CA.

I did not see it in the academic programs section. I cannot find credit for amateur radio license. You still did not prove the colleges you mentioned gives college credit for an amateur radio license. Please post a webpage link or something.

Lenover21 said:
>>A couple months later at a local luncheon, I brought up that
>> subject to two instructors at local colleges (Pierce and CSUN),
>> one a licensed amateur, the other having been one. When the
>> laughter subsided they said simply "no credit is given in
>> California colleges and universities for amateur radio activity."
Then K4YZ responded:
> NEITHER of which were the colleges mentioned... ! ! !

It does not matter if it is not the colleges mentioned. Colleges transfer credits from ACCREDITED courses. (Just read the college admission policy and you will see this statement).For example, I can transfer credits from a circuit analysis course, but not this "amateur radio license course credit".

Since those other colleges do not recognize the amateur radio license as an accredited course, an amateur radio license is not equivalent to college credit.

>BBBWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! !
>
> Now you look absolutely INFANTILE!

Seems to describe yourself. Were you looking in a mirror when you wrote this?

>Thanks for the laugh! Now you finally HAVE made yourself look COMPLETELY
>idiotic!

How about college credit for an amateur radio license? How does that look?

From "Bert Craig", wa2si

>I went to school for aeronautical engineering and for my degree project, I
>chose 'The Design and Construction of a Yagi-Uda Directional Antenna.' The
>degree project was worth two credits and was a prerequisite for graduation.
>You must chose a technical topic and submit it to the professor for approval
>before you begin work.

I agree completely with that. In fact, in a previous post I mentioned that ARRL publications have great material that would be useful in an academic class. I mentioned that if the professor included ARRL publications in the list of publications for the course, the course would have been much better. Also, I suggested a lab component to the course with practical projects, such as those in an ARRL publication.

>Now for most AROs, this is a nice and fairly quick exercise in research and
>paper preparation, which worked to my advantage since I was also working
>full-time while carrying a full semester load.

Having an amateur radio license from high school, and actually building projects during breaks, gives one a good advantage. Some projects could be used later in college course projects, with slight changes. This saves time and improves your chances for a good grade.

>So while AR may not be
>"overtly" worth college credits, it certainly supplies one with more tools
>in his/her tool box.

In one class, I used an antenna Handbook to help me with a mini project (not as big project as your project). I borrowed the handbook from a Ham at a club meeting.

3000. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-26 00:42:41 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030225194241.04508.00000086@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 61983

>Subject: Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/25/03 4:00 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030225170020.22973.00001562@mb-bd.aol.com>

>> The content of the item is accurate. You ARE "guilty" of all of the
>>points noted therein.
>
> "heah com de judge, heah com de judge..."

You do "the crime", you do the "time".

In this case the "crime" is being caught lying all the time. The "time"
is the time YOU spend trying to spin your way out of your own stupid acts.

>> As Janet Jackson beg's us to answer...."What Have You Done For
>>Me...LATELY...?!?!"
>
> Note: There is no apostrophe for possessive words.

Apostrophe or not, I see you didn't answer the question.

>> Well...what HAVE you done, LATELY, Lennie???
>
> "You don't have a need to know"

"We" already knew the answer...."NOTHING".

3001. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-26 00:47:22 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030225194722.04508.00000087@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 61984

>Subject: Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/25/03 4:00 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030225170020.22973.00001561@mb-bd.aol.com>

>>>For the "big lie technique" to be successful, you need to saturate
>>> the audience, the viewers, with the propaganda
>>
>> Well, you've certainly been trying to do that, Lennie!
>
> How?

BBBWWWWHHHAAAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA
HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! !

>> Not very successfully, though, as we won't LET you get away with it.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk, I'm still here.

It's not a matter of where you are, but where you think you are going.

>>>I just know they
>>> will all love to see your constant repetition of someone else's
>>> words.
>>
>> Hey...if it works... ! ! !
>
> Ah, but it doesn't work..

Ahhhh, but it DOES!

>>>Poor thing...you, like your buddy Sgt Putz, just LOVE the idea
>>> of being defunct, gone, dead, a relic.
>>
>> It is impossible to subscribe to "Ham Radio" magazine.
>
> It is impossible to be a marine after a discharge (medical or
> otherwise).

"Marine" s capitalized, Lennie.

And no, it's not impossible to be a Marine after one is discharged or
retired.

>> "Ham Radio" IS defunct. It's a fact.
>
> Not quite. Ham Radio Bookstore is still there, now run by

> CQ. Slightly better shipping charges from CQ than from
> ARRL at the Ham Radio Bookstore.

So how much editorial kibbutzing is required to run that "bookstore",
Putzy One?

>You are speaking Asian now, Hun.

Not to you, Babe.

3002. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-26 00:52:44 UTC
From: Jackie <buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com>
Message-ID: <wdU6a.265194$vm2.203250@rwcrnsc54>
Source record: 61985

> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20030225104504.00831.00001119@mb-fh.aol.com...
> > In article <v5j2rg137b05a1@corp.supernews.com>, "KB9TMP"
<kb9tmp@juno.com>

> > Nice try, and you have my most humble thanks. However, I fear that
> > you have wasted your valuable time. Kim and her newfound YL fellow
> > traveller Jackie

Huh? I haven't taken any trips with Kim or anyone else lately.

>aren't the least bit interested in hearing about what I'm
> > really like in person and my enthusiasm to help fellow hams explore
> > new modes. They're probably far too indoctrinated in popular Feminist
> > culture to think of me as anything other than a mean-spirited,
> misanthropic,
> > misogynist ogre who hates his fellow man, especially if they're women.

Uh, speaking of not knowing what someone is really like in person, Larry...
don't break your leg when you come back down after jumping to all those
conclusions.

I would be interested in having a QSO with you if you would show a little
class and quit coming down so hard on the newer ops. From what I've seen
here, though, you aren't a very nice person. That's the ONLY criteria on
which I could judge you by, since I don't know you personally. But your
written words are speaking volumes to me. I never said you're a
misanthropic, misogynistic ogre; you are putting words in my posts that
aren't there. I just think that here, you act like a jerk, and an arrogant
one at that. I don't think I'm wrong. Maybe you're a helluva nice guy on the
air and in RL, but seeing how you act on this newsgroup makes me hesitate to
want to know you in RL or have a QSO with you on the air. I don't suffer
arrogant people too well.

> > However, quite the opposite is true. I only want what is best for my
> > fellow man, and particularly my fellow amateur radio operators. I dare
> > say I am a bit more qualified to know what that is than they ever could.

I never asked for AR to be some touchy-feeley kumbaya thing, anyway. Why you
feel that you need to act like an arrogant know-it-all here is really still
puzzling me. You're not winning friends and influencing people. Maybe that's
just the way you want it. Suit yourself.

Jackie

3003. Re: Thanks For The Laughs, Lennie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-26 00:52:45 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030225195245.04508.00000088@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 61986

>Subject: Re: Thanks For The Laughs, Lennie
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/25/03 3:59 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030225165932.22973.00001556@mb-bd.aol.com>

>I have no idea of the personnel at Saddleback or their qualifications.
> Caller-ID does not yield a resume.

Here we go with the laundry list of excuses as to why he has no answers.

>> "Never answered"...?!?! Probably because your "letter" was NEVER sent,
>>Lennie! Can't "answer" what wasn't received, now can they?
>
> It was sent.

Uh-huh...Suuuuuuure it was, Lennie.

>> THOSE were ANSWERS...?!?!
>
> Awwww...you don't like answers?

I love answers. I am still waiting for you to provide some.

> Well, another charming inducement to enter the service of
> amateur radio...

If anything I say or do in this forum KEEPS you OUT of actual Amateur Radio, then I consider it a job-well-done. We don't need creeps like you here, Lennie.

>> NEITHER of which were the colleges mentioned... ! ! !
>
> True, both Pierce and CSUN are some distance from
> Saddleback. Perhaps you would like ARRL to make
> academic statements about entrance standards to
> California colleges and universities? If you need
> geographic location guidance, try mapquest.com

Lennie, if you had even the LITTLEST bit of REAL "evidence" that even seemingly rebutted anything I presented, then ort now, you would have been all over the NG with "Lookie what I found! Lookie what I found!".

You weren't. You never had any "conversation" about Amatur Radio licensure as elective credit with anyone, save perhaps Mrs. Lennie, and who can trust a woman who has to sleep with you?

>Keep that up and you will be fired from another hospital.

Un huh....

3004. Re: New Field Day Entry Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-26 00:54:58 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030225195458.04508.00000089@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 61987

>Subject: Re: New Field Day Entry Class
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/25/03 4:00 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030225170025.22973.00001564@mb-bd.aol.com>

>> For that you are dispicable beyond words.
>
> Note: D-E-S-P-I-C-A-B-L-E, not "dispicable."

Thanks. Still applies.

>> We ARE discussing YOU...And you ARE a PUTZ.
>
> :-)

Finding it hard to disagree, I see.

>> Ya Putz.
>
> Well, so much for amateur radio and ham comportment..

This is USENET, not Amateur Radio.

Ya PUTZ!

Steve

3005. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-26 01:04:25 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030225200425.04508.00000090@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 61988

>Subject: Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/25/03 4:00 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030225170027.22973.00001565@mb-bd.aol.com>

>> Ahem...It's a radio service that SOME people choose to pursue as a
>>hobby. THAT is a FACT substantiated by FCC policy.
>
> Not really "fact," just political phraseology common in many
> many pieces of legislation, rules, regulations in the USA.

Yes..it really is FACT. 47CFR97 refers.

>The word "service" is a regulatory term denoting a type and
> kind of radio activity all throughout Title 47 CFR. It isn't a
> military service, it is not a table service, it is not a service
> elevator or a service entrance

Yep..."type and kind of radio activity". And NO WHERE in Part 97 (or 95,
or any other Part that I am aware of...) does the FCC use the word "hobby".

>So, does the Hun think that model aircraft radio control is some
> kind of service to the aircraft industry?

No, Babe, he doesn't. But neither is Part 95 the exclusive domain of the
hobbyist.

>Okay, if it isn't an avocation or hobby, is it a regligious calling?
> You know, like a "cult?"

If you and Vippy say so. The FCC says it's a radio SERVICE.

>Is the word "fun" or "enjoyment" anywhere in Part 97? No?
> How about "recreation?" No? Does that mean no one can
> have any fun or enjoyment or recreation with ham radio?

Nope...but neither does the Tennessee Nurse Practice Act say anything
about "fun", but I have fun with my job. I also "enjoy" my job, yet the Act
doesn't say anthing about THAT, either.

Your point was...?!?!?

>Oh, by the way, is "ham" radio anywhere in Part 97?

Nope. But then I usually refer to it as AMATEUR Radio, Lennie.

Again...Your point...?!?!

>> Why don't YOU get the one you said you were going to get, and then tell
>>us, Lennie?
>
> Get what?

Uh huh...just what I thought.

>> Ya PUTZ!
>
> Calling others "dickhead" in a language not native to you does
> not absolve you, dill instructor.

Still doesn't absolve you of being one, either, Lennie, now dos it?

Ya PUTZ!

3006. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-26 01:07:51 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030225200751.23598.00000481@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 61989

In article <3E5AB4F9.2B76AC5E@att.net>, Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> In article <3E58605C.41600DD8@att.net>, Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
>writes:
>>
>> >In fact the FCC examiner who administered my Extra told me at that time
>> >that the Extra written was generally acknowledged to be a tougher test
>than
>> the
>> >First Phone - which I already had passed several years previously. And
>that
>> >examiner was the FCC's District Engineer for the Kansas City district.
>(Before
>> >some wag signs in insisting that District Engineers don't lower themselves
>to
>> >administering tests - that one did. He made a point of it. He was an Extra
>> class
>> >ham himself and an EE to boot).
>>
>> >I don't see any way that anyone could have ever made such a statement
>> >concerning the Extra class written I took in '69. There was a whole lot of
>> quite
>> >advanced and involved radio theory that demanded considerable
>> >comprehensive learning of complex material. Definitely way beyond entry
>level.
>>
>> Hmmm.. I passed the Extra in 1970 at the age of 16. Tougher than the First
>> Phone......
>>
>> Next time somebody starts waving their First Phone around...
>>
>
>Jim, whoever said that learning radio technology was/is difficult for a
>bright 16 year old?

Wasn't that tough for me, and I'm sure not the sharpest knife in the
drawer...;-)

>Sure seems to be
>more than a bit touhgh for some of the lesser denizens of RRAP, but that's
>an other matter.

I don't really know. I learned the stuff for several reasons:

1) I was interested
2) I wanted the license
3) I needed to know how to build my rigs

Once upon a time, just getting a rig on the air with a clean signal required a certain amount of techno-smarts. Hamming on a limited budget required even more know-how. Today that's not so important, because "modern" rigs don't require much (if any) tuneup. Different ball game.

Dig up an old ham mag or catalog and compare the prices of yesterday's ham gear with today's - then adjust for inflation.

>For sure the level of learning needed to actually pass the old
>First Phone tests, and there were several different tests administered, was not
>trivial nor "entry level". Just as the Extra class exams were not.

Sure. But there's no way to objectively know for sure because we don't have the old tests for comparison. And recall that the test methods have changed as well.

One thing's certain: We're not going back to the old test methods any time soon, so we have to make the best with what we have.

The big question is this: What should the written test requirements for a full-privileges amateur license be? On the one hand you have folks who want the absolute least testing possible, and on the other are folks who want something much more. All FCC really cares about is that we keep our signals clean and behave reasonably.

>> >Then we have geniuses like Slim Burke to offer up as genuine, current
>> >evidence.
>>
>> Only if you take him seriously, which many of us don't.
>
> The fella is seriously delusional.

Naw, he just likes to get folks worked up. Like Larry and Bruce and Vipul and Len.
>
>> After all, he can't or
>> won't answer these simple questions about his alleged T5 operation:
>>
>> What callsign was used?
>> What rigs and antennas were used?
>> Who did the equipment belong to?
>> What amateur bands and modes were used?
>> What countries and continents were worked?
>> How were the QSLs delivered?
>>
>> Simple, straightforward questions, but you'll not see a simple,
>> straightforward answer to any of them.

> There is one very good reason - he doesn't have rational, un-embarrassing
>answers
>to give.
>
Who knows? Maybe he and another ham used a pair of HTs, using a frequency in
the ham bands. Wouldn't that constitute amateur operation?
>
73 de Jim, N2EY

3007. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-26 01:22:11 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030225202211.04508.00000091@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 61990

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/25/03 4:00 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030225170031.22973.00001566@mb-bd.aol.com>

>You resent anyone who has radio-electronics experience and
> who disagrees with your opinions.

No, Lennie, I have a problem with people who represent themselves to be knowledgeable about something they are spouting off about, but clearly demonstrate their "knowlege" is second or third hand.

>You've not had any "conversations with folks at Johnsville"
> concerning myself and any project work there

Sure I have. I am sure you are sorry you ever mentioned it.

>Secondly, the time period was in the early 1970s and the
> military personnel at NAS Warminster (the one-runway
> airfield across the road from NADC) were USN, not USMC.

What does the Marine Corps have to do with it, Lennie?

My point-of-contact was civilian. He was a civilian when I knew him, he was a civilian for the 32 years he worked at NADC.

Sorry for you, huh?

>> "We"...?!?! More like "they"...Especially when "they" didn't renew
>>contracts or moved you elsewhere.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. Still so involved in Personality Conflicts that
> you can only see imagined fantasies generated by others?

So now yet another person who has known you personally was "fanatas(izing)"...?!?!

Why is it that everyone who knows you is wrong and you are the only one who's right?

>When the first air tests of...(SNIP)

Irrelevent historical ranting.

> Second phase of ground and air testing...(SNIP)

Still irrelevent to this forum.

>Meanwhile, 1972 through 1974...(SNIP)

Even more ranting on about completely irrelevent stuff. But I am sure it kept you busy for a while.

>What was not foreseen...(SNIP)

....was what a complete and utterly irrelevent waste of human flesh you'd become in your "retirement".

>In late 1975 RCA Corporation...(SNIP)

Whew. Can remember all this stuff but can't remember what he ranted about last week...Just before he makes yet another unsubstantiated claim that comes back to haunt him...

>I can write of the preceding because it is public, unrestricted
> information. I cannot write of other things which are restricted
> or still under a Non-disclosure agreement.

Uh huh. Of couse anyone else who cannot speak of past deeds or service are lying or are "hostile action heros" ...

Uh huh...

>Contrary to Katapult Kellie's statements, I was never a "temp" or "job-shopper."

Sure you were. Your "CV" proves it.

>That was an interesting time to be engaged in R&D.

I am sure that janitorial duties allowed you a great breadth of exposure to lot's of "R&D" stuff, Lennie. I am sure there's great satisfaction in Industrial Sanitation.

>> Obviously not a very competent one.
>
> Any cursory background check of personnel departments will
> show continuous employment, never being fired for any
> alleged incompetence. Your charge is bogus.

It wasn't a charge, Lennie. Just wondering what you did that was of any importance to anyone in here.

>> With good reason...You are neither very professional nor does it
>reflect
>>anything approaching what one would expect from an "engineer".
>
> Just how is a former short-term purchasing agent suddenly
> any judge of what constitutes an "engineering attitude?!?"

I didn't say anthing about "attitude", now did I..?!?! I SAID you don't act very professional, and NOT what I would expect from an engineer.

>I am a Life Member of the IEEE, a professional organization.

And with an appropriately funded check, you could be a "life member" of a great many other organizations. The ARRL included.

>That continuing ending comment from an amateur does not
> induce any desire to become a similar amateur.

Good!

Ya Putz.

3008. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-26 01:34:46 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030225203446.04508.00000092@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 61991

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 2/25/03 6:10 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030225191017.23135.00000180@mb-mk.aol.com>

>I did not see it in the academic programs section. I cannot find credit for
>amateur radio license. You still did not prove the colleges you mentioned
>gives
>college credit for an amateur radio license. Please post a webpage link or
>something.

Vippy, you NEED TO PAY ATTENTION!

I have CLEARLY stated on SEVERAL occcassions that this was done when I was
in California, my stay of which ended in 1992.

I have CLEARLY stated that I did not know if they still recognized the
Amateur license for such credit.

Lennie said no one ever did this. I provided him references to reputable
public educational facilities that did. I also CLEARLY stated in past posts
that I did not know if they still used the practice.

>Lenover21 said:

>>>A couple months later at a local luncheon, I brought up that
>>> subject to two instructors at local colleges (Pierce and CSUN),
>>> one a licensed amateur, the other having been one. When the
>>> laughter subsided they said simply "no credit is given in
>>> California colleges and universities for amateur radio activity."

>Then K4YZ responded:

>> NEITHER of which were the colleges mentioned... ! ! !
>
>It does not matter if it is not the colleges mentioned. Colleges transfer
>credits from ACCREDITED courses.

And at ONE TIME accepted as ELECTIVE CREDIT certain professional and other
federal licenses that demonstrated the applicant had expended SOME amount of
external learning.

>(Just read the college admission policy and
>you will see this statement).For example, I can transfer credits from a
>circuit
>analysis course, but not this "amateur radio license course credit".

Who said anything about TRANSFER of CREDIT, Vippy?

>Since those other colleges do not recognize the amateur radio license as an
>accredited course, an amateur radio license is not equivalent to college
>credit.

Go back and re-read what has been said here, Vippy, and in my previous
posts. But before you do, you might want to take a towel and wipe that
excrement from your eyes from having had your head so far up
your...uhhhh...well, you know where.

>> Now you look absolutely INFANTILE!
>
>Seems to describe yourself. Were you looking in a mirror when you wrote this?

Nope, Just Lennie's shameful attempt to excuse himself from yet another
newsgroup faux pas, and now your obviously errant "comment" on it.

>How about college credit for an amateur radio license? How does that look?

Pretty good. I am sorry I didn't finish up at SBCC, then I'd have a
transcript documenting the elective credit.

Now...aren't you getting tired of making a fool of yourself, Vipul...?!?!

Steve

3009. Re: Minimum Age Requirements for US Radio Amateurs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-26 02:20:21 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302251820.79bcdc6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 61992

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E5BBFA8.63BC9875@earthlink.net>...

>
> > Why is it then that you had no idea of what the U.S. Department of State
> > was doing on the African continent?
> >

Cool sentence structure.

3010. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-26 03:06:15 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030225220615.12173.00000680@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 61993

In article <f45722ac.0302251548.16e02e8@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<c2356669.0302250923.1cf6cdae@posting.google.com>...
>> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
>news:<f45722ac.0302241327.474d19a5@posting.google.com>...
>> > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
>news:<2Xp6a.5836$hj.1655097@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
>> > > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
>> > > news:f45722ac.0302231242.203ee0a9@posting.google.com...
>> > > >
>> > > > Many of the Extras on here, whom most of work in the field as
>> > > > electronics engineers, want the rest of us to learn everything to
>> > > > their level of professional detail, without getting paid a handsome
>> > > > salary for the effort.
>> > >
>> > > That is blatantly false ...
>>
>> Agreed!
>
>We'll see.
>
>> > > I, for one, have REPEATEDLY stated
>> > > that, while technical proficiency could/should be improved in our
>> > > ranks, that there should NOT be anything even remotely approaching
>> > > an EE level of knowledge requirement.
>>
>> And we have had numerous discussions here about how the written tests
>> could be made better - not harder. As I recall, Carl and I agreed on
>> many if not most of those issues.
>>
>> For the record, I passed the old Advanced and General writtens at the
>> age of 14, in the summer when I was between 8th and 9th grades. Passed
>> Extra written at the age of 16, in the summer when I was between 10th
>> and 11th grades. Would've gotten the Extra earlier but for the
>> then-required 2 year experience requirement. That was back in the bad
>> old days of FCC secret tests, etc., and it was not unusual back then.
>> No handsome paycheck back then, either.
>
>Lets even that out.

You can't. Different ball game today.

>At 16, did you think that an Amateur Extra should
>have had to know more than you knew,

Actually, yes. I was surprised that it wasn't harder. I passed it first time,
too.

>having just freshly passed the
>exam and your head full of 1962 theory?

1962 theory? You're quite mistaken. I took the test in 1970, not 1962. 1970
Extra was not the same test as the 1962 Extra.

>Do you enjoy a handsome paycheck today, courtesy of a career as an
>Engineer?

Quite handsome, thank you. Remember that somewhere in the intervening years I
went to EE school and got some degrees.
>
>> > Now Carl, is that false for every Extra on here, or just for you?
>>
>> False for Carl and false for me, too.
>
>Do you now know more about electronics and radio today than you did at
>age 16?

Sure. But even back then I knew enough to design and build amateur equipment
that worked and put out a clean signal.

However, the main point was that even the old FCC-administered tests weren't
all that tough. Not if I could pass them! ;-)

>> > > > They really do want something for nothing.
>> > >
>> > > Also blatantly false ... all we want is to eliminate an outdated,
>> > > unnecessary
>> > > requirement that only serves as a barrier to entry by qualified people
>(the
>> > > Morse proficiency requirement).
>>
>> That goal has already been achieved here in the USA, because there's
>> no way a reasonable person could consider the current 5 wpm test as a
>> "Morse proficiency requirement". That test is simply a demonstration
>> of a single basic Morse skill, at an entry level.
>
>Are you saying that the treaty has already been broken?

No. The treaty does not require "proficiency", does it?

Do you consider 5 wpm as being "proficient" at Morse code?
>
>Are you saying that the Morse Exam presents no barrier to every
>American who has ever had an interest in Amateur Radio?

No.

"Barrier"?

I'm sure there are some individuals who simply can't learn 5 wpm code. I'm also sure there are some who can't learn the material on the writtens, too.
>
>> > I think you completely misread my comment.
>> >
>> > And I agree with eliminating outdated, unnecessary and superfluous
>> > requirements.
>>
>> Me, too.
>
>Yet the exams, which have more material at a complexity far greater
>than the exam you took at age 16 is just not enough for you to be
>satisfied with the present crop of Extras?

Whoa there! You're presuming the conclusion again!

"more material at a complexity far greater than the exam you took at age 16"? Do you have the old 1970 exams for comparison? I don't think so.

The 1970 exams covered some of the same material as today's exams and some DIFFERENT material. More important, in those days we did not have the exact Q&A to study from, nor any clear idea what the test questions would be like other than that they would be multiple choice.

Shall I repost some of the study guide questions from the old License Manual? They were in essay format, even though the exams were multiple choice.

>> > But please reflect on what some of the PCTA Extras have stated
>> > regarding current theory exams.
>>
>> Like what?
>
>Extra Dick refuses to administer the exams anymore, current crop of
>examinees aren't worth the effort.

I'm not him. Have YOU ever volunteered your time and effort as a VE?
>
>Extra Bruce, using himself as an example, says anyone can pass Extra
>because the exam is worthless.

So? Is he not entitled to an opinion, however strange? He did pass the test, according to the database. I'm not him, btw.
>
>Extra Larry refuses to accept post restructuring Extras as anything
>except floatsam.

It's "flotsam". Is he not entitled to his opinion? I'm not him, btw.
>
>Now Extra Jim says the current exams could be made "better."

Been saying it for years. So has Extra Carl. I note that you don't take him to task for his opinions.

>
>> > As far as the code exam goes, does
>> > Extra Dick want the elimination of outdated requirements? Does Extra
>> > Jim want outdated requirements removed?
>>
>> Who is "Extra Jim"?
>>
>> If you mean me, then I'll say that I've always been FOR the
>> elimination of outdated requirements. Like removing questions about
>> the Advanced subbands from the tests, because no new ham really needs
>> to know that stuff since no new Advanceds are being issued.
>
>Then how will they ever become OO's?

Study the rules. OO qualification goes beyond what's on the tests.
>
>And they'll wonder why Joe 2x2 can't play in the same playground.

Only if they're Extras.
>
>> I also say that the code tests are not an outdated requirement. YMMV.
>
>Vastly.

Well, there you have it.
>
>> > Nope.
>>
>> You are mistaken. You're repeating the old Cecil trick of assuming
>> your conclusion.
>>
>> There was a time when an employer or educational institution
>> considered the possession of a ham radio license as a significant
>> qualification. I know that when I applied to EE schools in 1972 my
>> Extra class license made at least some difference in getting admitted.
>> (I was accepted at every school I applied to, btw). Does that same
>> situation exist today? I don't know.
>
>You must be assuming that some wouldn't, or you wouldn't have posted
>it.

No, I'm simply recalling how things were 31 years ago and wondering if they're
the same now.
>
>> None of this is meant to mean or imply anything negative about new
>> hams or old ones. But the written tests can and should be made better.
>> Many of us suggested ways of accomplishing this to the FCC as part of
>> the 2000 restructuring.
>
>You're the guy that wanted more license classes.

Where?

In discussions here with gentlemen like Jim Rosenthal, WA4STJ and Dick Plourde, several ideas of alternative license structures were developed. I still like the "Chinese menu" idea.

But the NPRM clearly showed that FCC wanted less complexity, not more, so I supported four license classes (same as FCC proposed) and some other changes. Like better test methods. Am I not entitled to my opinion?

>I'm the guy that asked for enforcement no matter which way it went.

Lots of us asked for enforcement. Enforcement is a good thing. But it won't make hams any more technically knowledgeable.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3011. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-26 03:52:58 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030225225258.00111.00002349@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 61994

In article <f45722ac.0302251212.37da315b@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

> Therefore, hardly any knowledge required for
>> licensing in the past can be considered an "outdated requirement."
>> And, IMHO, the only motivation for arguing against this premise would
>> be laziness.
>
>Larry, you've been saying that for years, but the government is about
>to say otherwise.
>
>73, Brian
>

Brian:

The only reason why "the government" got involved in reducing and/or
eliminating the code testing response to the lazy whiners nagging them
to do so. If there had not been a controversy over code testing, then
that requirement would likely never have been considered for reduction
or elimination. Action causes reaction.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3012. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-26 03:52:58 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030225225258.00111.00002350@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 61995

In article <3E5BF3F8.7080504@mailcity.moc>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
writes:

>>>Kim W5TIT
>>>
>>>
>>
>>
>> I forgot to add my callsign phonetics for Larry:
>>
>> Kastrated 3 Lacks Testosterone...
>
>Oh wow, that's hitting below the belt so to speak. LOL.

That would be so only if it were true. Actually, it's just another
indication of the crude, simple workings of W5TIT's mind!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3013. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-26 03:53:00 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030225225300.00111.00002351@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 61996

In article <wdU6a.265194$vm2.203250@rwcrnsc54>, "Jackie"
<buzzygirl@REMOVETHIS.attbi.com> writes:

>> > Nice try, and you have my most humble thanks. However, I fear that
>> > you have wasted your valuable time. Kim and her newfound YL fellow
>> > traveller Jackie
>
>Huh? I haven't taken any trips with Kim or anyone else lately.

Jackie:

Groan! You're not going to tell me you actually don't understand my use
of the term "fellow traveler" in the given context?

>>aren't the least bit interested in hearing about what I'm
>> > really like in person and my enthusiasm to help fellow hams explore
>> > new modes. They're probably far too indoctrinated in popular Feminist
>> > culture to think of me as anything other than a mean-spirited,
>> misanthropic,
>> > misogynist ogre who hates his fellow man, especially if they're women.
>
>Uh, speaking of not knowing what someone is really like in person, Larry...
>don't break your leg when you come back down after jumping to all those
>conclusions.

I'm confident that my "conclusion" is quite accurate, but thank you for your
concern with my well-being!

>I would be interested in having a QSO with you if you would show a little
>class and quit coming down so hard on the newer ops.

I don't "come down hard" on newer ops, Jackie. I just "come down hard"
on participants in this NEWSGROUP who propone that they are "equal"
as General- or Extra-class hams having been licensed/upgraded under the
present, significantly reduced licensing standards. The truth is that they
are definitely NOT equal to their fellow hams who were licensed/upgraded
in the Pre-Restructuring Era.

>From what I've seen
>here, though, you aren't a very nice person. That's the ONLY criteria on
>which I could judge you by, since I don't know you personally. But your
>written words are speaking volumes to me.

Jackie, it is impossible for you to know me based on what I write here.
This is a Usenet newsgroup, and newsgroups are well-known to NOT
accurately reflect Real Life. I do take ownership for everything I say in
here, but my words don't necessarily reflect my personal, one-on-one

relationships with real people in the real world. Having said that, I will admit that I am not given to "suffering fools gladly" in real life, and have been quite consistent in my behaviour toward people who place political correctness above reasonable, rational thought and action.

>I never said you're a
>misanthropic, misogynistic ogre; you are putting words in my posts that
>aren't there. I just think that here, you act like a jerk, and an arrogant
>one at that. I don't think I'm wrong.

Well, thank you very much. Contrary to your own standard, you have just judged me quite harshly indeed without really knowing me!

>Maybe you're a helluva nice guy on the
>air and in RL, but seeing how you act on this newsgroup makes me hesitate to
>want to know you in RL or have a QSO with you on the air. I don't suffer
>arrogant people too well.

Apparently there's quite a bit of slop in your definition of "arrogance." You obviously don't think it is "arrogant" for newcomer hams to demand to be treated as "equals" when they have achieved Extra-Lite status.

>> > However, quite the opposite is true. I only want what is best for my
>> > fellow man, and particularly my fellow amateur radio operators. I dare
>> > say I am a bit more qualified to know what that is than they ever could.
>
>I never asked for AR to be some touchy-feeley kumbaya thing, anyway. Why you
>feel that you need to act like an arrogant know-it-all here is really still
>puzzling me.

Well, Jackie, if you had been participating in this newsgroup and it's antecedent
Fidonet forums for, oh, say, about the last 12 years or so, you'd most likely be
a lot less puzzled! You see, in this newsgroup, I *AM* an arrogant know-it-all,
and so is everyone else! The problem is, they won't admit it; I just did!

>You're not winning friends and influencing people. Maybe that's
>just the way you want it. Suit yourself.

All of my friends, and those I have influenced, would tend to disagree with you!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3014. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-26 04:06:12 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030225230612.23135.00000183@mb-mk.aol.com>
Source record: 61997

From K4YZ:
> I have CLEARLY stated on SEVERAL occcassions that this was done when I
>was
>in California, my stay of which ended in 1992.

At first you did not state this, and after responding to my post you stated
this.

> I have CLEARLY stated that I did not know if they still recognized the
>Amateur license for such credit.

Most likely no accredited college today accepts an amateur radio license for
college credit.

>And at ONE TIME accepted as ELECTIVE CREDIT certain professional and other
>federal licenses that demonstrated the applicant had expended SOME amount of
>external learning.

The colleges you mentioned (from 1991) were less rigorous <,community>
colleges. One can pass the test within a week. No college should give credit
for the amateur radio license.

> Who said anything about TRANSFER of CREDIT, Vippy?

First, Len said no California college accepts amateur radio license for credit.
Then, you mentioned that the colleges he mentioned were not the ones you
mentioned.
Then, I said since those other colleges won't TRANSFER the credits, the
amateur radio license could not be used to obtain college credit.

Its important to note that if a college won't transfer that course for credits,
they do not recognize the course as valid course credit. The admissions policy
says nothing about elective credits. These usually ARE transferrable for
credit. (I may have to re-read the policy. I am not really sure about whether
elective credits are transferrable). Therefore, an amateur radio license does
not qualify as college credit. Now, do you understand?

> Go back and re-read what has been said here, Vippy, and in my previous
>posts. But before you do, you might want to take a towel and wipe that
>excrement from your eyes from having had your head so far up
>your...uhhhh...well, you know where.

It should be possible to respond without this type of comment.

>>How about college credit for an amateur radio license? How does that look?
>
> Pretty good. I am sorry I didn't finish up at SBCC, then I'd have a
>transcript documenting the elective credit.

Just because they did it does not make it right. Even that they recognized the amateur radio license for credit is in doubt.

> Now...aren't you getting tired of making a fool of yourself,
>Vipul...?!?!

You were the one who said an amateur radio license could qualify for college credit.

3015. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-26 04:46:53 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E5C46A5.94EF97F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61998

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3E5B0F57.1276FE6A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >I plan to repeat it often, Len. Your responses here are filled with
> >insults, ridicule, factual errors. The excessive use of emoticons is in
> >evidence and so is your generally infantile bahavior. The ethnic slurs
> >showed up right on time. It would be hard to improve upon Jim's quote.
> >It describes you quite accurately.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. Repeat it and repeat it and repeat it as long as
> you like. It will soothe your terribly-injured ego, won't it?
>
> You are no longer arguing anything about amateur radio or even
> any part of radio or communications. It is all involved about
> personal pride and a thirst for vengence and retribution at any
> cost.
>
> <shrug>

Len:

I plan to repeat it every time you resort to doing the things that the quote says you do. When you do those things, you yourself are not arguing anything about amateur radio. I don't wonder that N2EY chooses not to tell you where he works. You appear pretty interested in finding out. We've already seen what happens when you find out something about another's job or former job or his military or government service.

If it pleases you to pretend to be an injured party in this, I really don't mind. You can go on writing something about the "big lie" but your own words betray you.

You are to amateur radio what a bullfrog is to a game of Nine Ball.

Dave K8MN

3016. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-26 05:00:55 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E5C4A56.9C36C550@earthlink.net>
Source record: 61999

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5BB676.9C34F1CC@earthlink.net>...
>
> Be sure to let him know that
> > those sorry immigrants should get their act together and begin referring
> > to themselves as "natives of the former Yugoslavia/Jugoslavia".
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Like the natives of the former Burma?

No, I don't think that natives of the former Burma would put up with
having to call themselves "natives of the former Yugoslavia/Jugoslavia
but you really should take it up with Len. He's worried that some guy
can't consider himself Yugoslavian because there is no more Yugoslavia.

My mother-in-law was born in a Finnish town which is now part of
Russia. I guess she should start telling people that she's Russian.

Dave K8MN

3017. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-26 05:06:55 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E5C4BBD.A84F7ED5@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62000

Vshah101 wrote:

> It does not matter if it is not the colleges mentioned. Colleges transfer
> credits from ACCREDITED courses. (Just read the college admission policy and
> you will see this statement).For example, I can transfer credits from a circuit
> analysis course, but not this "amateur radio license course credit".
>
> Since those other colleges do not recognize the amateur radio license as an
> accredited course, an amateur radio license is not equivalent to college
> credit.
>

Quite a number of colleges and universities extend academic credit for
life experiences.

One U.S. Department of State course I took in radio, used the complete
Heath General Class amateur license course as part of the study
material. That State Department course is accepted for college credit.

Dave K8MN

3018. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-26 06:15:31 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E5C5B6E.29EE1EF6@att.net>
Source record: 62101

Floyd Davidson wrote:

> >
> >Extra Dick welcomes another new ham aboard.
>
> Or at least he _thought_ it was a new ham. But he blew that one
> in every way possible.
>

Just took you at your word, Floyd. We had no way of knowing it was no goode.

3019. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-26 06:32:39 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E5C5F70.A946C277@att.net>
Source record: 62102

> In article <f45722ac.0302251548.16e02e8@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>
> >Extra Dick refuses to administer the exams anymore, current crop of
> >examinees aren't worth the effort.
>

So you still lay claim to NOT being a liar? LIAR!!!

The challenge is crystal clear- Google up the post where I ever said anything like that.
It's the TESTS that aren't worth the effort.

3020. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-26 07:31:12 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@ptialaska.net>
Message-ID: <87y943jy67.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 62103

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote:
>Floyd Davidson wrote:
>> >
>> >Extra Dick welcomes another new ham aboard.
>>
>> Or at least he _thought_ it was a new ham. But he blew that one
>> in every way possible.
>>
>
> Just took you at your word, Floyd. We had no way of knowing it was no goode.

You imagined what you wanted to Dick. I said I'd been licensed
for awhile. You are the one who assumed it was a short while...

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://www.ptialaska.net/~floyd>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

3021. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-26 11:23:42 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302260323.74d55ec1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62104

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message news:<3E5C5F70.A946C277@att.net>...
> > In article <f45722ac.0302251548.16e02e8@posting.google.com>,
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >
> > >Extra Dick refuses to administer the exams anymore, current crop of
> > >examinees aren't worth the effort.
> >
>
> So you still lay claim to NOT being a liar? LIAR!!!
>
> The challenge is crystal clear- Google up the post where I ever said anything like
> that.
> It's the TESTS that aren't worth the effort.

Dick, while its important to make instant counter-accusations, you
have left this one alone.

You were complaining about the -people- who took the exams more than
once, i.e., multiple times.

Why?

Did they take the exam more than once because it was easy?

...because it was difficult?

...because the exams weren't worth the effort?

Good luck.

3022. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-26 12:43:07 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302260443.d415dba@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62105

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E5C4BBD.A84F7ED5@earthlink.net>...
> Vshah101 wrote:
>
>
> > It does not matter if it is not the colleges mentioned. Colleges transfer
> > credits from ACCREDITED courses. (Just read the college admission policy and
> > you will see this statement).For example, I can transfer credits from a circuit
> > analysis course, but not this "amateur radio license course credit".
> >
> > Since those other colleges do not recognize the amateur radio license as an
> > accredited course, an amateur radio license is not equivalent to college
> > credit.
> >
>
> Quite a number of colleges and universities extend academic credit for
> life experiences.
>
> One U.S. Department of State course I took in radio, used the complete
> Heath General Class amateur license course as part of the study
> material. That State Department course is accepted for college credit.
>
> Dave K8MN

It make you wonder how many of those Heath Housewife Kit Testers now
have engineering degrees.

3023. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-26 12:47:23 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302260447.7c440a5a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62106

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E5C4A56.9C36C550@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5BB676.9C34F1CC@earthlink.net>...
> >
> > Be sure to let him know that
> > > those sorry immigrants should get their act together and begin referring
> > > to themselves as "natives of the former Yugoslavia/Jugoslavia".
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > Like the natives of the former Burma?
>
> No, I don't think that natives of the former Burma would put up with
> having to call themselves "natives of the former Yugoslavia/Jugoslavia

Why would they do that? I would imagine that they would refer to
themselves by whatever new name they came up with. Otherwise, why
rename their country?

> but you really should take it up with Len. He's worried that some guy
> can't consider himself Yugoslavian because there is no more Yugoslavia.
>
> My mother-in-law was born in a Finnish town which is now part of
> Russia. I guess she should start telling people that she's Russian.

Depends. Was she still living there when it became Russia?

3024. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-26 12:49:14 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302260449.23b41341@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62107

Floyd Davidson <floyd@ptialaska.net> wrote in message news:<87y943jy67.fld@barrow.com>...
> Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote:
> >Floyd Davidson wrote:
> >> >
> >> >Extra Dick welcomes another new ham aboard.
> >>
> >> Or at least he _thought_ it was a new ham. But he blew that one
> >> in every way possible.
> >>
> > > Just took you at your word, Floyd. We had no way of knowing it was no goode.
>
> You imagined what you wanted to Dick. I said I'd been licensed
> for awhile. You are the one who assumed it was a short while...

Floyd, Extra Dick, actually, I'm the one who said "new." I should
have said "new to the group." Sorry for the confusion.

Brian

3025. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-26 13:03:56 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@ptialaska.net>
Message-ID: <87n0kj5h37.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 62109

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:
>Floyd Davidson <floyd@ptialaska.net> wrote in message news:<87y943jy67.fld@barrow.com>...
>> Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote:
>> >Floyd Davidson wrote:
>> >> >
>> >> >Extra Dick welcomes another new ham aboard.
>> >>
>> >> Or at least he _thought_ it was a new ham. But he blew that one
>> >> in every way possible.
>> >>
>> >
>> > Just took you at your word, Floyd. We had no way of knowing it was no goode.
>>
>> You imagined what you wanted to Dick. I said I'd been licensed
>> for awhile. You are the one who assumed it was a short while...
>
>Floyd, Extra Dick, actually, I'm the one who said "new." I should
>have said "new to the group." Sorry for the confusion.

Clearly though, from his other posts, poor Dick thought I was
new at amateur radio. He got trolled by an old pro. When he
couldn't counter the logic, he resorted to "you're a newbie".

Shame on Dick. Even Larry had the smarts to stay clear... :-)

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://www.ptialaska.net/~floyd>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

3026. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-26 13:22:13 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030226082213.27873.00000795@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 62108

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.has81l3.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 23 Feb 2003 18:21:57 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
>>I went on to EE school at age 18, and discovered that amateur radio
>>background was a big help in EE. But it was only a beginning - there
>>was a lot more to learn, of course. Radio is but a small part of
>>electrical engineering.
>
> I found the same thing - I got my first ham and commercial licebnses
> a year before I entered engineering school and I founf that I could
> "ace" the electronics courses and be a mentor to some of my classmates
> very easily, but the "power" courses - generation, transmission,
> distribution, and machine design and application - were the ones
> that I had to put some work into.

I found something similar. I was stronger on practice than pure theory. EE school fixed that.

A story from EE school:

In electronic circuits class, we had Prof. K, who closely resembled Wally Cox. Excellent teacher, really knowledgeable and practical.

In those days the circuit modeling by computer simulation was a hot subject, and we had access to SPICE and other modeling methods. Yet we were still required to learn all the classic circuit analysis methods. Some students (not me!) thought this was dumb - why learn to do the analysis by hand when a machine could do it faster, better and easier?

He also had us analyze all kinds of seemingly-odd circuits, many of which I recognized but which were a mystery to others. Some students (again, not me!) grumbled that we were learning stuff we'd never use. Prof. K explained that what we needed to learn was the methods of circuit analysis to the point where we could analyze anything, not just the common or obvious circuits.

One day Prof. K draws a resistance-coupled JFET amplifier on the board, asks what it will do. Everybody says "amplify the input signal". "Correct", says Prof. K.

Then he redraws it to use tuned LC input and output circuits, both tuned to "about the same frequency". Again he asks what it will do. Everybody but me says "amplify the input signal if it is near the tuned circuit frequency". I say "it may amplify, but it will probably oscillate". Rest of class thinks I'm nuts. Prof. K looks at me, smiles, says "You're a ham radio operator, aren't you?" "Ummm...yes"

He went on to explain to the class that if the tuned circuit values were correct and the internal capacitances of the FET were adequate, the circuit would indeed oscillate. 'You have to use the right model" he said "the simplified model that ignored Cgd is not adequate for this analysis".

Nobody ever forgot his practical examples.

Then there was the time I 'taught' a 400 level lab session in rotating machines while in second year (none of those guys had ever seen or heard of a "two-bulb synchronizer"). And Prof. W's power class and the incredible transmission line....

> Forty plus years later, not working in design in either field, I
> remember the "power engineering" stuff very well - it helps that my
> wife is a pro in the power utility engineering field and talks about
> her work quite often to keep me current. I've had continuing "hands
> on" professional experience in modern wire and radio communications
> which keeps me current in the "electronics" part of electrical
> engineering.

COOL!!
>
> But the secret is the -interest- that I have in the field, whether
> I'm paid for it or not.
>
Same here!

> Retired and loving every minute of it....

Someday...

> Work was getting in the way of my hobbies

Speaking of which...gotta go!

73 de Jim, N2EY

3027. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-26 14:11:59 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302260611.5cba2c07@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62110

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message news:<20030225220615.12173.00000680@mb-mr.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0302251548.16e02e8@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
> >news:<c2356669.0302250923.1cf6cdae@posting.google.com>...
> >> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
> news:<f45722ac.0302241327.474d19a5@posting.google.com>...
> >> > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> news:<2Xp6a.5836$hj.1655097@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> >> > > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> >> > > news:f45722ac.0302231242.203ee0a9@posting.google.com...
> >> > > >
> >> > > > Many of the Extras on here, whom most of work in the field as
> >> > > > electronics engineers, want the rest of us to learn everything to
> >> > > > their level of professional detail, without getting paid a handsome
> >> > > > salary for the effort.
> >> > >
> >> > > That is blatantly false ...
> >>
> >> Agreed!
> >
> >We'll see.
> >
> >> > > I, for one, have REPEATEDLY stated
> >> > > that, while technical proficiency could/should be improved in our
> >> > > ranks, that there should NOT be anything even remotely approaching
> >> > > an EE level of knowledge requirement.
> >>
> >> And we have had numerous discussions here about how the written tests
> >> could be made better - not harder. As I recall, Carl and I agreed on
> >> many if not most of those issues.
> >>
> >> For the record, I passed the old Advanced and General writtens at the
> >> age of 14, in the summer when I was between 8th and 9th grades. Passed
> >> Extra written at the age of 16, in the summer when I was between 10th
> >> and 11th grades. Would've gotten the Extra earlier but for the
> >> then-required 2 year experience requirement. That was back in the bad
> >> old days of FCC secret tests, etc., and it was not unusual back then.
> >> No handsome paycheck back then, either.
> >
> >Lets even that out.
>
> You can't. Different ball game today.

I was speaking of amateur radio.
>
> >At 16, did you think that an Amateur Extra should
> >have had to know more than you knew,
>
> Actually, yes. I was surprised that it wasn't harder. I passed it first time,
> too.

You would have been happier had you failed?

Did you think the General and Advanced exams, which you took at age
14, were lacking also?

Then at age 16 you began scheming to change amateur radio because you
knew more than the engineers creating the question pools?

Too much James Dean? Rebel with a cause?

> >having just freshly passed the
> >exam and your head full of 1962 theory?
>
> 1962 theory? You're quite mistaken. I took the test in 1970, not 1962. 1970
> Extra was not the same test as the 1962 Extra.

True, vastly, vastly different. You saw the introduction of
transistors to the QP.

> >Do you enjoy a handsome paycheck today, courtesy of a career as an
> >Engineer?
>
> Quite handsome, thank you. Remember that somewhere in the intervening years I
> went to EE school and got some degrees.

Did you learning anything more along the way?

> >> > Now Carl, is that false for every Extra on here, or just for you?
> >>
> >> False for Carl and false for me, too.
> >
> >Do you now know more about electronics and radio today than you did at
> >age 16?
>
> Sure. But even back then I knew enough to design and build amateur equipment
> that worked and put out a clean signal.

You are an exceptional individual.

> However, the main point was that even the old FCC-administered tests weren't
> all that tough. Not if I could pass them! ;-)

Well, I don't know about that. Engineering and building radios that
put out clean signals at age 16? Questioning the FCC about how lax
the Extra exam was?

I think you're being modest.

> >> > > > They really do want something for nothing.
> >> > >
> >> > > Also blatantly false ... all we want is to eliminate an outdated,
> >> > > unnecessary
> >> > > requirement that only serves as a barrier to entry by qualified people
> (the
> >> > > Morse proficiency requirement).
> >>
> >> That goal has already been achieved here in the USA, because there's
> >> no way a reasonable person could consider the current 5 wpm test as a
> >> "Morse proficiency requirement". That test is simply a demonstration
> >> of a single basic Morse skill, at an entry level.
> >
> >Are you saying that the treaty has already been broken?
>
> No. The treaty does not require "proficiency", does it?
>
> Do you consider 5 wpm as being "proficient" at Morse code?

Can legitimate communication take place at 5wpm?

> >Are you saying that the Morse Exam presents no barrier to every
> >American who has ever had an interest in Amateur Radio?
>
> No.

Are you sure?

> "Barrier"?
>
> I'm sure there are some individuals who simply can't learn 5 wpm code. I'm also
> sure there are some who can't learn the material on the writtens, too.

Which is relavent?

> >> > I think you completely misread my comment.
> >> >
> >> > And I agree with eliminating outdated, unnecessary and superfluous
> >> > requirements.
> >>
> >> Me, too.
> >
> >Yet the exams, which have more material at a complexity far greater
> >than the exam you took at age 16 is just not enough for you to be
> >satisfied with the present crop of Extras?
>
> Whoa there! You're presuming the conclusion again!

Which? Greater/more complex? Dissatisfaction with new Extras?

> "more material at a complexity far greater than the exam you took at age 16"?
> Do you have the old 1970 exams for comparison? I don't think so.

I know that there are electronic devices, signal processing, and modes
available today than there were when your QP was developed. Though
there were RF hazards back then, today they are being tested on
environmental assessments.

> The 1970 exams covered some of the same material as today's exams and some
> DIFFERENT material. More important, in those days we did not have the exact Q&A
> to study from,

Granted. Have you tried chaning that?

nor any clear idea what the test questions would be like other
> than that they would be multiple choice.

No clear idea? Cecil says otherwise. The ARRL, AMECO, and Bash were
publishing something in 1968-1970 time frame. I wonder what it could
have been.

Did you have either publication?

> Shall I repost some of the study guide questions from the old License Manual?
> They were in essay format, even though the exams were multiple choice.

Study guides? You used study guides?

> >> > But please reflect on what some of the PCTA Extras have stated
> >> > regarding current theory exams.
> >>
> >> Like what?

Remember, you asked.

> >Extra Dick refuses to administer the exams anymore, current crop of
> >examinees aren't worth the effort.
>
> I'm not him.

Remember, you asked. And he is an Extra, he does post here, and he
has had a career in electronics.

> Have YOU ever volunteered your time and effort as a VE?

FCC regulations prohibited Technicians from the VE system. I did
teach, with several other volunteers, two Technician classes.

> >Extra Bruce, using himself as an example, says anyone can pass Extra
> >because the exam is worthless.
>
> So?

Remember, you asked.

> Is he not entitled to an opinion, however strange?

However strange. But he is an Extra, he does post here, and his
career is electronics, though I don't know how handsomely he could be
paid at that literacy level.

He did pass the test,
> according to the database. I'm not him, btw.

Easy to tell - you're literate.

> >Extra Larry refuses to accept post restructuring Extras as anything
> >except floatsam.
>
> It's "flotsam".

Yes it is. And congrats on not tripping over my mispelled word and
not getting up.

> Is he not entitled to his opinion? I'm not him, btw.

Remember, you asked. And Larry is an Extra, posts here, but is not an
electronics careerist.

> >Now Extra Jim says the current exams could be made "better."
>
> Been saying it for years.

Ever since 1970, no doubt.

> So has Extra Carl. I note that you don't take him to
> task for his opinions.

I've said it too. Why should I take him to task?

> >> > As far as the code exam goes, does
> >> > Extra Dick want the elimination of outdated requirements? Does Extra
> >> > Jim want outdated requirements removed?
> >>
> >> Who is "Extra Jim"?
> >>
> >> If you mean me, then I'll say that I've always been FOR the
> >> elimination of outdated requirements. Like removing questions about
> >> the Advanced subbands from the tests, because no new ham really needs
> >> to know that stuff since no new Advanceds are being issued.
> >
> >Then how will they ever become OO's?
>
> Study the rules. OO qualification goes beyond what's on the tests.

True.

> >And they'll wonder why Joe 2x2 can't play in the same playground.
>
> Only if they're Extras.

Only if one is an Extra, and the other is an Advanced. But that was
the context.

> >> I also say that the code tests are not an outdated requirement. YMMV.
> >
> >Vastly.

>
> Well, there you have it.

Yes, there you have it. But we were talking WRITTEN exams. Unless
copying code is considered a written exam.

> >> > Nope.
> >>
> >> You are mistaken. You're repeating the old Cecil trick of assuming
> >> your conclusion.
> >>
> >> There was a time when an employer or educational institution
> >> considered the possession of a ham radio license as a significant
> >> qualification. I know that when I applied to EE schools in 1972 my
> >> Extra class license made at least some difference in getting admitted.
> >> (I was accepted at every school I applied to, btw). Does that same
> >> situation exist today? I don't know.
> >
> >You must be assuming that some wouldn't, or you wouldn't have posted
> >it.
>
> No, I'm simply recalling how things were 31 years ago and wondering if they're
> the same now.

Find out. Reapply under an assumed name.

> >> None of this is meant to mean or imply anything negative about new
> >> hams or old ones. But the written tests can and should be made better.
> >> Many of us suggested ways of accomplishing this to the FCC as part of
> >> the 2000 restructuring.
> >
> >You're the guy that wanted more license classes.
>
> Where?

Have we been secretly meeting somewhere else?

> In discussions here with gentlemen like Jim Rosenthal, WA4STJ and Dick Plourde,
> several ideas of alternative license structures were developed. I still like
> the "Chinese menu" idea.

Yes, yes. You liked more license clases, not fewer.

> But the NPRM clearly showed that FCC wanted less complexity, not more, so I
> supported four license classes (same as FCC proposed) and some other changes.
> Like better test methods. Am I not entitled to my opinion?

But you have a history of being dissatisfied with how the FCC does
things, ever since at least age 16/1970, and perhaps as early as age
14/1968. So in 1999 you supported the FCC's plan?

And I thought the FCC plan went to three license classes, not four.
The ARRL had a four class structure, as I recall.

I hope you're not another one of those Extras that confuses the ARRL
and FCC.

> >I'm the guy that asked for enforcement no matter which way it went.
>
> Lots of us asked for enforcement. Enforcement is a good thing. But it won't
> make hams any more technically knowledgeable.

Not even if they want to stay out of trouble? There's a Q over on
rra.antenna about the bandwidth of a SSB signal, and if it is an out
of band or spurious emission. That is covered by the exam, though.

Jim, I think you're in a better position to doubt the efficacy of the
FCC exam today than you were at age 16. You're an engineer though,
and prone to transfer a level or depth of professional knowledge,
which took a lifetime of learning and application to achieve no matter
what a hotshot you were at 16, to a -hobby- undertaking.

Thanks for listening.

3028. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-26 14:49:08 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E5CD3D7.EEF84967@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62111

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5C4A56.9C36C550@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5BB676.9C34F1CC@earthlink.net>...
> > >
> > > Be sure to let him know that
> > > > those sorry immigrants should get their act together and begin referring
> > > > to themselves as "natives of the former Yugoslavia/Jugoslavia".

> > > Like the natives of the former Burma?
> > >
> > No, I don't think that natives of the former Burma would put up with
> > having to call themselves "natives of the former Yugoslavia/Jugoslavia
>
> Why would they do that?

That was my point. I wrote of immigrants calling themselves natives of
the former Yugoslavia/Jugoslavia. You responded with "like the natives
of the former Burma?". I don't think anyone born in Burma calls himself
Yugoslavian.

> I would imagine that they would refer to
> themselves by whatever new name they came up with.

I don't think those who already left would do that. Our Deputy Chief of
Mission in Botswana was married to a fellow from what is now Croatia.
He told people he met that he was Yugoslavian. He didn't leave a
country called Croatia. He left a country called Yugoslavia.

> Otherwise, why
> rename their country?

I don't know, Brian--perhaps out of sheer boredom. Maybe they just
wanted something more difficult for foreigners to pronounce.

> > but you really should take it up with Len. He's worried that some guy
> > can't consider himself Yugoslavian because there is no more Yugoslavia.
> >
> > My mother-in-law was born in a Finnish town which is now part of
> > Russia. I guess she should start telling people that she's Russian.
>
> Depends. Was she still living there when it became Russia?

You might be getting near the point of understanding what has already been written. No, she was not still living there. She is a Finn.

Dave K8MN

3029. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-26 15:00:25 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E5CD67E.888574B6@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62112

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E564F03.72EB24C0@earthlink.net>...
> > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > >
> > > In article <20030220061433.23241.00000015@mb-da.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> > > writes:
> > >
> > > >Also gave a good indication of propagation. Back when a 1000 mile contact was
> > > >a major accomplishment, this was an important feature.
> > >
> > > Maybe you could help out K3LT complete his WAS? He seems
> > > to have difficulty getting out...
> >
> > Oh, I think it is all relative, Leonard. Compared, for example, to your
> > progress on WAS, his performance is stellar.
>
> Smug Dave offers a left-handed compliment to Novice Larry.

Larry didn't receive left-handed compliment. Larry has done fine,
especially when his low power and less than ideal antennas are
considered. Larry wasn't called a Novice. Brian is just reading between
the lines again. Do you consider Len's comment to Larry about his WAS a
compliment to Larry?

Len Anderson isn't even in the game. He's a never-WAS.

Dave K8MN

3030. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-26 15:01:32 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E5CD6CB.92FF33F3@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62113

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5A5911.9FAB8484@earthlink.net>...
> > Phil Kane wrote:
> > >
> > > On Mon, 24 Feb 2003 05:33:05 GMT, Dave Heil wrote:
> > >
> > > >....and you still can't spell the word "Attila".
> > >
> > > My friend with that name spells it exazctly the way you do. It's a
> > > common Yugoslavian first name mowadays.
> >
> > Len's now off in search of a "Hun language" dictionary online.
>
> Someone's got to do your homework for you.

Since when did Len's inability to spell a word become my homework?

Dave K8MN

3031. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-26 15:07:03 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns932E66E2F237Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 62114

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in
news:3E5AF8AE.399D8469@earthlink.net:

> Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <3E59967B.3B38934E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
>> <k8mn@earthlink.net> writes:
>>
>> >N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
>> >
>> >No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
>> >government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
>> >amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of
>> >Mr. Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors,
>> >ethnic slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."
>>
>> Another macro repeat of a Big Lie item, really the opinion of
>> another. As stated in another message, I will repeat such to aid a
>> propagandist wanna-be. :-)
>
> Yes, it was opinion. I happen to think it was extremely well crafted
> and accurate. For it to be a lie, there'd have to be evidence that you
> are never guilty of the things written. As anyone can see, I've used
> the quote below comments made by you which exemplify actions in the
> profile Jim put together. There's no legwork involved in tying the
> evidence to the profile.
>
>> >I'd have to say that you are predicatable, Leonard.
>>
>> More confusion and misspelling.
>>
>> I'm not "predicate-able" in that I don't like to diagram sentences.
>> I just write them. Sometimes I get money for writing.
>>
>> I'm not "predictable" in that I follow someone's rules on how
>> to take chastisement like a good little "inferior." :-)
>>
>> The word might be "predicament" misspelled...but it's not my
>> predicament but rather Heil's original snow job that he buried
>> hisself in 5 years ago.
>
> You get worked up over a single typo but you've repeatedly used
> "auxilliary" and "Attilla" even after they were drawn to your attention
> several times.

>
>
> Dave K8MN
>

"Auxilliary" is correct. It isn't the US spelling, however.

3032. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-26 15:09:09 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E5CD889.A2D29D5B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62115

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E5A5B76.3071A89@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E599E32.E4F3BC9C@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E57EB7C.A0596401@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E565A51.B1C29552@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > Brian wrote:

> > > > > > > > > I was not home when replying. Jump, jump, jump.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Oh. Correct my statement to read: "We're not all gathered whereever it
> > > > > > > > > is that you are". You can explain your second sentence, the incomplete
> > > > > > > > > one, later if you have any interest in anyone being able to understand
> > > > > > > > > it.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > You're supposed to be a bright boy.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > It is tough to fill in the blanks on a supposed sentence which contains
> > > > > > > > > only the same three words. Those three repeated words of yours have
> > > > > > > > > about the same meaning as "Tree, tree, tree" or "Lift, lift, lift". If
> > > > > > > > > you can't complete an idea, don't expect others to do it for you.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Dave, try using context. Like when I said "Jump, jump, jump" (to
> > > > > > > > conclusions).
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > You didn't write "Jump, jump, jump (to conclusions". You wrote "Jump,
> > > > > > > jump, jump" Nothing about conclusions was written by you or me.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I filled in the "(to conclusions)" so you'd finally get it. Poor
> > > > > > Dave.
> > > >
> > > > You also wrote some blather about context. Your three word non-sentence
> > > > had no context.
> > >
> > > Pull your head out. Do you want more context on that one?

There can't be "more context" until there is *some* context.

> > > > > > > > > Why would I turn on Jim's radio? You're still confused, aren't you?
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Phil may be on to something. Stupid seems to be your default mode. Ed
> > > > > > > > > Hare lost interest in the group when you ran extended versions of your
> > > > > > > > > nonsense replies.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > That's really too bad. Law of unintended consequences. I liked Ed.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > It wasn't apparent.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Perhaps not to you, Mr Obtuse.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > I don't believe it was apparent to Ed.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Ed was a decent enough guy before he hooked up with you. He just got
> > > > > > caught up running with the wrong crowd.
> > > >
> > > > I'm sure your comment will send him scurrying back here.
> >
> > Rats scurry.

Ed isn't a rat.

> > > We all have our limits. I thought I met had mine, and announced I was
> > > leaving the group. Then I decided not to let you guys run me off.
> > >
> > > You were wrong about your limits. You were wrong to announce anything
> > > if there was the possibility that you would nearly instantly change your
> > > mind. Alec Baldwin found himself having to eat HIS words too after
> > > announcing that he'd be leaving the country if George Bush was elected.
> > >
> > > You ran yourself off for a very brief time.
> > >
> > > > So next you start the "Kim and Alec Baldwin" routine on me. Didn't
> > > > work, didit?
> > >
> > > You, Kim and Alec have some traits in common.
> >
> > See what I mean. I predicted what you were going to do before you did
> > it. In writing. Yet you couldn't help but play out your role in my
> > life.

That isn't a very tough prediction. I predict the sun will come up
tomorrow.

> > > > > > > On the other hand, how many other people have been run off this group?
> > > > > > > I don't see any litttle violins playing for them.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > I don't know of anyone who has been "run off this group". Ed left of
> > > > > > > his own volition. His tolerance for crap had been exceeded.
> > > > > >

> > > > > As did mine.
> > > >
> > > > Did you mean "as was mine"?
> > >
> > > As in, "As was mine tolerance?" No. You'll have to be more specific.
> >
> > Read what you wrote. Read what I wrote. See if you can find any
> > glaring grammatical goofs on your part. Let me know what you find.
>
> I find you obtuse, still.

Your inability to use English grammar has nothing to do with me.

> > > How has my leaving worked out?
> >
> > For you? Not very well. You don't seem to have much will power.
>
> None whatsoever. Now its a matter for the actuarial tables.

Are you hoping to develop some will power before the actuarial tables
kick in?

Dave K8MN

3033. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-26 15:36:12 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E5CDEE0.FB871EAD@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62116

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5A5EB3.617021E1@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E599B49.56F5378E@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030222140633.12173.00000653@mb-mr.aol.com>...

> > > > > Likewise, I've not encountered many non-radio amateurs who claim they
> > > > > are going for an "Extra right out of the box" and who haven't done zip
> > > > > several years down the road.
> > >
> > > Dave, I'm sorry you have such limited experiences with people. Thats
> > > what happens when you spend the majority of your life in a comm shack
> > > handing out Q's at a 4 per minute rate.
> > >
> > I've never handed out "Q's" from a "comm shack".
>
> Do you hand them out from a Kool-Aid stand?

What a strange comment.

> You must be the slim you've been searching for.

Oh, Mogadishu Slim had nothing to do with me or Kool-Aid stands.

> > > Trust me.
> > >
> > I'm going to have problems with this one. You told us that you were
> > leaving the group but your absence was very brief. How can I trust you?
>
> Dave, my absence never happened. I had an Immediate change of heart.

Now you tell us you never left the group. Sorry I simply can't trust
you.
You seem to be quite unreliable.

> > > For example, many people find trying to learn the Morse code confusing
> > > and frustrating. Some just can't do it, whether they have a learning
> > > or hearing disability, or just can't get past the frustration part.
> > > In another time and place, those people became Cooks and MP's. Your

> > > only experience has been inside the comm shack, where you see a bunch
> > > of ditty-boppers. You assume anyone can be a ditty-bopper.
> >
> > I never worked with a bunch of ditty-boppers anywhere. My last year in
> > the military was spent doing news releases for the Lackland AFB Office
> > of Information.
>
> Isn't that where they drum people out of the Air Force fo
> non-adaptability?

I don't know. It is where most folks have gone through basic training.
It is where many folks are assigned PCS. I was there doing radio and TV
news releases.

> I never encountered ditty-boppers in any of the several
> > rock and blues bands of which I was a member.
>
> Say Hi to Robin Trower for me.

Never met him. I'd say to Muddy Waters and Albert King for you but
they're dead.

> While a couple of the
> > electronics distributors I worked for had hams as employees (I even had
> > a radio amateur, W8PBX as a sales manager at one place), none were real
> > CW aficionados.
>
> No doubt in downtown Dar es Salam.

Are you having trouble keeping up?

> > I believe that just about anyone can learn morse code at a rate of five
> > words per minute in very short order.
>
> Lets define "just about," please. Would that be 100%, 97%, 95%, what?

Something slightly under 100% would be my idea of "just about anyone".
For a definition of "just about", you'll have to do a littlel work on
your own.

> > > Do you suppose that there might be a person out there who has no
> > > interest in VHF+ amateur communications, but having had a career in HF
> > > communications, would like to get an HF license? But then finds that
> > > they cannot learn the code? Perhaps even reflects back on his or her
> > > experiences on HF, and ask why the Code is so necessary to amateur
> > > communications in the year 2003?
> >
> > We've been through all this before.
>
> So you've made up your mind.

Haven't you?

> > I don't believe there are many
> > people who can't learn morse code at five words per minute.
>
> Define "many." Of all the people who've shown an interest and taken
> the 5WPM exam (in whatever abomination; Morse or Farnsworth), what is
> the passing rate?

Something slightly under 100% is my definition of "many". You can do
research on the passing rate. I don't feel like taking on the project.

> What?
>
> I don't
> > believe there will be any morse test at all within a short period.
>
> A short period of what? Dits? Dahs? Time? What?

Do you measure the passage of time in dits or dahs?

> Would you mind completing a sentence?

The sentence was a complete thought. That is where it differs from many
of your comments.

> Nevermind. I can't even pretend to be thick like you.

...nor do you need to pretend.

> But do you think there should be?
>
> I
> > believe that even Len Anderson can learn morse at five words per
> > minute.
>
> Why do you believe that? Has he shown any real evidence of having
> learned the code?

See the sentence below:

> > After all, he has told us that he already knows morse code.
>
> In what capacity? Scouts flashing lights from one tent to another
> during a Jamboree? Now you think Len is Cecil?

Why aren't you asking him?

> > How much of a stretch can it be for him to become "proficient" with it
> > at five words per minute?
>
> Larry and Dick claim 5wpm cannot be "proficiency." Ditto 13wpm.

You'll note that I put "proficient" in quotes.

Dave K8MN

3034. Re: After S25.5 Goes (was Re: Hams help with Columbia recovery)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-26 15:37:59 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E5CDF55.CDA52C99@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62117

Alun Palmer wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in
> news:3E5AF8AE.399D8469@earthlink.net:
>
> > Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <3E59967B.3B38934E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> >> <k8mn@earthlink.net> writes:
> >>
> >> >N2EY: "Besides, here's a simple, plain fact:
> >> >
> >> >No matter what job, educational level, employer, or
> >> >government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio
> >> >amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of
> >> >Mr. Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors,
> >> >ethnic slurs, excessive emoticons and general infantile behavior."
> >>
> >> Another macro repeat of a Big Lie item, really the opinion of
> >> another. As stated in another message, I will repeat such to aid a
> >> propagandist wanna-be. :-)
> >
> > Yes, it was opinion. I happen to think it was extremely well crafted
> > and accurate. For it to be a lie, there'd have to be evidence that you
> > are never guilty of the things written. As anyone can see, I've used
> > the quote below comments made by you which exemplify actions in the
> > profile Jim put together. There's no legwork involved in tying the
> > evidence to the profile.
> >
> >> >I'd have to say that you are predicatable, Leonard.
> >>
> >> More confusion and misspelling.
> >>
> >> I'm not "predicate-able" in that I don't like to diagram sentences.
> >> I just write them. Sometimes I get money for writing.
> >>
> >> I'm not "predictable" in that I follow someone's rules on how
> >> to take chastisement like a good little "inferior." :-)
> >>
> >> The word might be "predicament" misspelled...but it's not my
> >> predicament but rather Heil's original snow job that he buried
> >> hisself in 5 years ago.
> >
> > You get worked up over a single typo but you've repeatedly used

> > "auxilliary" and "Attilla" even after they were drawn to your attention
> > several times.
> >
> >
> > Dave K8MN
> >
>
> "Auxilliary" is correct. It isn't the US spelling, however.

"Auxiliary" is correct. It isn't the British spelling, however.

Dave K8MN

3035. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-26 17:53:24 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3E5CFF14.4050609@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 62118

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>
>
> I don't "come down hard" on newer ops, Jackie. I just "come down hard"
> on participants in this NEWSGROUP who propone that they are "equal"
> as General- or Extra-class hams having been licensed/upgraded under the
> present, significantly reduced licensing standards. The truth is that they
> are definitely NOT equal to their fellow hams who were licensed/upgraded
> in the Pre-Restructuring Era.

Only in your ego inflated mind.

3036. Re: eBay removes legal 10m ham gear but allows illegal CB equipment

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-26 22:29:26 UTC
From: David Robbins <k1ttt@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <_B-dnclqncZfosCjXTWcpg@crocker.com>
Source record: 62119
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

ok, here is the proper way to report apparently illegal radio sales straight
from the horses mouth:

FCC CONSUMER ALERT

Federal Communications Commission

Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau

445 12th Street, SW Washington, DC 20554

1-888-CALL-FCC (voice)

1-888-835-5322 (TTY)

www.fcc.gov/cgb

UNAUTHORIZED EQUIPMENT SOLD ON INTERNET AND IN PUBLICATIONS

The Federal Communications Commission receives hundreds of complaints about
alleged illegal (non-FCC certified) equipment being offered for sale on the
Internet or in publications. The Commission is monitoring this situation
carefully and requests your assistance. If you have any information about
illegal or uncertified equipment being offered for sale, please forward it
to the FCC. Useful information for the FCC includes:

* An original advertisement or Web address where the illegal equipment is

being advertised or offered for sale with the types of equipment about which

the allegations are being made, highlighted.

* If it is a Web-auction we will need the name of the auction site, the
exact

item number, and auction opening and closing dates.

* Name and address of the individual or business offering the item(s) for
sale.

* Complainant's name and telephone number in the event follow-up is
necessary.

This information can remain confidential, if requested.

* Specifically, why you think the equipment is not in compliance with FCC
rules.

* Number of pieces or types of equipment about which the allegations are being

made (one piece, five pieces, how many models, etc.).

Information can be mailed to the FCC at the address below or e-mailed to fccinfo@fcc.gov.

###

To receive information on this and other FCC consumer topics through the

Commission's electronic subscriber service, click on

www.fcc.gov/cgb/emailservice.html

3037. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-26 22:35:53 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302261435.34f51443@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62120

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E5CD889.A2D29D5B@earthlink.net>...

>
> That isn't a very tough prediction. I predict the sun will come up
> tomorrow.
>

I used to predict that, too, and got paid to do it. But my clients
usually also wanted civil and nautical sunrise times, cloud cover,
visibility, etc.

Moon prediction was a little tougher, especially when my client is
flying NVG at an extremely low altitude.

3038. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-26 22:42:06 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302261442.4f919e27@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62121

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E5CD3D7.EEF84967@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5C4A56.9C36C550@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5BB676.9C34F1CC@earthlink.net>...
> > > >
> > > > Be sure to let him know that
> > > > > those sorry immigrants should get their act together and begin referring
> > > > > to themselves as "natives of the former Yugoslavia/Jugoslavia".
> >
> > > > Like the natives of the former Burma?
> > >
> > > No, I don't think that natives of the former Burma would put up with
> > > having to call themselves "natives of the former Yugoslavia/Jugoslavia
> >
> > Why would they do that?
> >
> That was my point. I wrote of immigrants calling themselves natives of
> the former Yugoslavia/Jugoslavia. You responded with "like the natives
> of the former Burma?". I don't think anyone born in Burma calls himself
> Yugoslavian.

Why would they do that?

> > I would imagine that they would refer to
> > themselves by whatever new name they came up with.
> >
> I don't think those who already left would do that. Our Deputy Chief of
> Mission in Botswana was married to a fellow from what is now Croatia.
> He told people he met that he was Yugoslavian. He didn't leave a
> country called Croatia. He left a country called Yugoslavia.

Thats nice.

> > Otherwise, why
> > rename their country?
> >
> I don't know, Brian--perhaps out of sheer boredom. Maybe they just
> wanted something more difficult for foreigners to pronounce.

Maybe they like changing letterhead, or the leader has a
brother-in-law that manufactures flags.

> > > but you really should take it up with Len. He's worried that some guy
> > > can't consider himself Yugoslavian because there is no more Yugoslavia.
> > >
> > > My mother-in-law was born in a Finnish town which is now part of
> > > Russia. I guess she should start telling people that she's Russian.
> >
> > Depends. Was she still living there when it became Russia?
>
> You might be getting near the point of understanding what has already
> been written. No, she was not still living there. She is a Finn.

So is Dann.

3039. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-26 22:58:39 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E5D46F3.F6D7AE52@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62122

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5CD3D7.EEF84967@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5C4A56.9C36C550@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5BB676.9C34F1CC@earthlink.net>...
> > > > >
> > > > > Be sure to let him know that
> > > > > > those sorry immigrants should get their act together and begin referring
> > > > > > to themselves as "natives of the former Yugoslavia/Jugoslavia".
> > >
> > > > > Like the natives of the former Burma?
> > > >
> > > > No, I don't think that natives of the former Burma would put up with
> > > > having to call themselves "natives of the former Yugoslavia/Jugoslavia
> > >
> > > Why would they do that?
> >
> > That was my point. I wrote of immigrants calling themselves natives of
> > the former Yugoslavia/Jugoslavia. You responded with "like the natives
> > of the former Burma?". I don't think anyone born in Burma calls himself
> > Yugoslavian.
>
> Why would they do that?

You tell me. Your response suggested that they might. Chalk it up as
another of those things like your having told somebody that you'd be
building 1N34A's when that is perhaps not what you wanted to convey.

Dave K8MN

3040. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-26 23:06:22 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@ptialaska.net>
Message-ID: <878yw263rl.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 62123

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:
>Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E5CD889.A2D29D5B@earthlink.net>...
>
>> .... I predict the sun will come up tomorrow.
>>
>
>I used to predict that, too, and got paid to do it.

Despite your extensive experiences (both of you) in that field,
trust me folks, the sun does *not* necessarily come up tomorrow!

Nor does it necessarily go down today.

Reminds me of something a school teacher showed me years ago
when my children were in grade school. It was an "IQ test", and
one of the questions was, "From which directions does the sun
come up in the morning?" The answers available were: North,
East, South, and West.

The teacher sighed, and said she just marked that one correct no
matter what the answer was. Her point was that the test was not
necessarily valid for her students.

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://www.ptialaska.net/~floyd>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

3041. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-27 01:34:01 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030226203401.27873.00000804@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 62124

In article <f45722ac.0302260611.5cba2c07@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20030225220615.12173.00000680@mb-mr.aol.com>...
>> In article <f45722ac.0302251548.16e02e8@posting.google.com>,
>> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>>
>> >N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
>> >news:<c2356669.0302250923.1cf6cdae@posting.google.com>...
>> >> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
>> news:<f45722ac.0302241327.474d19a5@posting.google.com>...
>> >> > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
>> news:<2Xp6a.5836$hj.1655097@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
>> >> > > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
>> >> > > news:f45722ac.0302231242.203ee0a9@posting.google.com...
>> >> > > >
>> >> > > > Many of the Extras on here, whom most of work in the field as
>> >> > > > electronics engineers, want the rest of us to learn everything to
>> >> > > > their level of professional detail, without getting paid a
>handsome
>> >> > > > salary for the effort.
>> >> > >
>> >> > > That is blatantly false ...
>> >> >
>> >> Agreed!
>> >
>> >We'll see.
>> >
>> >> > > I, for one, have REPEATEDLY stated
>> >> > > that, while technical proficiency could/should be improved in our
>> >> > > ranks, that there should NOT be anything even remotely approaching
>> >> > > an EE level of knowledge requirement.
>> >>
>> >> And we have had numerous discussions here about how the written tests
>> >> could be made better - not harder. As I recall, Carl and I agreed on
>> >> many if not most of those issues.
>> >>
>> >> For the record, I passed the old Advanced and General writtens at the
>> >> age of 14, in the summer when I was between 8th and 9th grades. Passed
>> >> Extra written at the age of 16, in the summer when I was between 10th
>> >> and 11th grades. Would've gotten the Extra earlier but for the
>> >> then-required 2 year experience requirement. That was back in the bad
>> >> old days of FCC secret tests, etc., and it was not unusual back then.

>> >> No handsome paycheck back then, either.
>> >
>> >Lets even that out.
>>
>> You can't. Different ball game today.
>
>I was speaking of amateur radio.

So was I. "Different ball game" is a figure of speech.

Point is, you can't "even that out" for a number of reasons. Like the fact that the old tests and test methods are not available.

>> >At 16, did you think that an Amateur Extra should
>> >have had to know more than you knew,
>>
>> Actually, yes. I was surprised that it wasn't harder. I passed it first
>> time, too.
>
>You would have been happier had you failed?

Nope. I was happy to pass. I just thought the test would be harder.
>
>Did you think the General and Advanced exams, which you took at age
>14, were lacking also?

I didn't say any of the tests were lacking. Just that I thought they'd be harder than they really were.
>
>Then at age 16 you began scheming to change amateur radio because you
>knew more than the engineers creating the question pools?

Not at all.
>
>Too much James Dean? Rebel with a cause?
>
Back then we rebelled against other things.

>> >having just freshly passed the
>> >exam and your head full of 1962 theory?
>>
>> 1962 theory? You're quite mistaken. I took the test in 1970, not 1962. 1970
>> Extra was not the same test as the 1962 Extra.
>
>True, vastly, vastly different. You saw the introduction of
>transistors to the QP.

Among other things.
>
>> >Do you enjoy a handsome paycheck today, courtesy of a career as an
>> >Engineer?
>>
>> Quite handsome, thank you. Remember that somewhere in the intervening

>> years I
>> went to EE school and got some degrees.
>
>Did you learning anything more along the way?

Oh yes, quite a few things.
>
>> >> > Now Carl, is that false for every Extra on here, or just for you?
>> >>
>> >> False for Carl and false for me, too.
>> >
>> >Do you now know more about electronics and radio today than you did at
>> >age 16?
>>
>> Sure. But even back then I knew enough to design and build amateur
>> equipment that worked and put out a clean signal.
>
>You are an exceptional individual.

Not at all. There were, and are, plenty of others like me.
>
>> However, the main point was that even the old FCC-administered tests
>> weren't all that tough. Not if I could pass them! ;-)
>
>Well, I don't know about that.

True, very true.

> Engineering and building radios that put out clean signals at age 16?

Actually, built my first transmitter at age 13. Simple but effective. Worked
quite a few hams with it.

>Questioning the FCC about how lax the Extra exam was?

I didn't question the FCC. I was simply surprised that the test wasn't harder.
And once it arrived, I started using it. I still do.
>
>I think you're being modest.

Nope. Just honest.
>
>> >> > > > They really do want something for nothing.
>> >> > >
>> >> > > Also blatantly false ... all we want is to eliminate an outdated,
>> >> > > unnecessary
>> >> > > requirement that only serves as a barrier to entry by qualified
>people
>> (the
>> >> > > Morse proficiency requirement).
>> >>
>> >> That goal has already been achieved here in the USA, because there's
>> >> no way a reasonable person could consider the current 5 wpm test as a

>> >> "Morse proficiency requirement". That test is simply a demonstration
>> >> of a single basic Morse skill, at an entry level.
>> >
>> >Are you saying that the treaty has already been broken?
>>
>> No. The treaty does not require "proficiency", does it?
>>
>> Do you consider 5 wpm as being "proficient" at Morse code?
>
>Can legitimate communication take place at 5wpm?

Sure - I've done it. 5 wpm is basic, entry-level skill. That's not a bad thing.

>
>> >Are you saying that the Morse Exam presents no barrier to every
>> >American who has ever had an interest in Amateur Radio?
>>
>> No.
>
>Are you sure?
>
Yes.

>> "Barrier"?
>>
>> I'm sure there are some individuals who simply can't learn 5 wpm code. I'm
>> also
>> sure there are some who can't learn the material on the writtens, too.
>
>Which is relavent?

Both are relevant.
>
>> >> > I think you completely misread my comment.
>> >> >
>> >> > And I agree with eliminating outdated, unnecessary and superfluous
>> >> > requirements.
>> >>
>> >> Me, too.
>> >
>> >Yet the exams, which have more material at a complexity far greater
>> >than the exam you took at age 16 is just not enough for you to be
>> >satisfied with the present crop of Extras?
>>
>> Whoa there! You're presuming the conclusion again!
>
>Which? Greater/more complex? Dissatisfaction with new Extras?

Both.

Have you ever seen me write anything that was a put-down of hams of any license
class or license vintage? If so, provide us with a copy of the post.

>
>> "more material at a complexity far greater than the exam you took at age
>>16"?
>> Do you have the old 1970 exams for comparison? I don't think so.
>
>I know that there are

[more]?

> electronic devices, signal processing, and modes
>available today than there were when your QP was developed.

So? That in itself proves nothing. The old tests covered subjects which the new
tests do not. Also covered them in more depth.

>Though
>there were RF hazards back then, today they are being tested on
>environmental assessments.

Sure. But there is no real calculation involved - the charts are all given.
>
>> The 1970 exams covered some of the same material as today's exams and some
>> DIFFERENT material. More important, in those days we did not have the exact
>Q&A
>> to study from,
>
>Granted. Have you tried chaning that?
>
How? It's clear FCC isn't going to abandon the VE system. Secret tests aren't
coming back any time in the foreseeable future.

>> nor any clear idea what the test questions would be like other
>> than that they would be multiple choice.
>
>No clear idea? Cecil says otherwise.

He's mistaken.

>The ARRL, AMECO, and Bash were
>publishing something in 1968-1970 time frame. I wonder what it could
>have been.

Reprints of the FCC study guides. They were in essay format.
>
>Did you have either publication?

I still have my old License Manuals.
>
>> Shall I repost some of the study guide questions from the old License
>>Manual?
>> They were in essay format, even though the exams were multiple choice.
>
>Study guides? You used study guides?

To know the general areas that would be on the exam, sure.
>
>> >> > But please reflect on what some of the PCTA Extras have stated
>> >> > regarding current theory exams.
>> >>
>> >> Like what?
>
>Remember, you asked.

So give us some examples.
>
>> >Extra Dick refuses to administer the exams anymore, current crop of
>> >examinees aren't worth the effort.
>>
>> I'm not him.
>
>Remember, you asked. And he is an Extra, he does post here, and he
>has had a career in electronics.

So give us some examples.
>
>> Have YOU ever volunteered your time and effort as a VE?
>
>FCC regulations prohibited Technicians from the VE system.

You're not one anymore.

> I did
>teach, with several other volunteers, two Technician classes.

That's good.
>
>> >Extra Bruce, using himself as an example, says anyone can pass Extra
>> >because the exam is worthless.
>>
>> So?
>
>Remember, you asked.
>
>> Is he not entitled to an opinion, however strange?
>
>However strange. But he is an Extra, he does post here, and his
>career is electronics, though I don't know how handsomely he could be
>paid at that literacy level.

Did it ever occur to you that his style of posting here could be an act?
>
> He did pass the test,
>> according to the database. I'm not him, btw.
>
>Easy to tell - you're literate.

Well, there you have it.
>
>> >Extra Larry refuses to accept post restructuring Extras as anything
>> >except floatsam.
>>
>> It's "flotsam".
>
>Yes it is. And congrats on not tripping over my mispelled word and
>not getting up.
>
>> Is he not entitled to his opinion? I'm not him, btw.
>
>Remember, you asked. And Larry is an Extra, posts here, but is not an
>electronics careerist.

So what's the beef?
>
>> >Now Extra Jim says the current exams could be made "better."
>>
>> Been saying it for years.
>
>Ever since 1970, no doubt.

Nope.
>
>> So has Extra Carl. I note that you don't take him to
>> task for his opinions.
>
>I've said it too. Why should I take him to task?

Because he and I say the same thing.
>
>> >> > As far as the code exam goes, does
>> >> > Extra Dick want the elimination of outdated requirements? Does Extra
>> >> > Jim want outdated requirements removed?
>> >>
>> >> Who is "Extra Jim"?
>> >>
>> >> If you mean me, then I'll say that I've always been FOR the
>> >> elimination of outdated requirements. Like removing questions about
>> >> the Advanced subbands from the tests, because no new ham really needs
>> >> to know that stuff since no new Advanceds are being issued.
>> >
>> >Then how will they ever become OO's?
>>
>> Study the rules. OO qualification goes beyond what's on the tests.
>
>True.
>
>> >And they'll wonder why Joe 2x2 can't play in the same playground.
>>
>> Only if they're Extras.

>
>Only if one is an Extra, and the other is an Advanced. But that was
>the context.
>
>> >> I also say that the code tests are not an outdated requirement. YMMV.
>> >
>> >Vastly.
>>
>> Well, there you have it.
>
>Yes, there you have it. But we were talking WRITTEN exams. Unless
>copying code is considered a written exam.

Of course it's a written exam. You have to write down the answers.
>
>> >> > Nope.
>> >>
>> >> You are mistaken. You're repeating the old Cecil trick of assuming
>> >> your conclusion.
>> >>
>> >> There was a time when an employer or educational institution
>> >> considered the possession of a ham radio license as a significant
>> >> qualification. I know that when I applied to EE schools in 1972 my
>> >> Extra class license made at least some difference in getting admitted.
>> >> (I was accepted at every school I applied to, btw). Does that same
>> >> situation exist today? I don't know.
>> >
>> >You must be assuming that some wouldn't, or you wouldn't have posted
>> >it.
>>
>> No, I'm simply recalling how things were 31 years ago and wondering if
>they're
>> the same now.
>
>Find out. Reapply under an assumed name.

Can't. That would be fraud.
>
>> >> None of this is meant to mean or imply anything negative about new
>> >> hams or old ones. But the written tests can and should be made better.
>> >> Many of us suggested ways of accomplishing this to the FCC as part of
>> >> the 2000 restructuring.
>> >
>> >You're the guy that wanted more license classes.
>>
>> Where?
>
>Have we been secretly meeting somewhere else?
>
>> In discussions here with gentlemen like Jim Rosenthal, WA4STJ and Dick
>Plourde,

>> several ideas of alternative license structures were developed. I still
>like
>> the "Chinese menu" idea.
>
>Yes, yes. You liked more license clases, not fewer.

In those discussions, yes.
>
>> But the NPRM clearly showed that FCC wanted less complexity, not more, so I
>> supported four license classes (same as FCC proposed) and some other
>changes.
>> Like better test methods. Am I not entitled to my opinion?
>
>But you have a history of being dissatisfied with how the FCC does
>things, ever since at least age 16/1970, and perhaps as early as age
>14/1968.

Wrong.

>So in 1999 you supported the FCC's plan?

I supported the N2EY plan.
>
>And I thought the FCC plan went to three license classes, not four.

Wrong again.

In NPRM 98-143, FCC proposed four classes of license (TGAE). Look it up.

>The ARRL had a four class structure, as I recall.

Same as the FCC NPRM.
>
>I hope you're not another one of those Extras that confuses the ARRL
>and FCC.

What about the other hams who do?

>> >I'm the guy that asked for enforcement no matter which way it went.
>>
>> Lots of us asked for enforcement. Enforcement is a good thing. But it won't
>> make hams any more technically knowledgeable.
>
>Not even if they want to stay out of trouble?

Enforcement makes people learn theory?

>There's a Q over on
>rra.antenna about the bandwidth of a SSB signal, and if it is an out
>of band or spurious emission. That is covered by the exam, though.

Which shows how effective the exam is at insuring hams understand that concept.
>
>Jim, I think you're in a better position to doubt the efficacy of the

>FCC exam today than you were at age 16.

I wasn't doubting it at age 16.

>You're an engineer though,
>and prone to transfer a level or depth of professional knowledge,
>which took a lifetime of learning and application to achieve no matter
>what a hotshot you were at 16, to a -hobby- undertaking.

All I wrote was that I was surprised that the tests were not as hard as I
expected, even back then.
>
>Thanks for listening.

You're welcome

73 de Jim, N2EY>
>
>
>
>
>
>

3042. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-27 02:52:38 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302261852.60e2f810@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62125

Floyd Davidson <floyd@ptialaska.net> wrote in message news:<878yw263rl.fld@barrow.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:
> >Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5CD889.A2D29D5B@earthlink.net>...
> >
> >> .... I predict the sun will come up tomorrow.
> >>
> >
> >I used to predict that, too, and got paid to do it.
>
> Despite your extensive experiences (both of you) in that field,
> trust me folks, the sun does *not* necessarily come up tomorrow!
>
> Nor does it necessarily go down today.
>
> Reminds me of something a school teacher showed me years ago
> when my children were in grade school. It was an "IQ test", and
> one of the questions was, "From which directions does the sun
> come up in the morning?" The answers available were: North,
> East, South, and West.
>
> The teacher sighed, and said she just marked that one correct no
> matter what the answer was. Her point was that the test was not
> necessarily valid for her students.

True. We get the coriolis force from the same phenomenon.

And the stars don't go away during the day.

3043. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-27 02:57:42 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302261857.4b4d42e1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62126

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E5D46F3.F6D7AE52@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5CD3D7.EEF84967@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5C4A56.9C36C550@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5BB676.9C34F1CC@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Be sure to let him know that
> > > > > > > those sorry immigrants should get their act together and begin referring
> > > > > > > to themselves as "natives of the former Yugoslavia/Jugoslavia".
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Like the natives of the former Burma?
> > > > > >
> > > > > No, I don't think that natives of the former Burma would put up with
> > > > > having to call themselves "natives of the former Yugoslavia/Jugoslavia
> > > > >
> > > > Why would they do that?
> > > >
> > > That was my point. I wrote of immigrants calling themselves natives of
> > > the former Yugoslavia/Jugoslavia. You responded with "like the natives
> > > of the former Burma?". I don't think anyone born in Burma calls himself
> > > Yugoslavian.
> >
> > Why would they do that?
>
> You tell me.

Because they're in Myanmar, the country formerly known as Burma, not
FY.

> Your response suggested that they might.

Hmmm? No it didn't.

Chalk it up as
> another of those things like your having told somebody that you'd be
> building 1N34A's when that is perhaps not what you wanted to convey.

Dave, I think you've tripped over another misspelled word and cannot get up. Probably bumped your head as well. Since you're already prostrated, go ahead and take a rest.

3044. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-27 03:14:03 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302261914.4ff53c58@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62127

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E5CDEE0.FB871EAD@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:

> > Dave, my absence never happened. I had an Immediate change of heart.
>
> Now you tell us you never left the group. Sorry I simply can't trust
> you.
> You seem to be quite unreliable.

I had an immediate change of heart, which you noticed and made note
of, then chided me for not hooking up with Kim and Alec.

Now you tell us I left.

Which is it?

You're sounding more unreliable with each post. Did you bump your
head on that last spelling trip-up?

> > > I believe that just about anyone can learn morse code at a rate of five
> > > words per minute in very short order.
> >
> > Lets define "just about," please. Would that be 100%, 97%, 95%, what?
>
> Something slightly under 100% would be my idea of "just about anyone".
> For a definition of "just about", you'll have to do a littlel work on
> your own.

Is "littlel" a Finnish word?

> > > > Do you suppose that there might be a person out there who has no
> > > > interest in VHF+ amateur communications, but having had a career in HF
> > > > communications, would like to get an HF license? But then finds that
> > > > they cannot learn the code? Perhaps even reflects back on his or her
> > > > experiences on HF, and ask why the Code is so necessary to amateur
> > > > communications in the year 2003?
> > >
> > > We've been through all this before.
> >
> > So you've made up your mind.
>
> Haven't you?

Ham chronology shouldn't be measured in geological time.

> > > I don't believe there are many
> > > people who can't learn morse code at five words per minute.

> >
> > Define "many." Of all the people who've shown an interest and taken
> > the 5WPM exam (in whatever abomination; Morse or Farnsworth), what is
> > the passing rate?
>
> Something slightly under 100% is my definition of "many". You can do
> research on the passing rate. I don't feel like taking on the project.

So many and most are synonyms?

> > What?
> >
> > I don't
> > > believe there will be any morse test at all within a short period.
> >
> > A short period of what? Dits? Dahs? Time? What?
>
> Do you measure the passage of time in dits or dahs?

Ahh. Thanks for clearing that up for me. You meant to say "short
period of time."

> > Would you mind completing a sentence?
>
> The sentence was a complete thought. That is where it differs from many
> of your comments.

Your thought may have been complete, but it never was turned into
bits.

> > Nevermind. I can't even pretend to be thick like you.
>
> ...nor do you need to pretend.

Thanks, I'll quit for the rest of this post. Its really much more
work playing stupid than straight. Sometimes, I don't know how you do
it, but you're a natural at it.

> > But do you think there should be?
> >
> > I
> > > believe that even Len Anderson can learn morse at five words per
> > > minute.
> >
> > Why do you believe that? Has he shown any real evidence of having
> > learned the code?
>
> See the sentence below:
>
> > > After all, he has told us that he already knows morse code.
> >
> > In what capacity? Scouts flashing lights from one tent to another
> > during a Jamboree? Now you think Len is Cecil?

>
> Why aren't you asking him?
>
> > > How much of a stretch can it be for him to become "proficient" with it
> > > at five words per minute?
> >
> > Larry and Dick claim 5wpm cannot be "proficiency." Ditto 13wpm.
>
> You'll note that I put "proficient" in quotes.

Who are you quoting?

Ooops. Just having a "littlel" fun with you.

3045. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-27 03:20:27 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302261920.66e9014a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62128

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E5CD67E.888574B6@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E564F03.72EB24C0@earthlink.net>...
> > > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > > >
> > > > In article <20030220061433.23241.00000015@mb-da.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> > > > writes:
> > > > >
> > > > >Also gave a good indication of propagation. Back when a 1000 mile contact was
> > > > >a major accomplishment, this was an important feature.
> > > > >
> > > > Maybe you could help out K3LT complete his WAS? He seems
> > > > to have difficulty getting out...
> > > >
> > > Oh, I think it is all relative, Leonard. Compared, for example, to your
> > > progress on WAS, his performance is stellar.
> > >
> > Smug Dave offers a left-handed compliment to Novice Larry.
> >
> Larry didn't receive left-handed compliment.

He did if he read your post.

Larry has done fine,
> especially when his low power and less than ideal antennas are
> considered. Larry wasn't called a Novice.

Larry is a novice Award seeker. Is being a novice an insult?

Brian is just reading between
> the lines again. Do you consider Len's comment to Larry about his WAS a
> compliment to Larry?

You're kidding, right? When did those two ever have anything nice to
say about each other?

> Len Anderson isn't even in the game. He's a never-WAS.

Perhaps. But not everyone seeks awards whether they're "in the game"
or not.

3046. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-27 04:59:35 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3E5D9B37.455D7757@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 62129

Brian wrote:

>
> We do have human failings. Forgive us. Please allow me to lay
> prostrate on a cold damp floor and whip myself with split palm fronds
> till my back bleeds, while chanting, "Forgive me Father for I have
> Sinned, I've not used CW since 1987."
>

We break out the "Woff Fong" for that. See the ARRL web page
for an explanation....

3047. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-27 05:12:27 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E5D9E8B.49A8CDAE@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62130

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5D46F3.F6D7AE52@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5CD3D7.EEF84967@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5C4A56.9C36C550@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5BB676.9C34F1CC@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Be sure to let him know that
> > > > > > > > those sorry immigrants should get their act together and begin referring
> > > > > > > > to themselves as "natives of the former Yugoslavia/Jugoslavia".
> > >
> > > > > > > > Like the natives of the former Burma?
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > No, I don't think that natives of the former Burma would put up with
> > > > > > > > having to call themselves "natives of the former Yugoslavia/Jugoslavia
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Why would they do that?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > That was my point. I wrote of immigrants calling themselves natives of
> > > > > > the former Yugoslavia/Jugoslavia. You responded with "like the natives
> > > > > > of the former Burma?". I don't think anyone born in Burma calls himself
> > > > > > Yugoslavian.
> > > > >
> > > > > Why would they do that?
> > > >
> > > > You tell me.
> >
> > Because they're in Myanmar, the country formerly known as Burma, not
> > FY.

Then why would you suggest that they refer to themselves natives of the
former Yugoslavia/Jugoslavia? FY is French Guiana.

> > Your response suggested that they might.
>

> Hmmm? No it didn't.

Yes, Brian, it did.

> > Chalk it up as
> > another of those things like your having told somebody that you'd be
> > building 1N34A's when that is perhaps not what you wanted to convey.
>
> Dave, I think you've tripped over another misspelled word and cannot
> get up. Probably bumped your head as well. Since you're already
> prostrated, go ahead and take a rest.

It is typically Brian Burke to blame others for your inability to read
or write English.

Better prostrated than prostated...

Dave K8MN

3048. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-27 05:15:28 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E5D0CF1.6F0EAB1C@att.net>
Source record: 62131

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> In article <3E5BF3F8.7080504@mailcity.moc>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
> writes:
>
> >>>Kim W5TIT
> >>>
> >>>
> >>
> >>
> >> I forgot to add my callsign phonetics for Larry:
> >>
> >> Kastrated 3 Lacks Testosterone...
> >>
> >Oh wow, that's hitting below the belt so to speak. LOL.
>
> That would be so only if it were true. Actually, it's just another
> indication of the crude, simple workings of W5TIT's mind!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

You DO mean W5BOOB don't you?

3049. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-27 05:15:34 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E5D8E5D.B0552A69@att.net>
Source record: 62132

Floyd Davidson wrote:

> Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote:
> >Floyd Davidson wrote:
> >> I've been reading this thread, and frankly it is not amusing at
> >> all. I've been licensed as KL7GPS for awhile and thought
> >> amateur radio might be something to take up as a hobby now that
> >> I'm retired (from a professional career in communications, which
> >> included both commercial radiotelegraph and radiotelephone
> >> licenses).
> >>
> >> I haven't gotten around to putting together a rig to get on the
> >> air, and this type of exchange is cause to question whether it
> >> would be worth the bother.
> >>
> >
> > So there you have it. You're not a ham radio operator at all,
> > but rather an FCC licensee. You can't seem to find time to
> > get around to actually getting a rig together and getting on
> > the air although you've been licensed for "awhile".
>
> Well, you have a point. I've only been licensed for 43 years
> Dick. It is true that I haven't had time for ham radio for some
> time, but it isn't like I wouldn't know what we are talking
> about, eh?
>
> Maybe you want to stop and look at what I said instead of making
> assumptions.

As anyone reading here can plainly see, I interpreted your remarks
correctly as written. You made it clear that you were licensed but never
had gotten around to putting a rig on the air. Now you attempt to
throw in
additional facts, which were foreclosed by implication if not direct
statement. So we can conclude that you are nothing more than just
another internet troll at work.

>
> .... And make no mistake, that's what this NG is all about-
> >the protesters resisting all the "hoops" thrown in their way by
> >-get this- *us longtime hams*, particularily old Extras who
> >passed a 20wpm code test! Ain't it amazing? And now you sign
> >on, claiming longtime professional service but none as a ham,
> >and still you're the original "authority"!
>

> I have neither said "none" as a ham, nor have I claimed to be
> any "original" authority.

Again, your statement clearly stated that you had held a license for
"awhile" but you had never "got around" to getting a rig on the air. And
then you find it desirable to change your statement. Truly the mark a
deliberate troll.

> But certainly I can claim to have the
> experience to make the kinds of comments that I do.
>
> I don't think my technical background makes me a "better" ham
> than *most* of the best hams, who almost all have less technical
> experience than I do.

And I indicated that I do? Nothing doing, Floyd, if you think you can
Google
up that one feel free to do so. You can't.

> I'm not impressed with whatever your
> technical background is that you think gives you something
> special compared to newer less experienced hams.

I couldn't care less what impresses you. Your alleged work background
isn't so extraordinary, either.

> If either of
> us are special, that isn't the reason why.

It's not that anyone is so special, it's that all the "avoiders" are so
un-special.

>
>
> >> It's a hobby folks.
> >
> > Ah, another "it's all just a hobby" type. Tell it to the
> >FCC. The day they start to consider it "just another hobby"
> >will be the day all that valuable spectrum is up for
> >grabs. Like right now. Folks like you speed it along. An
> >avocation it is, to be sure.
>
> The FCC *does* consider it just a hobby. Look at the way they
> administer it! Draw a few comparisons to other services,
> including CB.
>

You are cordially invited to take a (evidently first) look at what the
FCC clearly states about the ARS- that FCC considers -still- the ARS
to be a "Fundamentally technical service". Unquote. They said
it once again at the last Restructuring.

>
> And while you are researching that, look up "avocation" in a
> dictionary. It means... "hobby". And it is, to be sure!
>

So most hams view it as an avocation rather than a vocation. I always
have. But if you believe that it's "just a hobby" and thus its
practitioners need nothing in the way of technical training beyond
how to read a frequency dial, shame on you. shows what you (don't) know.

>
> >> Those tests are *all* meaningless to anyone
> >> who has worked in the field.
> >
> > You have a right to your opinion, and that's all it is. FCC
> >doesn't agree with it, obviously. Or they didn't untll
> >recently.
>
> Yes they *do* agree with it.

If the FCC agrees that all the tests they administer are meaningless,
why do they continue to devote resources to that end? Methinks you need
a good dose of the rational. Might be hard to find on Point Barrow. You
can still try. Surely there's some around there somewhere.

> We might also note what happened
> to the 1st Phone license too!

The First Phone was killed by the broadcasters who wanted to save money
by hiring the cheapest help possible. The fact that one
had to hold that license to sign paperwork and do numerous other mundane
things helped
kill it. Had the license been required for only the work which actually
required technical learning and skill,-as sit initially was- it would
still be around. Is it "needed"? Is a ham radio license needed?
Is Morse code training and skill still needed? Matters of opinion,
obviously.
If you had worked around some of the BC stations post-1st phone and seen
some of the stuff that goes on you might have another opinion. The real
techs are now consultants and work a number of stations. The flunky kids
are still flunky kids, only now sans the phoney licenses they were never
qualified for in the first place.

> And yet, since I worked for
> many years on government owned radio systems where a commercial
> license was not needed I worked many very fine technicians who
> were simply not good at taking tests and never did get a
> commercial ticket.
>

Well as a matter of fact, so did I. When I signed on, the license (1st)
was
still a requirement and for the next 20 years, both by the FCC and the

employer. The employer still requires it (GROL)though the FCC does not.
Clearly there is still some value accorded to technical training there.

>
> I do think the Amateur radio tests serve a purpose at the "entry
> level". It is indeed a valid, and very necessary, requirement
> to demonstrate knowledge of rules and understanding of enough
> theory to presumably operate within those rules.
>
> The Extra Class (and the old Advanced Class too) fill no purpose
> or need other than as an incentive to reward people for making
> the effort. It can be a fun thing, not unlike DXCC or WAS or
> whatever. But it is an experience, and not in itself some
> measure of a good ham.

You've fallen into the trap set here long ago by the no-coders who
have
always attempted to portray any oldtimer who supports any code test in
ham radio licensing as being automatically dead set against all
newcomers.
Nothing could be further from the truth. Shame on you.
Larry's incendiary remarks aside, which he has long said are
designed merely to stir the pot, no one here that I know has any such
viewpoint. Truth is, he has some valid if extreme points.

>
>
> >Why should you presume that you're the only one here who has
> >worked in the field? You're certainly not.
>
> Who claimed that? But... I am quite clearly one of the more
> senior members here too.

Seniority at what? Posting here? HA!

> Probably about on the same level as
> you for example, both as a licensed ham operator where you
> probably have more experience than I do, and in the commercial
> arena where I probably have a broader background.

None of which has any relevence to the instant situation, whatever
the facts.

> I am also not
> at all alone in what I have been saying, and I think you must
> have noticed that most responses to what I've posted have
> supported my comments.

Ah, yes. All the whining,code hating,Extra bashers cheer and suddenly
you have "support". Right. Your critics remain silent and suddenly
that's "evidence" that you've got it all together. Fraid not.

>
> >> Someone mentioned getting an Extra
> >> Class at age 16 and that it was tougher than a 1st Phone.
> >
> > Read a little closer next time, in fact it seems it would be
> >productive if you'd just go back and reread it now, and see if
> >you can thrash out what was actually said.
>
> I read it right the first time.

Actually you evidently didn't. Jim said he was 16 when he got his
Extra. He lived a short distance from the FCC examiner. I lived 260
miles away. It was I who mentioned that
the FCC engineer-examiner had commented to me that most people regarded
the Extra exam as tougher than the First Phone- and I wasn't 16.
And having taken the First Phone test not long after completing
electronics school-several years before taking the Extra- I personally
didn't see it that way.
I took the First Phone exam in New York City and
while that surely didn't make much if any difference, I found the First
Phone tough enough that I still remember a couple questions
that I had difficulty with while I don't recall any such difficulty
with the Extra. In fact I didn't miss a single question as evidenced
by the fact that the examiner didn't put pencil to paper a single time
while grading the test.

> And the person who made the
> comment didn't disagree with my interpretation of it, so I fail
> to see what your problem is. As I said, virtually everyone back
> then felt the Amateur Extra was the more difficult test.
>
> >> I had
> >> a 1st Phone at age 16, but by age 20 I'd met at least a dozen
> >> people who'd been to a 6 week school that taught that test, and
> >> even though they didn't understand a bit of electronics, they
> >> were just as legal (and frankly at least a useful to the boss)
> >> for standing a transmitter watch as I was!
> > >
> > >
> > >Most of us have known some of the First Phone 'crash school'
> > >grads, but I sure wouldn't characterize them as being useful as
> > >those who learned the material.
> >
> > DJ's with a 1st Phone who could sign off the transmitter log
> > were highly prized.

Sure, even though they had no idea what they were attaching their
signature to, nor any technical skills beyond memorizing in a
crash school. FCC should have prosecuted each and every crash school
operator and retested every graduate, which clearly would have
eliminated most. In your view failure of bureaucracy validates whatever
follows.

We see where you're coming from, and it ain't pretty.
Another troll checking in with more Mister Twister views. Ugh.

Dummies like me were considered excess

> baggage, forced on them by the bureaucracy, because between
> hourly initials in the log, what good was I! That's why they
> paid us peanuts too, and it's why I never saw that as part of my
> future. (An attitude that really annoyed some of the people I
> worked for while I was going to school, but...)

I was a contract engineer. Beyond checking the transmitter and antenna
for proper operation periodically and confirming all was well by signing
to that effect in the statikon's log, they called me when something
broke. I was on retainer for the routine stuff and billed them
extra for repair time.

>
> >Makes one wonder if you weren't one of them instead of one of
> >us. It's one thing to babysit a transmitter and quite another
> >matter to actually work on it or repair it.
>
> How many people capable of working on it did they need though?
> Only one, but they can't operate 24 hours a day with that one
> guy signing the log. Typically they needed one Chief Engineer
> and a bunch of log signers!
>
> >I remember another case, when I was a kid with a new Novice ham
> >ticket. One of the 'crash school' grads was hired as the
> >engineer at the local BC AM.
>
> Anyone who hires an inexperienced person as "the" one and only
> engineer gets what they deserve. What's your point? The fact
> is the license didn't mean he could do the work, or even ever
> learn how.
>

Sure came down to that, didn't it? Such is evolution over time when the
system is allowed to slide into that sort of degradation. Early stifling
of purveyors of illicit licensing along with reasonable standards
demanding
the presense of transmitter engineers would have avoided that whole
ugly scene. FCC wasn't up to the task, for whatever reasons.
Now we see exactly the same sort of thing occurring in ham radio.

>
> And that is exactly what a couple of us have been trying to
> explain the significance of to you. Being a ham is similar in a
> small way, because we've seen here an example of a ham who has
> passed the toughest test there is, and he still sets a poor
> example.

You have no idea what sort of example Larry sets. What he does here is
mostly to stir up the uninitiated and the thin skinned thickheaded.
Yep, there are some of them here. I was quite surprised to find that
too,
when I first dropped in on rrap some 7 years ago.

> We can also find many others who will never be able to
> pass that same test who happen to be great examples of what a
> ham should be.
>

You still don't, and probably will never, get it.
FCC: 'The Amateur Radio Service is a fundamentally technical service".

>
> > "Useful" isn't a word I'd use to describe that crash school grad.
>
> If they weren't useful do you really think people would have
> been wasting their time and money on a crash school???? Take
> the blinders off. There are useful things and useful people in
> this world who do things you don't.
>
> > Ya got to learn *some* theory to get that far. How much would
> >one of your 'crash school' grads be worth here?
>
> Are you really so hung up on your own self that you think what
> you do is the important stuff and what anyone else does isn't,
> just because you are all that smart?
>

You just don't get it, and probably never will.

FCC: "Ham radio is fundamentally a technical service". You don't believe
that FCC means what it says?

>
> Wow. But, I just don't think so.
>
> > So in your view, since some First Phone licenses were issued
> >to unqualified individuals, it really doesn't matter whether or
> >not anyone ever did actually qualify for one?
>
> Where do you get off calling them "unqualified"???? They took
> the same test everyone else did. They were just as qualified
> for the ticket as you or I.

You DON'T get it, clearly. To you anyone who comes out with the paper
is fully qualified, even though they know nothing about the material on
which they were tested, and were/are unable to properly function as
licensees.
Welcome to ham radio in the new millenia. It's a lot like that here
too,
these days.

>
>
> I don't know about you, but I certainly was never qualified to
> do the jobs they did, and they weren't qualified to do the jobs
> I did. But I did notice that they were getting paid a heck of a
> lot more than me!
>

I didn't find that at all. Sorry you did.

>
> So I went and found a job that paid more than they got. It
> didn't require a 1st Phone either...
>

Good for you! I was a part timer since I already had a good fulltime
job.

>
> > Did you ever stop to consider that the proliferation of 'crash
> >school' grads and the results of their unlearned and unskilled
> >'efforts' were instrumental in the FCC doing away with the
> >license entirely? It sure gave lots of ammunition to those
> >eager to do away with commercial radio licensing.
>
> It rather proved that we didn't need those licenses anyway. In
> all honesty, the 3rd Class license covering rules and regulations
> was more significant than either a 2nd Class or 1st Class.
>

Man, you're dense! People scam the testing and licensing system so
thoroughly that the proof of technical qualification becomes
meaningless, and to you that means there was never a need for a
technical qualification! Amazing!

>
> > And then maybe that same situation applies to ham radio? So
> >why even bother with licenses?
>
> You're mixing apples and oranges. I have no problem with things
> like the entire concept of "incentive licensing" as it was
> implemented in the 50's.

It was 1968. Maybe you're not very familiar with ham radio.

> But I never saw much purpose in either
> the Advanced or the Extra Class, and even though CW was always
> the fun for me personally, I don't mind a bit that they've
> reduced the requirements to a minimum.
>

I can just imagine. You're so involved that though you claim licensing
for (now you say) 43 years but with little to no activity, evidently
none

whatever that can be used to claim current knowledge of conditions in ham radio, why should you care about much of anything related to ham radio? Again, you're an FCC licensee, not a ham radio operator!

>
> Hence if they had a single license, and it covered rules and regs
> and had a minimal amount of radio theory and a 5 wpm code
> test... I would not have a problem with it.

Hang on, that's where we're headed. And you can look for lots of us to lose interest in DC to daylight CB.

FCC might as well understand that their present enforcement problems are nothing beside what's coming!

>
>
> But... I don't mind either if there are 8 classes, as long as we
> don't deny people significant privileges just because they are
> not professional level engineers or technicians. I.e., it seems
> they *have* a pretty good license structure right now! Bravo!
>
> >> I can't see either
> >> the Extra test or the 1st Phone as significant... compared to
> >> something like working in a modern telecommunications center.
> >
> > So you worked in a comm center. Most hams have not and never
> >will. So they then shouldn't bother to learn anything about the
> >technical material?
>
> That is exactly the kind of logic you use that I object to.
> Nothing I said suggests that people who *want* to learn
> something should not. The point is there is no reason to
> *force* anyone to learn that in order to engage in Amateur Radio
> as a hobby.
>
> You seem to think that just because you have learned something,
> suffered through an exam, or whatever, that everyone else should
> do the same. I'm saying that is absurd, and I am the perfect
> example of why. In the past 40 years I've worked on so many
> different kinds of communications equipment that it would take
> all week to remember half of it. There simply is *no* need for
> ham radio operators to be forced to seek that level of
> experience just because a relative few of us actually do have
> it.

So since they can't possibly learn anything of commercial significance, no ham should be required to bother with such a thing as technical learning. We see. But don't expect to find much agreement except from the set here who never would anyway. And so far, thank our lucky stars, the FCC doesn't agree.

I tire of ya, Floyd - already. Your thought process, such as it is, is mired in the muck, never to be rescued in this lifetime.
Into the bit bucket with you, right along with
Lennie-AVeryFineSpeciMan,
Slim-Twit Burke, Vshah, and THE BOOB, also known as W5TIT.

It ain't crowded but I'm sure you'll enjoy the company.

Oh, one more thing. Get yourself some gear together and learn to use it - yes, whatever your background, you'll have to learn to use modern ham radio gear, it's unlike anything commercial that's out there, and fer sure unlike the earlier ham radio equipment. If you're really that learned it won't be hard to do, so not to worry.
Then -learn how to build and hang some antennas, get on the air and actually become a ham radio operator. You might learn something about ham radio, and for sure you will expose yourself to some fun. There's all
sorts of new (and old) fun stuff out there these days.

3050. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-27 05:15:35 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E5D9050.5E52B80C@att.net>
Source record: 62133

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> "Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> news:3E5A8FB9.1CA0D9B8@ix.netcom.com...
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > >
> > > You might as well have taken the First Phone test, you wouldn'thave
> been the first
> > > 16 year old to get one. Obviously you could have done it. Wasn't any
> huge deal. But
> > > I get a little tired of hearing repeatedly that all the ham radio tests
> have always
> > > been "entry level" and trivial. Not so.
> > >
> >
> > Depends on what background you had when you took the tests. Sure, the
> > extra writtens are not a big deal for a person with a BSEE to handle.
> > But for someone in a non technical field it would take some effort.
> >
>
> What's the point??? Remember, we're talking about basic qualifications
> here, not some "work ethic, make 'em jump through hoops" crap ...
>
> Dick apparently thought the test he had to take was "hard" ... he doesn't
> believe that todays' tests are "hard enough" ... and he begrudges anyone
> who already has the technical knowledge to pass them easily because
> he believes that "everyone should have to work hard to demonstrate their
> dedication" in order to "earn" their license ...

Kode-hating Karl, we know were you're coming from and you are NOT worth even
an argument. Stuff it. You'll never know what the test I took was like, you
weren't
qualified to even take it. While You sat licking your bruised ego for half your
adult life
others of us were just doing it and getting on with life. If I thought you ever
could, I'd
advise you to get over it, but that's not gonna ever happen.

3051. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-27 05:35:27 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E5DA38A.B1E9D5FD@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62134

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5CDEE0.FB871EAD@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
>
> > > Dave, my absence never happened. I had an Immediate change of heart.
> >
> > Now you tell us you never left the group. Sorry I simply can't trust
> > you.
> > You seem to be quite unreliable.
>
> I had an immediate change of heart, which you noticed and made note
> of, then chided me for not hooking up with Kim and Alec.
>
> Now you tell us I left.
>
> Which is it?

It has to be both, Brian. You told us you were leaving. You told us
that you never left. Why are you asking me which it is? You're having
trouble making up your own mind about it.

>
> > > > > Do you suppose that there might be a person out there who has no
> > > > > interest in VHF+ amateur communications, but having had a career in HF
> > > > > communications, would like to get an HF license? But then finds that
> > > > > they cannot learn the code? Perhaps even reflects back on his or her
> > > > > experiences on HF, and ask why the Code is so necessary to amateur
> > > > > communications in the year 2003?
> > > >
> > > > We've been through all this before.
> > >
> > > So you've made up your mind.
> >
> > Haven't you?
>
> Ham chronology shouldn't be measured in geological time.

There's a strange statement. Did you just decide to throw it in?

> > > I don't
> > > > believe there will be any morse test at all within a short period.
> > >
> > > A short period of what? Dits? Dahs? Time? What?

> >
> > Do you measure the passage of time in dits or dahs?
>
> Ahh. Thanks for clearing that up for me. You meant to say "short
> period of time."

No, I meant to write "I don't believe there will be any morse test at all within a short period." In future, you may assume that I mean "time" and not "dits", "dahs" or "snow flurries".

Dave K8MN

3052. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-27 05:46:32 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E5DA624.42BBDC48@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62135

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5CD67E.888574B6@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E564F03.72EB24C0@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > In article <20030220061433.23241.00000015@mb-da.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> > > > > writes:
> > > > >
> > > > > >Also gave a good indication of propagation. Back when a 1000 mile contact was
> > > > > >a major accomplishment, this was an important feature.
> > > > >
> > > > > Maybe you could help out K3LT complete his WAS? He seems
> > > > > to have difficulty getting out...
> > > >
> > > > Oh, I think it is all relative, Leonard. Compared, for example, to your
> > > > progress on WAS, his performance is stellar.
> > >
> > > Smug Dave offers a left-handed compliment to Novice Larry.
> >
> > Larry didn't receive left-handed compliment.
>
> He did if he read your post.

I don't think you can presume to speak for him on how he feels about my
statement.

> > Larry has done fine,
> > especially when his low power and less than ideal antennas are
> > considered. Larry wasn't called a Novice.
>
> Larry is a novice Award seeker. Is being a novice an insult?

You wrote "Novice Larry". Is that a compliment?

> > Brian is just reading between
> > the lines again. Do you consider Len's comment to Larry about his WAS a
> > compliment to Larry?
>
> You're kidding, right? When did those two ever have anything nice to
> say about each other?

No, I wasn't kidding. I don't think Len's comment was intended to be a compliment to Larry.

> > Len Anderson isn't even in the game. He's a never-WAS.
>
> Perhaps.

There's no "perhaps" to it.

> But not everyone seeks awards whether they're "in the game"
> or not.

Wrong. Not everyone who is in the game seeks (amateur radio) awards. Those who are not in the game cannot seek (amateur radio) awards. Len can play a game of Visit All States or e-mail all states or telephone all states.

In the mean time, Shhhhhh! Len's very hard at work. He's trying to think of a way out of the N2EY profile conundrum.

Dave K8MN

3053. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-27 06:56:12 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030227015612.06558.00000164@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 62136

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101)
>Date: 2/25/03 10:06 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20030225230612.23135.00000183@mb-mk.aol.com>

>Most likely no accredited college today accepts an amateur radio license for
>college credit.

Pehaps. But that was not the point made.

>The colleges you mentioned (from 1991) were less rigorous <,community>
>colleges. One can pass the test within a week. No college should give credit
>for the amateur radio license.

"Less rigorous"..?!?! USC, UCLA, and others suggest those schools as
preparatory work for their programs.

And please tell me WHAT college you earned your Masters of Education in
that qualifies you to make the assertion "No college should give credit for the
amateur radio license".

>First, Len said no California college accepts amateur radio license for
>credit.
>Then, you mentioned that the colleges he mentioned were not the ones you
>mentioned.
>Then, I said since those other colleges won't TRANSFER the credits, the
>amateur radio license could not be used to obtain college credit.

I see. You merely had to interject a non-germane argument in order to
have something to add. Lenniesque.

>> Go back and re-read what has been said here, Vippy, and in my previous
>>posts. But before you do, you might want to take a towel and wipe that
>>excrement from your eyes from having had your head so far up
>>your...uhhhh...well, you know where.
>
>It should be possible to respond without this type of comment.

No, Vippy, in this case it's not.

You seem to have a problem with blundering into on-going discussions
without any evidence of having taken the time to acquaint yourself with what's
going on. You are poorly prepared and shotgun answers that are at best
humorous, at worst humiliating.

Please don't waste our time.

>> Pretty good. I am sorry I didn't finish up at SBCC, then I'd have a
>>transcript documenting the elective credit.
>
>Just because they did it does not make it right.

At the time, it was right. Amateur Radio licenses still had the trust and confidence of boards-of-education becasue there was still an assumption that the test demonstrated that the licensee learned something in order to BE licensed.

>> Now...aren't you getting tired of making a fool of yourself,
>>Vipul...?!?!
>
>You were the one who said an amateur radio license could qualify for college
>credit.

That didn't answer the question, Vippy. I asked you if you weren't tired of making a fool out of yourself.

Had you taken the time to follow what was going on and the context in which it was presented, you wouldn't have wandered into yet another quagmire of foolishness.

Please try to follow along next time, OK?

Steve

3054. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-27 09:22:06 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@ptialaska.net>
Message-ID: <87k7fm3wox.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 62137

Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> wrote:
>Floyd Davidson wrote:

[really irrelavent ranting snipped]

>> >> It's a hobby folks.
>> >
>> > Ah, another "it's all just a hobby" type. Tell it to the
>> >FCC. The day they start to consider it "just another hobby"
>> >will be the day all that valuable spectrum is up for
>> >grabs. Like right now. Folks like you speed it along. An
>> >avocation it is, to be sure.
>>
>> The FCC *does* consider it just a hobby. Look at the way they
>> administer it! Draw a few comparisons to other services,
>> including CB.
>>
> You are cordially invited to take a (evidently first) look at what the
>FCC clearly states about the ARS- that FCC considers -still- the ARS
>to be a "Fundamentally technical service". Unquote. They said
>it once again at the last Restructuring.

How does "technical service" exclude it being a hobby? Stop
being absurd. It *is* a hobby. It has always been a hobby.
And that is why they call it the "Amateur" Radio Service.

>> And while you are researching that, look up "avocation" in a
>> dictionary. It means... "hobby". And it is, to be sure!
>>
>
> So most hams view it as an avocation rather than a vocation. I always
>have. But if you believe that it's "just a hobby" and thus its

I said "It's a hobby folks". I did *not* say that it can't be
other things too, so claiming I've said "just a hobby" when I
have not is deliberate fabrication on your part. You even put
it in quotes. Shame on you.

It *is* a hobby, and you might as well a get used to it. Get used
to the new FCC license structure too, it isn't going away soon.

>practitioners need nothing in the way of technical training beyond
>how to read a frequency dial, shame on you. shows what you (don't) know.

Nobody has said that. Shame on you for more fabrication.

>> >> Those tests are *all* meaningless to anyone
>> >> who has worked in the field.
>> >
>> > You have a right to your opinion, and that's all it is. FCC
>> >doesn't agree with it, obviously. Or they didn't untll
>> >recently.
>>
>> Yes they *do* agree with it.
>
>
>
> If the FCC agrees that all the tests they administer are meaningless,

You just can't stop with changing what I say and arguing against
something I've never even implied much less said. Nobody said
the tests are meaningless. I said to a professional they are
meaningless (essentially they are trivially easy for someone who
uses the very same information daily).

I was going to respond to some of the other comments, but by the
time I got half way through it you'd stopped even trying to make
sense and had gone back to manufacturing insults. Clearly you
don't have many valid points to bring up, and have to make do
with insults and fabrications.

I don't think anyone is interested in reading that kind of exchange,
and I can't see wasting my time either.

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://www.ptialaska.net/~floyd>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

3055. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-27 15:26:02 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030227102602.11066.00000003@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 62138

>Subject: Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)
>From: Floyd Davidson floyd@ptialaska.net
>Date: 2/27/03 3:22 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <87k7fm3wox.fld@barrow.com>

>How does "technical service" exclude it being a hobby? Stop
>being absurd. It *is* a hobby. It has always been a hobby.
>And that is why they call it the "Amateur" Radio Service.

It's called "Amateur" because we are prohibited from receiving money for what we do. That many persons do what they do in the "Aamteur" radio service in a professional manner is a matter of record.

For many it's a hobby. For many others it's a tool...a means to an end. That many use it as a hobby is fact. That it is MORE than a hobby is also a fact.

>I said "It's a hobby folks". I did *not* say that it can't be
>other things too, so claiming I've said "just a hobby" when I
>have not is deliberate fabrication on your part. You even put
>it in quotes. Shame on you.

No "shame on you" required. If you say "It's a hobby, folks", without any other qualifiers, that's ALL you said. That's where the confusion enters.

>It *is* a hobby, and you might as well a get used to it. Get used
>to the new FCC license structure too, it isn't going away soon.

You're right.. And it's probably going to get MORE socialistic in it's structure before it's all over.

>>practitioners need nothing in the way of technical training beyond
>>how to read a frequency dial, shame on you. shows what you (don't) know.
>
>Nobody has said that. Shame on you for more fabrication

The sad truth is that's it's all too true. No one's really required to KNOW the material necessary to become licensed, let alone upgrade to Amateur Extra. Yes, many DO "know" the material. Most don't.

Thanks Dick Bash.

>Clearly you
>don't have many valid points to bring up, and have to make do
>with insults and fabrications.

He may have been to-the-point and brusque, but there IS a point to be made.

>I don't think anyone is interested in reading that kind of exchange,
>and I can't see wasting my time either.

Despite the excellent opportunity this forum presents to actually discuss any "policy" issues, Floyd, any attemtpt to deviate from the "code test" issue is promptly pulled back to it by a few narrow minded individuals who don't have the mental capacity to discuss anything BUT the code test issue. Mostly by those who, regardless of the subject, will reintroduce the "code issue" with something like.."Oh yeah, and NOW you'll tell us how CW get's through when all else fails...", even if mode selection wasn't the topic.

There are a great number of policy matters that need to be "front burnered" for the good of the Amateur Radio Service, but if you want to have any impact on those issues, it will have to be done elsewhere.

My pet project is "Spectrum Protection". I don't think anything else is as important as any other discussion in Amateur Radio right now since if we have no allocations, we're dead.

Try and discuss it here!

All I can say is "Good Luck"..!

73

Steve, K4YZ

3056. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-27 16:17:56 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302270817.6155a13b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62139

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E5D9E8B.49A8CDAE@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5D46F3.F6D7AE52@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5CD3D7.EEF84967@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5C4A56.9C36C550@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5BB676.9C34F1CC@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Be sure to let him know that
> > > > > > > > > those sorry immigrants should get their act together and begin referring
> > > > > > > > > to themselves as "natives of the former Yugoslavia/Jugoslavia".
>
> > > > > > > > > Like the natives of the former Burma?
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > No, I don't think that natives of the former Burma would put up with
> > > > > > > > > having to call themselves "natives of the former Yugoslavia/Jugoslavia
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Why would they do that?
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > That was my point. I wrote of immigrants calling themselves natives of
> > > > > > > > the former Yugoslavia/Jugoslavia. You responded with "like the natives
> > > > > > > > of the former Burma?". I don't think anyone born in Burma calls himself
> > > > > > > > Yugoslavian.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Why would they do that?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > You tell me.
> > > >
> > > > Because they're in Myanmar, the country formerly known as Burma, not
> > > > FY.
>
> Then why would you suggest that they refer to themselves natives of the
> former Yugoslavia/Jugoslavia?

Why would I do that?

> FY is French Guiana.

In context, FY is former Yugoslavia.

You might want to try picking yourself up and dusting yourself off.
You've been taking a lot of falls lately.

3057. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-27 16:22:22 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302270822.ebfe121@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62140

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E5DA38A.B1E9D5FD@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5CDEE0.FB871EAD@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> >
> > > > Dave, my absence never happened. I had an Immediate change of heart.
> > >
> > > Now you tell us you never left the group. Sorry I simply can't trust
> > > you.
> > > You seem to be quite unreliable.
> >
> > I had an immediate change of heart, which you noticed and made note
> > of, then chided me for not hooking up with Kim and Alec.
> >
> > Now you tell us I left.
> >
> > Which is it?
> >
> It has to be both, Brian.

You must be right. I did leave and I didn't leave. Its settled.

3058. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-27 17:34:49 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E5E4C6D.7351BA43@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62141

```
Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5D9E8B.49A8CDAE@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5D46F3.F6D7AE52@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5CD3D7.EEF84967@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5C4A56.9C36C550@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5BB676.9C34F1CC@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > Be sure to let him know that
> > > > > > > > > > > those sorry immigrants should get their act together and begin
referring
> > > > > > > > > > > to themselves as "natives of the former Yugoslavia/Jugoslavia".
> > >
> > > > > > > > > > > Like the natives of the former Burma?
> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > No, I don't think that natives of the former Burma would put up with
> > > > > > > > > > > having to call themselves "natives of the former Yugoslavia/Jugoslavia
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > Why would they do that?
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > That was my point. I wrote of immigrants calling themselves natives of
> > > > > > > > > the former Yugoslavia/Jugoslavia. You responded with "like the natives
> > > > > > > > > of the former Burma?". I don't think anyone born in Burma calls himself
> > > > > > > > > Yugoslavian.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Why would they do that?
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > You tell me.
> > > > >
> > > > > Because they're in Myanmar, the country formerly known as Burma, not
> > > > FY.
```

> >
> > Then why would you suggest that they refer to themselves natives of the
> > former Yugoslavia/Jugoslavia?
>
> Why would I do that?

...because you don't take time to compose a complete thought.

> > FY is French Guiana.
>
> In context, FY is former Yugoslavia.

...then why not write "former Yugoslavia"?

> You might want to try picking yourself up and dusting yourself off.
> You've been taking a lot of falls lately.

You have a very active fantasy life and, no doubt, you believe what
you've written.

Dave K8MN

3059. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-27 17:36:50 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0302270936.598330cc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62142

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E5BC6F8.E20A989C@earthlink.net>...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> > Go for it, Goebbels 2! :-)

Len Over 21 loses. Godwin's Law.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3060. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-27 17:43:39 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E5E4E75.DCB6F894@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62143

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5DA38A.B1E9D5FD@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5CDEE0.FB871EAD@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > > > > Dave, my absence never happened. I had an Immediate change of heart.
> > > > >
> > > > > Now you tell us you never left the group. Sorry I simply can't trust
> > > > > you.
> > > > > You seem to be quite unreliable.
> > > >
> > > > I had an immediate change of heart, which you noticed and made note
> > > > of, then chided me for not hooking up with Kim and Alec.
> > > >
> > > > Now you tell us I left.
> > > >
> > > > Which is it?
> > >
> > > It has to be both, Brian.
>
> You must be right. I did leave and I didn't leave. Its settled.

I agree that it is settled. You told us one thing and did another.
That's one reason I'm not apt to trust you. Consider yourself chided
once again.

Cecil - Would never go for the Extra
Len - Going for the Extra "right out of the box"
Alec Baldwin - Leaving America if George Bush is elected
Kim - Leaving r.r.a.p.
Brian - Leaving r.r.a.p. but says he never left
Richard Nixon - You won't have Dick Nixon to kick around any more (he
finally made good on that one)

Dave K8MN

3061. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-27 17:48:06 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0302270948.1c88ff71@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62144

Floyd Davidson <floyd@ptialaska.net> wrote in message
>
> >> >> It's a hobby folks.

Some folks get all worked up over the word "hobby". I think it's because the word conjures up an image of triviality, low or non-existent standards of knoweldge or skill, not contributing anything really meaningful to society, and/or being purely for the fun of those involved.

So, Floyd, how about defining what "hobby" means in the Amateur Radio context?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3062. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-27 17:51:58 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E5E5066.3FC5AF28@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62145

N2EY wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5BC6F8.E20A989C@earthlink.net>...
> > Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > > Go for it, Goebbels 2! :-)
>
> Len Over 21 loses. Godwin's Law.

Leonard has himself a dilemma, Jim. He can't make "the big lie" stick
while using his typical comments. He doesn't seem to be able to avoid
your profile.
Character cannot be assassinated if the statements made about character
have been demonstrated to be factual.

Meanwhile, Jug Southgate, I could have sworn I saw the ghost of the
frosh out by the north tower last night during the high winds.

The big BC-348Q and National RCP restoration projects are coming along
nicely.
I have the '348 operational and only have to do a touch up alignment. I
haven't powered up the RCP yet since the cap replacement isn't all done.

Dave K8MN

3063. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-27 19:59:03 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@ptialaska.net>
Message-ID: <87d6ld4hrs.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 62146

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
>Floyd Davidson <floyd@ptialaska.net> wrote in message
>>
>> >> >> It's a hobby folks.
>
>Some folks get all worked up over the word "hobby". I think it's
>because the word conjures up an image of triviality, low or
>non-existent standards of knoweldge or skill, not contributing
>anything really meaningful to society, and/or being purely for the fun
>of those involved.

Why would anyone conjure up that notion? Amateur astronomers
have discovered a lot of interesting things, so have amateur
geologists, amateur botonists, and we could list several other
very technical fields where amateur activities are not
necessarily trivial.

Of course *some* of what they do is indeed trivial. Maybe even
a majority of what they do... but after all, heh heh, we're
discussing hobbies.

>So, Floyd, how about defining what "hobby" means in the Amateur Radio
>context?

Is that any different that what "hobby" means in any other
context? It's an avocation, or what a person likes to do when
they aren't engaged in their vocation.

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://www.ptialaska.net/~floyd>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

3064. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-27 22:59:57 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302271459.948053d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62147

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E5E4E75.DCB6F894@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5DA38A.B1E9D5FD@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5CDEE0.FB871EAD@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> >
> > > > > > Dave, my absence never happened. I had an Immediate change of heart.
> > > > >
> > > > > Now you tell us you never left the group. Sorry I simply can't trust
> > > > > you.
> > > > > You seem to be quite unreliable.
> > > >
> > > > I had an immediate change of heart, which you noticed and made note
> > > > of, then chided me for not hooking up with Kim and Alec.
> > > >
> > > > Now you tell us I left.
> > > >
> > > > Which is it?
> > >
> > > It has to be both, Brian.
> >
> > You must be right. I did leave and I didn't leave. Its settled.
>
> I agree that it is settled. You told us one thing and did another.
> That's one reason I'm not apt to trust you. Consider yourself chided
> once again.
>
> Cecil - Would never go for the Extra
> Len - Going for the Extra "right out of the box"
> Alec Baldwin - Leaving America if George Bush is elected
> Kim - Leaving r.r.a.p.
> Brian - Leaving r.r.a.p. but says he never left

Yet you documented that I never left.

> Richard Nixon - You won't have Dick Nixon to kick around any more (he
> finally made good on that one)

I thought that was Mike Deignan.
>

>
> Dave K8MN

3065. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-27 23:04:20 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302271504.bcd8c48@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62148

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E5E4C6D.7351BA43@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > In context, FY is former Yugoslavia.
>
> ...then why not write "former Yugoslavia"?

To see if you would trip and fall down?

It is a common enough abbreviation in war planning circles. I screwed up and thought amateurs radio operators were adept at abbreviations considering the CW handicap.

Brian

3066. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-27 23:05:43 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302271505.523a9700@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62149

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E5DA624.42BBDC48@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:

> > Perhaps.
>
> There's no "perhaps" to it.

Perhaps.

3067. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-27 23:06:14 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030227180614.23598.00000518@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 62150

In article <3E5E4C6D.7351BA43@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

Jugoslavia?
>>
Every time I see that word, I am reminded of a Benny Hill bit in which he plays
a somewhat befuddled announcer who mispronounces it "Jug o' saliva"

We miss you, Benny.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3068. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-27 23:52:59 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030227185259.23275.00000686@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 62301

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 2/27/03 5:04 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0302271504.bcd8c48@posting.google.com>

>> > In context, FY is former Yugoslavia.
>>
>> ...then why not write "former Yugoslavia"?
>
>To see if you would trip and fall down?
>
>It is a common enough abbreviation in war planning circles.

Oh? So now you are an associate of the Brookings Institute?

>I screwed
>up and thought amateurs radio operators were adept at abbreviations
>considering the CW handicap.
>

What handicap?

Steve, K4YZ

3069. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-28 00:30:20 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E5E8BAC.7A423601@att.net>
Source record: 62302

N2EY wrote:

> In article <f45722ac.0302260611.5cba2c07@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >Can legitimate communication take place at 5wpm?
>
> Sure -

But only assuming that both operators are able to stay awake!

3070. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-28 00:30:21 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E5E8C0C.EE243D33@att.net>
Source record: 62303

Robert Casey wrote:

> Brian wrote:
>
> >
> > We do have human failings. Forgive us. Please allow me to lay
> > prostrate on a cold damp floor and whip myself with split palm fronds
> > till my back bleeds, while chanting, "Forgive me Father for I have
> > Sinned, I've not used CW since 1987."
> >
>
> We break out the "Woff Fong" for that. See the ARRL web page
> for an explanation....

In his case we may be able to add some fangs to that "Fong".

3071. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-28 00:30:22 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net>
Message-ID: <3E5E8D3D.477E8EF0@att.net>
Source record: 62304

Brian wrote:

> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5C4BBD.A84F7ED5@earthlink.net>...
> > Vshah101 wrote:
> >
> >
> > > It does not matter if it is not the colleges mentioned. Colleges transfer
> > > credits from ACCREDITED courses. (Just read the college admission policy and
> > > you will see this statement).For example, I can transfer credits from a circuit
> > > analysis course, but not this "amateur radio license course credit".
> > >
> > > Since those other colleges do not recognize the amateur radio license as an
> > > accredited course, an amateur radio license is not equivalent to college
> > > credit.
> > >
> >
> > Quite a number of colleges and universities extend academic credit for
> > life experiences.
> >
> > One U.S. Department of State course I took in radio, used the complete
> > Heath General Class amateur license course as part of the study
> > material. That State Department course is accepted for college credit.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> It make you wonder how many of those Heath Housewife Kit Testers now
> have engineering degrees.

There were probably a few Rose Riveters who made Mechanical Engineer after the war, too.
Did you have a point other than the steep one on your headgear?

3072. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-28 01:05:12 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <08C8437111E3C447.3ECEB14CA721585A.39570DC21513C39B@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 62305

```
"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3E5E4E75.DCB6F894@earthlink.net...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5DA38A.B1E9D5FD@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5CDEE0.FB871EAD@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > > Dave, my absence never happened. I had an Immediate change of
heart.
> > > > >
> > > > > Now you tell us you never left the group. Sorry I simply can't
trust
> > > > > you.
> > > > > You seem to be quite unreliable.
> > > >
> > > > I had an immediate change of heart, which you noticed and made note
> > > > of, then chided me for not hooking up with Kim and Alec.
> > > >
> > > > Now you tell us I left.
> > > >
> > > > Which is it?
> > >
> > > It has to be both, Brian.
> >
> > You must be right. I did leave and I didn't leave. Its settled.
>
> I agree that it is settled. You told us one thing and did another.
> That's one reason I'm not apt to trust you. Consider yourself chided
> once again.
>
> Cecil - Would never go for the Extra
> Len - Going for the Extra "right out of the box"
> Alec Baldwin - Leaving America if George Bush is elected
> Kim - Leaving r.r.a.p.
> Brian - Leaving r.r.a.p. but says he never left
> Richard Nixon - You won't have Dick Nixon to kick around any more (he
> finally made good on that one)
>
>
```

> Dave K8MN
>

Are you perchance implying that you have never said one thing and done another, or changed your mind, or did the complete opposite of what you said? Yeah, right...

Kim W5TIT

3073. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-28 03:45:39 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030227224539.05048.00000879@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 62306

In article <3E5E8BAC.7A423601@att.net>, Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> In article <f45722ac.0302260611.5cba2c07@posting.google.com>,
>> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>>
>> >Can legitimate communication take place at 5wpm?
>>
>> Sure -
>
> But only assuming that both operators are able to stay awake!
>
Never been a problem for me.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3074. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-28 03:45:40 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030227224540.05048.00000880@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 62307

In article <3E5E5066.3FC5AF28@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3E5BC6F8.E20A989C@earthlink.net>...
>> > Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >
>> > > Go for it, Goebbels 2! :-)
>>
>> Len Over 21 loses. Godwin's Law.
>
>Leonard has himself a dilemma, Jim. He can't make "the big lie" stick
>while using his typical comments.

A person cannot talk their way out of a situation that person behaved his/her
way into.

>He doesn't seem to be able to avoid your profile.

All it would take would be for him to behave in a civil, respectful manner
towards those he disagrees with.

>Character cannot be assassinated if the statements made about character
>have been demonstrated to be factual.

Which he does in practically every post.
>
>Meanwhile, Jug Southgate,

Lo, Bohunk. How goes it?

>I could have sworn I saw the ghost of the
>frosh out by the north tower last night during the high winds.

Torn blue sweater and all?

btw, Ivy, Collier, Marcellus, Rollins and Pliny send their greetings. Ann wants
to know what sort of rig she should get.
>
>The big BC-348Q and National RCP restoration projects are coming along
>nicely.

Black crackle finish, like the business end of a dog's nose, only it is not
wet.

>I have the '348 operational and only have to do a touch up alignment.

How capital!

>I
>haven't powered up the RCP yet since the cap replacement isn't all done.
>
If you need any parts, you need but ask...

The Type 7 has been burning holes in the 40 meter ether the past few evenings.
Nice QRQ ragchews around 7020.

Time to hit the hay. 4:30 AM comes way too fast. If it doesn't snow too much,
running conditions will be good in the morning.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3075. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-28 03:47:58 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E5EDC26.811EA4C9@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62308

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5E4E75.DCB6F894@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5DA38A.B1E9D5FD@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5CDEE0.FB871EAD@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Brian wrote:

> > > > > It has to be both, Brian.
> > > >
> > > > You must be right. I did leave and I didn't leave. Its settled.
> > >
> > > I agree that it is settled. You told us one thing and did another.
> > > That's one reason I'm not apt to trust you. Consider yourself chided
> > > once again.
> > >
> > > Cecil - Would never go for the Extra
> > > Len - Going for the Extra "right out of the box"
> > > Alec Baldwin - Leaving America if George Bush is elected
> > > Kim - Leaving r.r.a.p.
> > > Brian - Leaving r.r.a.p. but says he never left
> >
> > Yet you documented that I never left.

I documented it? How, pray tell, could I do that? We have your word
that you were leaving and we have your word that you never left. You
want me to trust you?

Dave K8MN

3076. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-28 03:50:49 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E5EDCD1.49847E44@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62309

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5E4C6D.7351BA43@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> >
> > > In context, FY is former Yugoslavia.
> >
> > ...then why not write "former Yugoslavia"?
>
> To see if you would trip and fall down?
>
> It is a common enough abbreviation in war planning circles.

Not many of us are involved in war planning circles.

> I screwed up...

Agreed.

>... and thought amateurs radio operators were adept at abbreviations
> considering the CW handicap.

Play it any way you want. Last week you thought Phil was going to
contact some Spanish stations.

Dave K8MN

3077. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-28 03:53:30 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E5EDD72.DB32D50D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62310

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> N2EY wrote:
>
> > In article <f45722ac.0302260611.5cba2c07@posting.google.com>,
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> >
> > >Can legitimate communication take place at 5wpm?
> >
> > Sure -
>
> But only assuming that both operators are able to stay awake!

Right-o. We mustn't confuse legitimate (yet very slooooooooow)
communications and proficiency in use of a mode.

Dave K8MN

3078. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-28 03:59:29 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302271959.13311bfd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62311

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E5E4C6D.7351BA43@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:

> > You might want to try picking yourself up and dusting yourself off.
> > You've been taking a lot of falls lately.
>
> You have a very active fantasy life and, no doubt, you believe what
> you've written.

The only fantasies I've seen here were Han's story of Little Billy Beeper, Larry's broken leg on the mountain, and Dick's New Madrid disaster. But he can't work CW away from the power mains, so he's not able to save the day.

3079. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-28 04:01:05 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E5EDF27.7032976D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62313

W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3E5E4E75.DCB6F894@earthlink.net...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:<3E5DA38A.B1E9D5FD@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:<3E5CDEE0.FB871EAD@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > > > Dave, my absence never happened. I had an Immediate change of
> heart.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > > Now you tell us you never left the group. Sorry I simply can't
> trust
> > > > > > > you.
> > > > > > > You seem to be quite unreliable.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I had an immediate change of heart, which you noticed and made note
> > > > > > of, then chided me for not hooking up with Kim and Alec.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Now you tell us I left.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Which is it?
> > > > >
> > > > > It has to be both, Brian.
> > > >
> > > > You must be right. I did leave and I didn't leave. Its settled.
> > >
> > I agree that it is settled. You told us one thing and did another.
> > That's one reason I'm not apt to trust you. Consider yourself chided
> > once again.
> >
> > Cecil - Would never go for the Extra
> > Len - Going for the Extra "right out of the box"
> > Alec Baldwin - Leaving America if George Bush is elected
> > Kim - Leaving r.r.a.p.
> > Brian - Leaving r.r.a.p. but says he never left
> > Richard Nixon - You won't have Dick Nixon to kick around any more (he
> > finally made good on that one)

> Are you perchance implying that you have never said one thing and done
> another, or changed your mind, or did the complete opposite of what you
> said? Yeah, right...

Are you by chance attempting to ask a question (in which you attempt to
put words in my mouth) and then supplying your own answer?

I never did any of the things I've outlined above. I've certainly
never:

1. announced here that I'd be doing something that I changed my mind
and decided not to do.

2. announced here that I'd never do something then reversed myself.

Nice try, Kim.

Dave K8MN

3080. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-28 04:02:35 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302272002.6a51c485@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62312

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E5DA624.42BBDC48@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:

> > > Larry didn't receive left-handed compliment.
> > >
> > He did if he read your post.
> >
> I don't think you can presume to speak for him on how he feels about my
> statement.

I can recognize a left-handed compliment when I see one, even if I
didn't receive it.

3081. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-28 04:08:26 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3E5EE0F2.FAF9DC75@earthlink.net>
Source record: 62314

```
Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5DA624.42BBDC48@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
>
> > > > Larry didn't receive left-handed compliment.
> > >
> > > He did if he read your post.
> >
> > I don't think you can presume to speak for him on how he feels about my
> > statement.
>
> I can recognize a left-handed compliment when I see one, even if I
> didn't receive it.

I'm sure you have your hands full with those which you have received.
Please allow Larry to decide for himself if he has received one.

Len's, as I'm sure you noticed, was not left-handed.

Dave K8MN
```

3082. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-28 12:42:28 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302280442.2ee641e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62315

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E5EE0F2.FAF9DC75@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5DA624.42BBDC48@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
>
> > > > > Larry didn't receive left-handed compliment.
> > > >
> > > > He did if he read your post.
> > >
> > > I don't think you can presume to speak for him on how he feels about my
> > > statement.
> >
> > I can recognize a left-handed compliment when I see one, even if I
> > didn't receive it.
>
> I'm sure you have your hands full with those which you have received.
> Please allow Larry to decide for himself if he has received one.
>
> Len's, as I'm sure you noticed, was not left-handed.
>
Len is direct. You are smug. Left-handed is more your style.

3083. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-28 12:44:21 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302280444.77fcba50@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62316

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E5EDF27.7032976D@earthlink.net>...

> Are you by chance attempting to ask a question (in which you attempt to
> put words in my mouth) and then supplying your own answer?
>
> I never did any of the things I've outlined above. I've certainly
> never:
>
> 1. announced here that I'd be doing something that I changed my mind
> and decided not to do.
>
> 2. announced here that I'd never do something then reversed myself.
>
> Nice try, Kim.
>
> Dave K8MN

Dave, I certainly hope that you've changed your mind about working
Frenchmen on 6M out of band.

3084. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-28 12:45:53 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302280445.7e429953@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62317

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E5EDC26.811EA4C9@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5E4E75.DCB6F894@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5DA38A.B1E9D5FD@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5CDEE0.FB871EAD@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > Brian wrote:
>
> > > > > > It has to be both, Brian.
> > > > > >
> > > > > You must be right. I did leave and I didn't leave. Its settled.
> > > >
> > > I agree that it is settled. You told us one thing and did another.
> > > That's one reason I'm not apt to trust you. Consider yourself chided
> > > once again.
> > >
> > > Cecil - Would never go for the Extra
> > > Len - Going for the Extra "right out of the box"
> > > Alec Baldwin - Leaving America if George Bush is elected
> > > Kim - Leaving r.r.a.p.
> > > Brian - Leaving r.r.a.p. but says he never left
> >
> > Yet you documented that I never left.
>
> I documented it? How, pray tell, could I do that?

Quite easily. With a post to rrap.

3085. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-28 12:49:17 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302280449.5cc5ae3b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62318

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030227185259.23275.00000686@mb-da.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 2/27/03 5:04 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0302271504.bcd8c48@posting.google.com>
>
> >> > In context, FY is former Yugoslavia.
> >>
> >> ...then why not write "former Yugoslavia"?
> >
> >To see if you would trip and fall down?
> >
> >It is a common enough abbreviation in war planning circles.
>
> Oh? So now you are an associate of the Brookings Institute?
>
> >I screwed
> >up and thought amateurs radio operators were adept at abbreviations
> >considering the CW handicap.
> >
>
> What handicap?

Abbreviations abound because of the tediousness of spelling out words.
Either that or CW ops don't spell very well and hide it through
abbreviations.

3086. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-28 12:57:01 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302280457.79a500e4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62319

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E5EDCD1.49847E44@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3E5E4C6D.7351BA43@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > > In context, FY is former Yugoslavia.
> > >
> > > ...then why not write "former Yugoslavia"?
> >
> > To see if you would trip and fall down?
> >
> > It is a common enough abbreviation in war planning circles.
>
> Not many of us are involved in war planning circles.

With all the coverage in the news, its unfortunate that you missed it.

> > I screwed up...
>
> Agreed.
>
> >... and thought amateurs radio operators were adept at abbreviations
> > considering the CW handicap.
>
> Play it any way you want. Last week you thought Phil was going to
> contact some Spanish stations.

He may have for all I know. He never did say what an EA was.

3087. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-28 13:34:18 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302280534.1ee520d2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62320

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3E5EDD72.DB32D50D@earthlink.net>...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > N2EY wrote:
> >
> > > In article <f45722ac.0302260611.5cba2c07@posting.google.com>,
> > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> > >
> > > >Can legitimate communication take place at 5wpm?
> > >
> > > Sure -
> >
> > But only assuming that both operators are able to stay awake!
>
> Right-o. We mustn't confuse legitimate (yet very slooooooooow)
> communications and proficiency in use of a mode.
>
> Dave K8MN

Why not? The desired communication took place, according to both of your comments.

3088. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-28 13:48:22 UTC
From: W5TIT <seventythree@eightyeight.net>
Message-ID: <A31FB46C47A2ED56.47FA3CCA3780CDD8.9512C1820717413A@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 62321

```
"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3E5EDF27.7032976D@earthlink.net...
> W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3E5E4E75.DCB6F894@earthlink.net...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:<3E5DA38A.B1E9D5FD@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:<3E5CDEE0.FB871EAD@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Dave, my absence never happened. I had an Immediate change
of
> > heart.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Now you tell us you never left the group. Sorry I simply
can't
> > trust
> > > > > > > > you.
> > > > > > > > You seem to be quite unreliable.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > I had an immediate change of heart, which you noticed and made
note
> > > > > > > > of, then chided me for not hooking up with Kim and Alec.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Now you tell us I left.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Which is it?
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > It has to be both, Brian.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > You must be right. I did leave and I didn't leave. Its settled.
> > > > >
> > > > > I agree that it is settled. You told us one thing and did another.
> > > > > That's one reason I'm not apt to trust you. Consider yourself chided
> > > > > once again.
> > > > >
> > > > > Cecil - Would never go for the Extra
> > > > > Len - Going for the Extra "right out of the box"
```

> > > Alec Baldwin - Leaving America if George Bush is elected
> > > Kim - Leaving r.r.a.p.
> > > Brian - Leaving r.r.a.p. but says he never left
> > > Richard Nixon - You won't have Dick Nixon to kick around any more (he
> > > finally made good on that one)
>
> > Are you perchance implying that you have never said one thing and done
> > another, or changed your mind, or did the complete opposite of what you
> > said? Yeah, right...
>
> Are you by chance attempting to ask a question (in which you attempt to
> put words in my mouth) and then supplying your own answer?
>
> I never did any of the things I've outlined above. I've certainly
> never:
>
> 1. announced here that I'd be doing something that I changed my mind
> and decided not to do.
>
> 2. announced here that I'd never do something then reversed myself.
>
> Nice try, Kim.
>
> Dave K8MN

You know, Dave, there *are* other forms of masturbation than mental... You
might try some of them.

Kim W5TIT

3089. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-28 14:32:48 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hb0o291.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 62322

On 28 Feb 2003 04:57:01 -0800, Brian wrote:

>> Play it any way you want. Last week you thought Phil was going to
>> contact some Spanish stations.
>
>He may have for all I know. He never did say what an EA was.

As I posted before, ask your CPA to explain it to you. CPA is not intended to mean "Cleaning, Pressing, and Alterations" (an inside joke in the accounting industry).

---
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3090. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-28 15:37:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030228103700.11205.00000013@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 62323

>Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 2/28/03 6:49 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0302280449.5cc5ae3b@posting.google.com>

>Abbreviations abound because of the tediousness of spelling out words.
> Either that or CW ops don't spell very well and hide it through
>abbreviations

Do I need to spell more slowly for you, Brain?

W-h-a-t h-a-n-d-i-c-a-p. . . ? ! ? ! ?

S-t-e-v-e

3091. Icing problems on Yagi antennas

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-28 15:39:32 UTC
From: dhardy@backroads.net
Message-ID: <3180eec5.0302280739.16ac78eb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62324

Need help--I have a problem with icing on a yagi. I lose signal everytime we have an ice storm--I have seen (somewhere??) something about a type of spray on de-icer (aerosol). Any body out there know anything about this?

Thanks in advance.

David

3092. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-28 17:56:32 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030228125632.14389.00001212@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 62329

In article <f45722ac.0302271959.13311bfd@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3E5E4C6D.7351BA43@earthlink.net>...
>> Brian wrote:
>
>> > You might want to try picking yourself up and dusting yourself off.
>> > You've been taking a lot of falls lately.
>>
>> You have a very active fantasy life and, no doubt, you believe what
>> you've written.
>
>The only fantasies I've seen here were Han's story of Little Billy
>Beeper, Larry's broken leg on the mountain, and Dick's New Madrid
>disaster. But he can't work CW away from the power mains, so he's not
>able to save the day.

Dickie's "New Madrid" thing happened well before he was
born with a gold J-38 in his nose and rather before radio
was born. But, he read all about it in a book so he's an
expert and can coach all of us who've ridden out actual
earthquakes.

For official fantasies, I rather like the State Department
Heathkit Course used for training its "key" people. Just
think, foreign policy of the United States of America based
on a defunct kit company in Michigan. :-)

3093. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-28 17:56:33 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030228125633.14389.00001213@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 62328

In article <3E5E8D3D.477E8EF0@att.net>, Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> writes:

>Brian wrote:
>
>> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3E5C4BBD.A84F7ED5@earthlink.net>...
>> > Vshah101 wrote:
>> >
>> >
>> > > It does not matter if it is not the colleges mentioned. Colleges
>transfer
>> > > credits from ACCREDITED courses. (Just read the college admission
>policy and
>> > > you will see this statement).For example, I can transfer credits from a
>circuit
>> > > analysis course, but not this "amateur radio license course credit".
>> > >
>> > > Since those other colleges do not recognize the amateur radio license
>as an
>> > > accredited course, an amateur radio license is not equivalent to
>college
>> > > credit.
>> > >
>> >
>> > Quite a number of colleges and universities extend academic credit for
>> > life experiences.
>> >
>> > One U.S. Department of State course I took in radio, used the complete
>> > Heath General Class amateur license course as part of the study
>> > material. That State Department course is accepted for college credit.
>> >
>> > Dave K8MN
>>
>> It make you wonder how many of those Heath Housewife Kit Testers now
>> have engineering degrees.
>
> There were probably a few Rose Riveters who made Mechanical Engineer after
>the war, too.
>Did you have a point other than the steep one on your headgear?

The fictional name during WW2 was "Rosie the Riveter," not
'Rose Riveter.' Even a popular song at the time. You must
have been too young to remember, old-timer. Ham radio was
deactivated for the duration of the war.

How many "Rosie the Riveters" got BSMEs back then, old-timer,
and what does it have to do with amateur radio?

Oh, yes, this is a newsgroup about amateur radio policy, not
headgear. Styles of headgear are very optional, are not in
regulations of Part 97.

I can't see where you PCTAs are SERIOUS enough for a life
of fun and recreation in a hobby. Please consider alternatives.

3094. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-28 17:56:34 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030228125634.14389.00001215@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 62325

In article <3E5E8C0C.EE243D33@att.net>, Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> writes:

>Robert Casey wrote:
>
>> Brian wrote:
>>
>> > We do have human failings. Forgive us. Please allow me to lay
>> > prostrate on a cold damp floor and whip myself with split palm fronds
>> > till my back bleeds, while chanting, "Forgive me Father for I have
>> > Sinned, I've not used CW since 1987."
>>
>> We break out the "Woff Fong" for that. See the ARRL web page
>> for an explanation....
>
>In his case we may be able to add some fangs to that "Fong".

There's NO "woff fong" on any ARRL page. There IS a
"whouff hong" if that's needed for a symbol. It must have
meant something significant in 1914...it's looked like two
pieces of scrap wood crudely fastened together over the
last half-century. The rettysnitch had lots of sharp points.

Imagine that...grown men revering two pieces of scrap wood
and not being carpenters...in a radio club.

3095. Re: Callsign etiquette?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-28 17:56:34 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030228125634.14389.00001214@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 62330

In article <3E5DA624.42BBDC48@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Brian wrote:
>>
>> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3E5CD67E.888574B6@earthlink.net>...
>> > Brian wrote:
>> > >
>> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3E564F03.72EB24C0@earthlink.net>...
>> > > > Len Over 21 wrote:
>> > > > >
>> > > > > In article <20030220061433.23241.00000015@mb-da.aol.com>,
>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>> > > > > writes:
>> > > > >
>> > > > > >Also gave a good indication of propagation. Back when a 1000 mile
>contact was
>> > > > > >a major accomplishment, this was an important feature.
>> > > > >
>> > > > > Maybe you could help out K3LT complete his WAS? He seems
>> > > > > to have difficulty getting out...
>> > > >
>> > > > Oh, I think it is all relative, Leonard. Compared, for example, to
>your
>> > > > progress on WAS, his performance is stellar.
>> > > >
>> > > Smug Dave offers a left-handed compliment to Novice Larry.
>> > >
>> > Larry didn't receive left-handed compliment.
>>
>> He did if he read your post.
>
>I don't think you can presume to speak for him on how he feels about my
>statement.
>
>> > Larry has done fine,
>> > especially when his low power and less than ideal antennas are
>> > considered. Larry wasn't called a Novice.
>>
>> Larry is a novice Award seeker. Is being a novice an insult?
>
>You wrote "Novice Larry". Is that a compliment?

>
>> > Brian is just reading between
>> > the lines again. Do you consider Len's comment to Larry about his WAS a
>> > compliment to Larry?
>>
>> You're kidding, right? When did those two ever have anything nice to
>> say about each other?
>
>No, I wasn't kidding. I don't think Len's comment was intended to be a
>compliment to Larry.
>
>> > Len Anderson isn't even in the game. He's a never-WAS.
>>
>> Perhaps.
>
>There's no "perhaps" to it.
>
>> But not everyone seeks awards whether they're "in the game"
>> or not.
>
>Wrong. Not everyone who is in the game seeks (amateur radio) awards.
>Those who are not in the game cannot seek (amateur radio) awards. Len
>can play a game of Visit All States or e-mail all states or telephone
>all states.
>
>In the mean time, Shhhhhh! Len's very hard at work. He's trying to
>think of a way out of the N2EY profile conundrum.

Poor baby. I've been working*, not concerning self with
middle-aged adolescents indulging in their own aroma therapy
(attar of stinky slinging) in wordplay. Pays fairly well, too. :-)

Tell us, munchkin of many keys, was there a State Dept. Heath
Course in Getting Along With People? If there was, you never
took it or flunked out if you did.

You PCTAs are just too SERIOUS for this world...consider
alternatives.

* You don't have a need to know. [NDA] :-)

3096. Re: CW DX? (somewhat OT)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-28 17:56:35 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030228125635.14389.00001216@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 62326

In article <20030227224540.05048.00000880@mb-cs.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>Time to hit the hay. 4:30 AM comes way too fast. If it doesn't snow too much,
>running conditions will be good in the morning.

Don't slip on the ice on the way to the stealth works, old-timer.
Keep thinking of Jim Fixx.

Be SERIOUS about what you do...

3097. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-28 17:56:35 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030228125635.14389.00001217@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 62327

In article <c2356669.0302270948.1c88ff71@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>Floyd Davidson <floyd@ptialaska.net> wrote in message
>>
>> >> >> It's a hobby folks.
>
>Some folks get all worked up over the word "hobby". I think it's
>because the word conjures up an image of triviality, low or
>non-existent standards of knoweldge or skill, not contributing
>anything really meaningful to society, and/or being purely for the fun
>of those involved.

Good grief, can't have such terrible "trivialities" here!

Everyone MUST be serious-minded!

It's a pejorative thing, very low standard to actually have
FUN or RECREATION in a HOBBY?

Oy gevalt!

>So, Floyd, how about defining what "hobby" means in the Amateur Radio
>context?

How's about another Sermon on the Antenna Mount from the
distinguished cloggyman at the pulpit? Show us all where we
went wrong on considering a hobby as a hobby? Tell all how
to achieve nirvana in the present life by adopting the lifestyle of
amateur radio as a savior?

Be SERIOUS now...

3098. Re: Extra-Lite Status (Was: Re: Callsign etiquette?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-28 17:56:38 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030228125638.14389.00001218@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 62331

In article <20030227102602.11066.00000003@mb-mr.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>From: Floyd Davidson floyd@ptialaska.net

>>How does "technical service" exclude it being a hobby? Stop
>>being absurd. It *is* a hobby. It has always been a hobby.
>>And that is why they call it the "Amateur" Radio Service.
>
> It's called "Amateur" because we are prohibited from receiving money for
>what we do. That many persons do what they do in the "Aamteur" radio service
>in a professional manner is a matter of record.

"Aamteur?!?" Forgot the Prozac dose again? :-)

Doing amateur work in a professional manner? :-)

Oh, yes, by-the-book, the official book of course, in jargon, expressions, and (by all means) morse code. Relaying all those vital-to-the-nation messages along the NTS. Playing in those "radio sport" contests to qualify as emergency-trained operators. :-)

> For many it's a hobby. For many others it's a tool...a means to an end.

In Sgt Steam Yaputz' case it is a surrogate for life in the corpse, er, Corps. :-)

>That many use it as a hobby is fact. That it is MORE than a hobby is also a
>fact.

Oh, dear, the "fact" fantasy again. Yes, some use amateur radio as a whole lifestyle away from work, imagining all kinds of heroic high-altitude, low-opening derring-do and saving the Titanic over and over again.

>>I said "It's a hobby folks". I did *not* say that it can't be
>>other things too, so claiming I've said "just a hobby" when I
>>have not is deliberate fabrication on your part. You even put
>>it in quotes. Shame on you.
>
> No "shame on you" required. If you say "It's a hobby, folks", without
any
>other qualifiers, that's ALL you said. That's where the confusion enters.

Floyd isn't confused, Sgt Yaputz. You are.

Avocation, hobby, fun, recreation is all it is. Amateur radio
isn't vital to national security, national defense, or anything
else except as a fantasy-land for a minority within. If US
amateur radio were suddenly removed, the USA would continue
to function just fine without it, losing nothing but some loud
complaining from its life-stylers.

>>It *is* a hobby, and you might as well a get used to it. Get used
>>to the new FCC license structure too, it isn't going away soon.
>
> You're right.. And it's probably going to get MORE socialistic in it's
>structure before it's all over.

"Socialistic?!?" :-)

> The sad truth is that's it's all too true. No one's really required to
>KNOW the material necessary to become licensed, let alone upgrade to Amateur
>Extra. Yes, many DO "know" the material. Most don't.

Two four-year-olds "passed the test" well before the Restructuring
of 99-412 R&O.

Are you really serious about thinking that four-year-olds "know the
material?!?"

I don't think you are being serious...

>>Clearly you
>>don't have many valid points to bring up, and have to make do
>>with insults and fabrications.
>
> He may have been to-the-point and brusque, but there IS a point to be
>made.

That sentence should be in the top three Understatement
category!

>>I don't think anyone is interested in reading that kind of exchange,
>>and I can't see wasting my time either.
>
> Despite the excellent opportunity this forum presents to actually discuss
>any "policy" issues, Floyd, any attemtpt to deviate from the "code test" issue
>is promptly pulled back to it by a few narrow minded individuals who don't
have
>the mental capacity to discuss anything BUT the code test issue. Mostly by
>those who, regardless of the subject, will reintroduce the "code issue" with
>something like.."Oh yeah, and NOW you'll tell us how CW get's through when
>all else fails...", even if mode selection wasn't the topic.

Poor baby. You want to moderate the newsgroup? Contact
Paul. Talk nice and you might get to be a honcho! :-)

> There are a great number of policy matters that need to be "front
>burnered" for the good of the Amateur Radio Service, but if you want to have
>any impact on those issues, it will have to be done elsewhere.

"Front burnered?!?" So far thousands of cubic yard of GAS
have been wasted by the illustrious, noble morsemen of the
PCTA camp. Their pilots are (apparently) lit, but the only fire
they start is used for illuminating their personal magnificences.

> My pet project is "Spectrum Protection". I don't think anything else is
>as important as any other discussion in Amateur Radio right now since if we
>have no allocations, we're dead.

"No allocations?" Oh, my, lots of allocations. US ham radio bands
have increased since 1975, not decreased.

How is Sgt Steam Yaputz fixed for knowledge on US amateur bands
above the 70 cm band? Ever count the number of bands there and
compared them against those below 30 MHz? Know anything about
the microwave region? Remember, you've had 3 decades to learn.

Who is going to "take away the ham bands?" Are you hearing
black helicopters again? FCC has only auctioned off already-
allocated commercial bands for commercial services...no amateur
bands have even been hinted at as being auctioned off except by
the black helicopter fans.

There MAY be some cause for concern. Folks in Yurp got a new
LF ham band in their countries. USA hasn't gotten one yet.
ARRL can't seem to shake the notion that 160 to 190 KHz
isn't "ham territory" (as if it ever was). Oh, my, ARRL got this
pioneering research group to "evaluate" a small piece of 5 MHz
spectrum real estate in the 1990s (as if it were an unknown as
in the 30s) but the R&O hasn't been given yet. FB OM

Got a spectrum analyzer, Sgt Yaputz? Know what it is? If y'all
going to po-lice that spectrum you gots to know what's there.

Have you taken that expert Heathkit Course that Department of
State had for its "key" officers? Better get busy and study up
on things policy, things spectral, and how to play well with
human beings...

> Try and discuss it here!

Not a problem to me but I expect you will have the usual SOP
(Standard Off-color Pejoratives) to issue in snarlygrams. :-)

> All I can say is "Good Luck"..!

Tsk, tsk, tsk, no famous phrases like "fair winds and..." and other
phine phrases? Just "good luck?!?" :-)

3099. Re: Icing problems on Yagi antennas

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-28 18:51:50 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030228135150.29016.00000530@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 62333

In article <3180eec5.0302280739.16ac78eb@posting.google.com>,
dhardy@backroads.net (Montysmoke) writes:

>Need help--I have a problem with icing on a yagi. I lose signal
>everytime we have an ice storm--I have seen (somewhere??) something
>about a type of spray on de-icer (aerosol). Any body out there know
>anything about this?

Icing on antennas is usually caused by precipitation freezing
on antenna components. ["water from the sky"] *

Likely causes of disturbance to antennas are:

1. Loss of one or more conductive paths due to components
decreasing in physical size from low temperatures brought
on by icing conditions.

2. Mistuning of critical antenna components due to dielectric
loading from built-up ice.

3. Sloppy construction of antenna components and antenna
system which cause (1) and (2).

Condition (1) may be aggravated by sloppiness of conductive
joints which allow moisture/water build-up during warmth, then
freezing and allowing temporary ice expansion to separate
joints. Cure: Clean and tighten all conductive joints, seal
with some known polymer compound, double-check that
all insulated parts do not contract with temperature and cause
conductive paths.

Condition (1) may also be caused by a break in the feeder
line, particularly the center conductor in coaxial cable. This
would not be in the antenna structure per se but the feeder
line outside the station would also be exposed to icing.
Check: Resistance if normal connection resulted in a
conductive path through antenna or if there is not a DC path
through antenna. Cure: Repair/replace faulty section of
feeder line.

Spray-on anti-icing compounds are transitory cures, good
for aircraft about to depart, not recommended for relatively
permanent installations. They do not prevent ice formation,
simply mix with ice/snow to reduce the total mix freezing
temperature and allow removal. Once ambient temperature
returns to warmth, such de-icing compounds evaporate or
disperse and icing may accumulate again. Rather than

depend on transitory miracle cures such as spritzing a magic fluid (plus installing such a spray system permanently along with a myriad of extra piping), simply use a heater. Andrew Corporation sold 6' to 12' parabolic antenna assemblies in 1950 which had a thermostatically-controlled 150 W flood lamp focussed on the microwave antenna's dipole-reflector feed assembly. Those were successfully used for many years in icing conditions at remote sites.

Condition (2) has only one cure: Don't use an antenna design so sensitive or narrowband, susceptible to the slightest amount of water to mistune it. Normal antenna designs are relatively stable in all types of precipitation.

Condition (3) was encountered by the writer at Warminster NAS on an RA-2 test aircraft that had an added L-band blade antenna on its underside. A required doubler plate (to reinforce structural skin of aircraft) had been drilled with too small a diameter clearance hole for the type N connector. The center conductor connector pin barely made contact on the ground (DC check okay) but lower temperatures aloft caused contraction of the connector pin and contact was opened. Cure: Enlarge the clearance hole in doubler plate to allow full seating of N connector on coax to blade antenna and flight testing resumed normally, no problems from temperature differences.

Note: This newsgroup is for amateur radio policy arguments, not about antenna problems. Rec.radio.amateur.antennas is the appropriate venue for antenna discussion.

* deliberate wording to yield an "opening" for those who cannot get along with others without fighting personalities instead of topics.

3100. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-28 18:51:53 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030228135153.29016.00000532@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 62332

In article <A31FB46C47A2ED56.47FA3CCA3780CDD8.9512C1820717413A@lp.airnews.net>,
"W5TIT" <seventythree@eightyeight.net> writes:

>> Nice try, Kim.
>>
>> Dave K8MN
>
>You know, Dave, there *are* other forms of masturbation than mental... You
>might try some of them.

ROTFL! :-)

3101. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-28 18:51:53 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030228135153.29016.00000531@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 62334

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hb0o291.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 28 Feb 2003 04:57:01 -0800, Brian wrote:
>
>>> Play it any way you want. Last week you thought Phil was going to
>>> contact some Spanish stations.
>>
>>He may have for all I know. He never did say what an EA was.
>
> As I posted before, ask your CPA to explain it to you. CPA is not
> intended to mean "Cleaning, Pressing, and Alterations" (an inside
> joke in the accounting industry).

Gosh, old-timer, I thought "EA" meant "Extra Attitude." :-)

"Why is the word 'abbreviation' so long?" - anon. tagline

3102. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-28 22:59:27 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302281459.6dbc6775@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62335

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hb0o291.pminews@netnews.attbi.com>...
> On 28 Feb 2003 04:57:01 -0800, Brian wrote:
>
> >> Play it any way you want. Last week you thought Phil was going to
> >> contact some Spanish stations.
> >
> >He may have for all I know. He never did say what an EA was.
>
> As I posted before, ask your CPA to explain it to you.

Thanks Phil, I knew I could count on you to give good advice. But
since I handle my own taxes, I don't need a CPA. Should I hire one
just to decipher your jargon? No, its just not that important.

Thanks again for everything, Brian

3103. Re: The RIGHT Stuff

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-28 23:01:19 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302281501.4eef08a2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62336

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20030228103700.11205.00000013@mb-mr.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: The RIGHT Stuff
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 2/28/03 6:49 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0302280449.5cc5ae3b@posting.google.com>
>
> >Abbreviations abound because of the tediousness of spelling out words.
> > Either that or CW ops don't spell very well and hide it through
> >abbreviations
>
> Do I need to spell more slowly for you, Brain?
>
> W-h-a-t h-a-n-d-i-c-a-p. . . ? ! ? ! ?
>
> S-t-e-v-e

S-t-e-v-e, its not a matter of speed. Its a matter of accuracy.

Like the FISTS website states, "Accuracy Transcends Speed."

3104. Re: Last Advanced/Novice could become like last Civil War Veteran

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-02-28 23:06:31 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0302281506.3e27c96e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 62337

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030228125634.14389.00001215@mb-mw.aol.com>...
> In article <3E5E8C0C.EE243D33@att.net>, Dick Carroll <dickc58@att.net> writes:
>
> >Robert Casey wrote:
> >
> >> Brian wrote:
> >>
> >> > We do have human failings. Forgive us. Please allow me to lay
> >> > prostrate on a cold damp floor and whip myself with split palm fronds
> >> > till my back bleeds, while chanting, "Forgive me Father for I have
> >> > Sinned, I've not used CW since 1987."
> >>
> >> We break out the "Woff Fong" for that. See the ARRL web page
> >> for an explanation....
> >>
> >In his case we may be able to add some fangs to that "Fong".
>
> There's NO "woff fong" on any ARRL page. There IS a
> "whouff hong" if that's needed for a symbol. It must have
> meant something significant in 1914...it's looked like two
> pieces of scrap wood crudely fastened together over the
> last half-century. The rettysnitch had lots of sharp points.
>
> Imagine that...grown men revering two pieces of scrap wood
> and not being carpenters...in a radio club.

I guess it beats picking up ice cubes with one's buttocks for an initiation rite.

I wonder what they did with them, and if they sanitized it afterwards.